Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1524

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLISON). On this rollcall of the House, 384 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

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

□ 1525

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110–548 by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) had been disposed of.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110–548.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 is revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, including appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013:

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

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

Fiscal year 2008: $1,873,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,017,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,104,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,198,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,291,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,352,645,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2008: -$6,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: -$80,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: -$78,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: -$229,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: -$362,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: -$402,095,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2008: $2,546,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,429,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,409,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,514,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,523,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,619,267,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2008: $2,461,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,478,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,476,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,523,601,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,504,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,594,191,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2008: $588,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $462,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $372,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $324,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $213,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $241,546,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2008: $9,572,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $10,179,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,745,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $11,281,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,746,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $12,233,839,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2008: $5,402,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,733,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $6,002,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $6,225,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $6,337,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $6,482,741,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2008 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $693,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $604,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $612,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $645,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $550,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $607,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $557,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $577,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $565,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $576,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,503,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $38,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,327,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,967,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $27,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $27,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $28,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $29,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,026,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $4,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,212,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $32,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $33,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $34,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $35,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,490,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,896,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $22,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,816,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $11,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $8,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,535,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $79,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $74,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $76,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $77,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $78,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $79,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,112,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $14,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $15,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $15,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $15,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,561,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $90,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $92,835,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $98,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $101,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $103,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $97,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,411,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $285,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $305,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $322,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $323,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $343,709,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $366,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $365,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $391,993,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,267,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $390,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $420,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $445,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $494,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $491,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $490,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $552,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $552,389,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $389,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $410,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $412,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $414,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $416,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $424,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $410,706,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $410,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $426,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,036,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $30,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $33,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,162,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $86,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $94,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $96,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $101,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $99,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $105,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,266,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $46,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $50,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $48,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $47,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $48,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $49,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,540,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $56,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $19,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $20,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $20,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,194,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $349,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $349,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $333,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $333,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $367,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $403,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $429,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $445,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,455,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, -$8,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, -$84,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$72,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, -$129,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$124,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, -$155,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$168,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, -$195,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$205,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$229,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$246,124,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, -$68,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$68,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, -$71,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$71,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, -$77,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$77,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, -$78,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$78,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,033,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION TO PROVIDE FOR THE REFORM OF MANDATORY SPENDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 29, 2008, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $9,321,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $1,292,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(C) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—The Committee on Education and the Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $15,926,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(D) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $115,812,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(E) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $73,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(F) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Foreign Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $250,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(G) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $3,450,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(H) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $3,721,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(I) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $4,679,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(J) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $4,672,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(K) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $253,204,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(b) REVENUE RECONCILIATION.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill not later than July 29, 2008, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $1,151,441,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget pursuant to subsection (a), or the reporting of a measure pursuant to subsection (b), a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

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

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

TITLE III—EARMARK REFORM

SEC. 301. MORATORIUM ON EARMARKS.

(a) HOUSE.— In the House, for the remainder of the 110th Congress, it shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, or conference report, containing a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit, as such terms are defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) SENATE.—In the Senate, [to be supplied]

SEC. 302. JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON EARMARK REFORM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION.—There is established a Joint Select Committee on Earmark Reform. The joint select committee shall be composed of 16 members as follows:

(1) 8 Members of the House of Representatives, 4 appointed from the majority by the Speaker of the House and 4 from the minority by the minority leader; and

(2) 8 Members of the Senate, 4 appointed from the majority by the majority leader of the Senate and 4 from the minority by the minority leader. A vacancy in the joint select committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint select committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

(b) STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—The joint select committee shall make a full study of the practices of the House, Senate, and executive branch, regarding earmarks in authorizing, appropriation, tax, and tariff measures. As part of the study, the joint select committee shall consider the efficacy of—

(A) the disclosure requirements of clause 9 of rule XXI and clause 17 of rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, House Resolution 491, and rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and the definitions contained therein;

(B) requiring full transparency in the process, with earmarks listed in bills at the outset of the legislative process and continuing throughout consideration;

(C) requiring that earmarks not be placed in any bill after initial committee consideration;

(D) requiring that Members be permitted to offer amendments to remove earmarks at subcommittee, full committee, floor consideration, and during conference committee meetings;

(E) requiring that bill sponsors and majority and minority managers certify the validity of earmarks contained in their bills;

(F) recommending changes to earmark requests made by the executive branch through the annual budget submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code;

(G) requiring that House and Senate amendments meet earmark disclosure requirements, including amendments adopted pursuant to a special order of business;

(H) establishing new categories for earmarks, including—

(i) projects with national scope;

(ii) military projects; and

(iii) local or provincial projects, including the level of matching funds required for such project.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) the joint select committee shall submit to the House and the Senate a report of its findings and recommendations not later than 6 months after adoption of this concurrent resolution.

(B) no recommendation shall be made by the joint select committee except upon the majority vote of the members from each House, respectively.

(C) notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, any recommendation with respect to the rules and procedures of one House that only affects matters related solely to that House may only be made and voted on by members of the joint select committee from that House and, upon its adoption by a majority of such members, shall be considered to have been adopted by the full committee as a recommendation of the joint select committee. In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the joint select committee shall hold not fewer than 5 public hearings.

(c) RESOURCES AND DISSOLUTION.—

(1) The joint select committee may utilize the resources of the House and Senate.

(2) The joint select committee shall cease to exist 30 days after the submission of the report described in subsection (a)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''earmark'' shall include congressional earmarks, congressionally directed spending items, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as those terms are defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Nothing in this subsection shall confine the study of the joint select committee or otherwise limit its recommendations.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. ENHANCE ACCOUNTABILITY BY REQUIRING A SEPARATE VOTE ON AN INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT.

(a) PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.—In the House, a joint resolution prepared pursuant to the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget, or any revision to such concurrent resolution, under the procedures set forth in rule XXVIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall reflect an increase in the statutory limit on the public debt of zero.

(b) STATEMENT.—The report of the Committee on the Budget on a concurrent resolution and the joint explanatory statement of the managers on a conference report to accompany such concurrent resolution shall

(1) include the language of the joint resolution described in rule XXVIII, which will reflect no increase in the statutory limit on the public debt;

(2) contain a clear statement that an increase in the statutory limit on the public debt requires a separate roll call vote of all Members of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 402. SAME-DAY CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS.

A report on a rule, joint rule, or the order of business may not be called up for consideration on the same calendar day, or less than 17 hours after that, it is presented to the House except—

(1) when so determined by a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present;

(2) in the case of a resolution proposing only to waive a requirement of clause 4 or of clause 8 of rule XXII concerning the availability of reports; or

(3) during the last three days of a session of Congress.

SEC. 403. TWO-THIRDS REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN WAIVERS UNDER THE RULES OF THE HOUSE.

It is not in order to consider a rule or order that waives—

(1) the layover requirement of clause 8 of rule XXII concerning the availability of reports;

(2) clause 8(a)(1) of rule XXII;

(3) the scope requirement of the last sentence of clause 9 of rule XXII;

by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present.

SEC. 404. TWO-THIRDS REQUIREMENT FOR AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE INTERNET.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF COMMITTEE REPORTED MEASURES.—Except as specified in subparagraph (2) of clause 4(a) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, it shall not be in order to consider in the House a measure or matter reported by a committee until the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which each report of a committee on that measure or matter has been available and until the third such calendar day on which the underlying measure or matter has been made available by the Committee on Rules on its Internet site.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CONFERENCE REPORTS.—Except as specified in subparagraph (2) of clause (a) of rule XXII of the House of Representatives, it shall not be in order to consider a conference report until—

(1) the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which the conference report and the accompanying joint explanatory statement have been available, published in the Congressional Record and until the third such calendar day on which such conference report and joint explanatory statement have been made available by the standing committee of the House with subject matter jurisdiction over the underlying legislation on its Internet site; and

(2) copies of the conference report and the accompanying joint explanatory statement have been available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner for at least two hours,

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It is not in order to consider a rule or order which would waive subsections (a) or (b) by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present.

SEC. 405. COST ESTIMATES FOR CONFERENCE REPORTS AND UNREPORTED MEASURES.

It shall not be in order to consider a conference report or an unreported bill or joint resolution unless an estimate of costs as described in clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII has been printed in the Congressional Record at least one day before its consideration.

SEC. 406. ROLL CALL VOTES FOR NEW SPENDING.

The yeas and nays shall be considered as ordered when the Speaker puts the question on passage of a bill or joint resolution, or on adoption of a conference report, for which the chairman of the Budget Committee has advised the Speaker that such bill, joint resolution or conference report authorizes or provides new budget authority of not less than $50,000,000. The Speaker may not entertain a unanimous consent request or motion to suspend this section.

SEC. 407. NONDEFENSE, NONTERRORISM RELATED SPENDING POINT OF ORDER.

(a) NONDEFENSE AND NONTERRORISM-RELATED SPENDING.—It shall not be in order to consider any supplemental appropriation measure that primarily provides funding for war-related defense needs and for the global war on terrorism, that also provides funding for domestic discretionary programs, projects or activities designated as emergencies.

(b) LISTING OF NONDEFENSE AND NONTERRORISM-RELATED PROVISIONS.—Prior to the consideration of any appropriation bill or joint resolution referred to in subsection (a), the Committee on the Budget of the House shall transmit to the Speaker, the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, and the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, and, to the extent practicable, publish in the Congressional Record, a list of any nondefense and nonterrorism related provisions designated as emergency included in that bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 408. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING PROPOSALS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each bill or joint resolution reported from committee (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations), or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, an estimate of whether the measure would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in direct spending in excess of $5 billion in any of the four 10-year periods beginning in fiscal year 2016 through fiscal year 2055.

(b) DIRECT SPENDING LIMITATION.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of $5 billion in any of the four 10-year periods beginning in 2016 through 2055.

SEC. 409. LIMIT ON NEW DIRECT SPENDING IN RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

In the House, it shall not be in order to consider any reconciliation bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, in relation to, a reconciliation bill pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, that produces an increase in outlays, if—

(1) the effect of all the provisions in the jurisdiction of any committee is to create gross new direct spending that exceeds 20 percent of the total savings instruction to the committee; or

(2) the effect of the adoption of an amendment would result in gross new direct spending that exceeds 20 percent of the total savings instruction to the committee.

SEC. 410. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) ADVANCE APPROPRIATION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for the fiscal years 2010 and 2011 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,565,000,000 in new budget authority in each year.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2009.

SEC. 411. POLICY STATEMENT ON HANFORD AND NUCLEAR CLEAN-UP.

It is the policy of this resolution that the United States Government must meet its responsibility in cleaning up nuclear waste sites created in the name of our Nation's defense by our World War II and Cold War era nuclear weapons production and is an obligation of the Federal Government, not an option. The Environmental Management program responsible for cleaning up these wastes requires a sufficient level of funding so as not to cause legal cleanup milestones and obligations to be missed.

SEC. 412. POLICY STATEMENT ON WAR FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) there are currently more than 183,000 troops in the theater supporting Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom;

(2) in February of 2007, the President submitted a war request for supplemental funding to support these troops and their ongoing operations in the global war on terrorism;

(3) more than a year later, Congress has only acted to partially fund that request by providing less than half of the funding required by the troops;

(4) this policy assumes Congress will act on war funding requests in a timely manner so as to avoid—

(A) not having sufficient funds to pay United States soldiers, serving at home or abroad;

(B) not having sufficient funds to pay civilian Army personnel;

(C) significant disruption in base budget activities, which may result in delaying or foregoing contracts and activities (e.g., training) that ultimately may increase cost; and

(D) losing the ability to use the Commanders Emergency Response Program, which is critical to the success of United States and Coalition Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(b) POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON WAR FUNDING.—It is the policy of the House that funding for troops in Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom should be provided in a timely manner so as not hinder their performance or needlessly place them in harms way.

SEC. 413. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL LIABILITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) medical liability and the resulting practice of defensive medicine continue to plague the medical profession in the United States, reducing access for patients, increasing the cost of medical care generally, and increasing the cost of government programs such as Medicare and Medicaid for the United States taxpayer; and

(2) as the medical liability crisis grows, a large fraction of these dollars will be spent on wasteful health care services provided solely to shield providers from a lawsuits.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL LIABILITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that it assumes effective medical liability reform which will contribute to the overall goal of domestic entitlement reform, constraining the growth of vital programs such as Medicare and Medicaid and helping to ensure their long-term viability.

SEC. 414. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE MEDICARE "TRIGGER".

This resolution assumes that the committees of jurisdiction, in complying with the reconciliation instruction set forth in section 20, will submit to the Committee on the Budget language that locks in any savings resulting from Medicare funding warning legislation designed to reduce the program's general revenue spending exceeding 45 percent. By directing savings solely to deficit reduction, this provision will help Medicare fulfill its mission for the long term.

SEC. 415. PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

(1) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME REDETERMINATIONS.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $264,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $240,000,000, and the amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $6,997,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and provides an additional appropriation of up to $490,000,000, and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(3) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates up to $198,000,000 and the amount is designated to the health care fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $10,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $40,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsection (a) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a), except that no adjustment shall be made for provisions exempted for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 under section 404 of this resolution.

(2) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in paragraph (1) are to be made to—

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

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

(c) PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.—In determining whether an adjustments may be made pursuant to this section, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall take into consideration, the recommendations made in President's budget related to such adjustments.

SEC. 416. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.

This resolution assumes that the Committee on Ways and Means, in complying with the reconciliation instruction set forth pursuant to section 201(b) of this resolution, will prepare legislative language which will phase out the alternative minimum tax.

SEC. 417. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Medicare's unfunded liability will grow from $34 trillion to $45 trillion in the next 5 years;

(2) health care spending is expected to reach nearly 20 percent of GDP by 2017;

(3) half of the Nation's $2.4 trillion in annual health care spending comes from taxpayer dollars; and

(4) the only way to ensure health care entitlement programs survive and continue to fulfill their missions in the 21st century is through fundamental reform.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE SPENDING.—This resolution assumes that the committees of jurisdiction over health care spending issues will report legislation to reduce health care costs and expand coverage, in part, by removing distortions in the health care market. The removal of these distortions may be accomplished by increasing personal ownership and improving health care quality and information through the sharing of information, including the passage of H.R. 1174 and H.R. 3370.

TITLE V—EMERGENCY RESERVE FUND

SEC. 501. NONDEFENSE RESERVE FUND FOR EMERGENCIES.

(a) NONDEFENSE SET ASIDE.—In the House:

(1) Except as provided by subsection 506, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto (or considered as adopted) or a conference report is filed thereon, that provides new discretionary budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom), and such provision is designated as an emergency pursuant to this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make adjustments to the allocations and aggregates set forth in this resolution up to the amount of such provisions if the requirements set forth in section 504 are met, but the sum of all adjustments made under this paragraph shall not exceed $7,300,000,000 for fiscal year 2009.

(2) If a bill or joint resolution is reported or a conference report is filed thereon, and a direct spending or receipt provision included therein is designated as an emergency pursuant to this paragraph, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make adjustments to the allocations and aggregates set forth in this resolution.

(b) ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENT PROCEDURES.—In the House, before any adjustment is made pursuant to this section for any bill, joint resolution, or conference report that designates a provision an emergency, the enactment of which would cause the total amount of the set aside fund set forth in subsection (a)(1) for fiscal year 2009 to be exceeded:

(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall convene a meeting of that committee, where it shall be in order, subject to the terms set forth in this section, for one motion described in paragraph (2) to be made to authorize the chairman to make adjustments above the maximum amount of adjustments set forth in subsection (a). If the Chairman does not call such a meeting within 24 hours of a committee reporting such a measure, any member of the Committee may call such a meeting.

(2) The motion referred to in paragraph (1) shall be in the following form: ''I move that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget be authorized to adjust the allocations and aggregates set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009 by the following amount: $______,000,000 for fiscal year 2009.'', with the blank being filled in with amount determined by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. For any measure referred to in subsection (a)(1), such amount shall not exceed the total amount for fiscal year 2009 designated as an emergency in excess of the applicable amount remaining in the set aside fund.

(3) The motion set forth in paragraph (2) shall be open for debate and amendment, but any amendment offered thereto is only in order if limited to changing an amount in the motion.

(4) Except as provided by paragraph (5), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may not make any adjustments under subsection (a) or subsection (b) unless or until the committee filing a report or joint statement of managers on a conference report on a measure including an emergency designation fulfills the terms set forth in section 504.

(5) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make any adjustments he deems necessary under this section if he determines the enactment of the provision or provisions designated as an emergency is essential to respond to an urgent and imminent need, the chairman determines the exceptional circumstances referred to in rule 3 of the rules of the committee are met and the committee cannot convene to consider the motion referred to in this section in a timely fashion.

(c) APPLICATION OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) shall

(1) apply while that bill, joint resolution, conference report or amendment is under consideration;

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

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

SEC. 502. EMERGENCY CRITERIA.

As used in this title:

(1) The term ''emergency'' means a situation that—

(A) requires new budget authority and outlays (or new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom) for the prevention or mitigation of, or response to, loss of life or property, or a threat to national security; and

(B) is unanticipated.

(2) The term ''unanticipated'' means that the underlying situation is—

(A) sudden, which means quickly coming into being or not building up over time;

(B) urgent, which means a pressing and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(C) unforeseen, which means not predicted or anticipated as an emerging need; and

(D) Temporary, which means not of a permanent duration.

SEC. 503. DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATION OF EMERGENCY DEFINITION.

In the House, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, after consultation with the chairmen of the applicable committees, the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, prepare additional guidelines for application of the definition of an emergency and shall issue a committee print from the Committee on the Budget for this purpose.

SEC. 504. COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION.—Whenever a committee of the House (including a committee of conference) reports any bill or joint resolution that includes a provision designated as an emergency pursuant to this title, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution (or the joint explanatory statement of managers in the case of a conference report on any such bill or joint resolution) shall identify all provisions that provide amounts designated as an emergency and shall provide an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria set forth in section 502.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.—If such a measure is to be considered by the House without being reported by the committee of jurisdiction, then the committee shall cause the explanation to be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

SEC. 505. UP-TO-DATE TABULATIONS.

The Committee on the Budget of the House shall publish in the Congressional Record up-to-date tabulations of amounts remaining in the set aside fund set forth in section 501, or authorized in excess thereof, as soon as practicable after the enactment of such amounts designated as emergencies.

SEC. 506. CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS RELATED TO THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM AND FOR UNANTICIPATED DEFENSE NEEDS.

(a) EXEMPTION OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS RELATED TO THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM AND FOR UNANTICIPATED DEFENSE NEEDS.—In the House, if any bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that makes appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, or receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of titles III or IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) CURRENT LEVEL.—Amounts included in this resolution for the purpose set forth in this section shall be considered to be current law for purposes of the preparation of the current level of budget authority and outlays and the appropriate levels shall be adjusted upon the enactment of such bill.

TITLE VI—LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO AUTHORITY

SEC. 601. PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) PROPOSED CANCELLATIONS.—If, within 45 calendar days after the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing any discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefit, the President proposes, in the manner provided in subsection (b), the cancellation of any dollar amount of such discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, or targeted tax benefit, such recommendation shall be introduced as a free-standing measure consistent with the terms of this title and shall be eligible for the expedited procedures set forth herein. If the 45 calendar-day period expires during a period where either House of Congress stands adjourned sine die at the end of a Congress or for a period greater than 45 calendar days, the President may propose a cancellation under this section and transmit a special message under subsection (b) on the first calendar day of session following such a period of adjournment.

(b) TRANSMITTAL OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.—

(1) SPECIAL MESSAGE.—

(A) CONTENTS OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.—Each special message shall specify, with respect to the discretionary budget authority, items of direct spending proposed, limited tariff benefits, or targeted tax benefits to be canceled—

(i) the dollar amount of discretionary budget authority, the specific item of direct spending (that OMB, after consultation with CBO, estimates to increase budget authority or outlays as required by section 1017(9)), the limited tariff benefit, or the targeted tax benefit that the President proposes be canceled;

(ii) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such discretionary budget authority is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;

(iii) the reasons why such discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefit should be canceled;

(iv) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect (including the effect on outlays and receipts in each fiscal year) of the proposed cancellation;

(v) to the maximum extent practicable, all facts, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the proposed cancellation and the decision to propose the cancellation, and the estimated effect of the proposed cancellation upon the objects, purposes, or programs for which the discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or the targeted tax benefit is provided;

(vi) a numbered list of cancellations to be included in an approval bill that, if enacted, would cancel discretionary budget authority, items of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefits proposed in that special message; and

(vii) if the special message is transmitted subsequent to or at the same time as another special message, a detailed explanation why the proposed cancellations are not substantially similar to any other proposed cancellation in such other message.

(C) DUPLICATIVE PROPOSALS PROHIBITED.—The President may not propose to cancel the same or substantially similar discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefit more than one time under this Act.

(D) MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SPECIAL MESSAGES.—The President may not transmit to the Congress more than 5 special messages under this subsection related to any bill or joint resolution described in subsection (a), but may transmit not more than 10 special messages for any omnibus budget reconciliation or appropriation measure.

(2) ENACTMENT OF APPROVAL BILL.—

(A) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Amounts of budget authority, items of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefits which are canceled pursuant to enactment of a bill as provided under this section shall be dedicated only to reducing the deficit or increasing the surplus.

(B) ADJUSTMENT OF LEVELS IN THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET.—Not later than 5 days after the date of enactment of an approval bill as provided under this section, the chairs of the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall revise allocations and aggregates and other appropriate levels under the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget to reflect the cancellation, and the applicable committees shall report revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b), as appropriate.

(C) TRUST FUNDS AND SPECIAL FUNDS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), nothing in this title shall be construed to require or allow the deposit of amounts derived from a trust fund or special fund which are canceled pursuant to enactment of a bill as provided under this section to any other fund.

SEC. 602. PROCEDURES IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS.

(a) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The majority leader or minority leader of each House or his designee shall (by request) introduce an approval bill as defined in section 1017 not later than the third day of session of that House after the date of receipt of a special message transmitted to the Congress under section 1011(b). If the bill is not introduced as provided in the preceding sentence in either House, then, on the fourth day of session of that House after the date of receipt of the special message, any Member of that House may introduce the bill.

(2) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which an approval bill is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than the seventh legislative day after the date of its introduction. If a committee fails to report the bill within that period or the House has adopted a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die at the end of a Congress, such committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the bill and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After an approval bill is reported by or discharged from committee or the House has adopted a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die at the end of a Congress, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the approval bill in the House. Such a motion shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two legislative days after the day on which the proponent announces his intention to offer the motion. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to that special message. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The approval bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against an approval bill and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on an approval bill to its passage without intervening motion except five hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the bill. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the bill shall not be in order.

(D) SENATE BILL.—An approval bill received from the Senate shall not be referred to committee.

(3) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION.—A motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill under this subsection in the Senate shall not be debatable. It shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to proceed is agreed to or disagreed to.

(B) LIMITS ON DEBATE.—Debate in the Senate on a bill under this subsection, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith (including debate pursuant to subparagraph (D)), shall not exceed 10 hours, equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

(C) APPEALS.—Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a bill under this subsection shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

(D) MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATE.—A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a bill under this subsection is not debatable.

(E) MOTION TO RECOMMIT.—A motion to recommit a bill under this subsection is not in order.

(F) CONSIDERATION OF THE HOUSE BILL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Senate has received the House companion bill to the bill introduced in the Senate prior to the vote required under paragraph (1)(C), then the Senate may consider, and the vote under paragraph (1)(C) may occur on, the House companion bill.

(ii) PROCEDURES AFTER VOTE ON SENATE BILL.—If the Senate votes, pursuant to paragraph (1)(C), on the bill introduced in the Senate, then immediately following that vote, or upon receipt of the House companion bill, the House bill shall be deemed to be considered, read the third time, and the vote on passage of the Senate bill shall be considered to be the vote on the bill received from the House.

(b) AMENDMENTS PROHIBITED.—No amendment to, or motion to strike a provision from, a bill considered under this section shall be in order in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

SEC. 603. IDENTIFICATION OF TARGETED TAX BENEFITS.

(a) STATEMENT.—The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate acting jointly (hereafter in this subsection referred to as ''the chairmen'' shall review any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution which includes any amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is being prepared for filing by a committee of conference of the two Houses, and shall identify whether such bill or joint resolution contains any targeted tax benefits. The chairmen shall provide to the committee of conference a statement identifying any such targeted tax benefits or declaring that the bill or joint resolution does not contain any targeted tax benefits. Any such statement shall be made available to any Member of Congress by the chairmen immediately upon request.

(b) STATEMENT INCLUDED IN LEGISLATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other rule of the House of Representatives or any rule or precedent of the Senate, any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution which includes any amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 reported by a committee of conference of the two Houses may include, as a separate section of such bill or joint resolution, the information contained in the statement of the chairmen, but only in the manner set forth in paragraph (2).

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The separate section permitted under subparagraph (A) shall read

as follows: Section 1021 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 shall "______________" apply to "______________." with the blank spaces being filled in with—

(A) in any case in which the chairmen identify targeted tax benefits in the statement required under subsection (a), the word "only" in the first blank space and a list of all of the specific provisions of the bill or joint resolution in the second blank space; or

(B) in any case in which the chairmen declare that there are no targeted tax benefits in the statement required under subsection (a), the word "not" in the first blank space and the phrase "any provision of this Act" in the second blank space.

(c) IDENTIFICATION IN REVENUE ESTIMATE.—With respect to any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution with respect to which the chairmen provide a statement under subsection (a), the Joint Committee on Taxation shall—

(1) in the case of a statement described in subsection (b)(2)(A), list the targeted tax benefits in any revenue estimate prepared by the Joint Committee on Taxation for any conference report which accompanies such bill or joint resolution, or

(2) in the case of a statement described in section 13(b)(2)(B), indicate in such revenue estimate that no provision in such bill or joint resolution has been identified as a targeted tax benefit.

(d) PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY.—If any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution is signed into law

(1) with a separate section described in subsection (b)(2), then the President may use the authority granted in this section only with respect to any targeted tax benefit in that law, if any, identified in such separate section; or

(2) without a separate section described in subsection (b)(2), then the President may use the authority granted in this section with respect to any targeted tax benefit in that law.

SEC. 604. ADDITIONAL MATTERS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) APPROPRIATION LAW.—The term "appropriation law" means an Act referred to in section 105 of title I, United States Code, including any general or special appropriation Act, or any Act making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations, that has been signed into law pursuant to Article I, section 7, of the Constitution of the United States.

(2) APPROVAL BILL.—The term "approval bill" means a bill or joint resolution which only approves proposed cancellations of dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, items of new direct spending, limited tariff benefits, or targeted tax benefits in a special message transmitted by the President under this part and

(A) the title of which is as follows: "A bill approving the proposed cancellations transmitted by the President on ______________," the blank space being filled in with the date of transmission of the relevant special message and the public law number to which the message relates;

(B) which does not have a preamble; and

(C) which provides only the following after the enacting clause: "That the Congress approves of proposed cancellations: ______________," the blank space being filled in with a list of the cancellations contained in the President's special message, "as transmitted by the President in a special message on ______________," the blank space being filled in with the appropriate date, "regarding ______________." the blank space being filled in with the Public Law number to which the special message relates;

(D) which only includes proposed cancellations that are estimated by CBO to meet the definition of discretionary budgetary authority or items of direct spending, or limited tariff benefits, or that are identified as targeted tax benefits pursuant to section 1014;

(E) if any proposed cancellation other than discretionary budget authority or targeted tax benefits is estimated by CBO to not meet the definition of item of direct spending, then the approval bill shall include at the end: "The President shall cease the suspension of the implementation of the following under section 1013 of the Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006: ______________," the blank space being filled in with the list of such proposed cancellations; and

(F) if no CBO estimate is available, then the entire list of legislative provisions proposed by the President is inserted in the second blank space in subparagraph (C).

(3) CALENDAR DAY.—The term "calendar day" means a standard 24-hour period beginning at midnight.

(4) CANCEL OR CANCELLATION.—The terms "cancel" or "cancellation" means to prevent

(A) budget authority from having legal force or effect;

(B) in the case of entitlement authority, to prevent the specific legal obligation of the United States from having legal force or effect;

(C) in the case of the food stamp program, to prevent the specific provision of law that provides such benefit from having legal force or effect;

(D) a limited tariff benefit from having legal force or effect, and to make any necessary, conforming statutory change to ensure that such limited tariff benefit is not implemented; or

(E) a targeted tax benefit from having legal force or effect, and to make any necessary, conforming statutory change to ensure that such targeted tax benefit is not implemented and that any budgetary resources are appropriately canceled.

(5) CBO.—The term "CBO" means the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

(6) DIRECT SPENDING.—The term "direct spending" means—

(A) budget authority provided by law (other than an appropriation law);

(B) entitlement authority; and

(C) the food stamp program.

(7) DOLLAR AMOUNT OF DISCRETIONARY BUDGET AUTHORITY.—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term "dollar amount of discretionary budget authority" means the dollar amount of budget authority—

(i) specified in an appropriation law, or the dollar amount of budget authority or obligation limitation required to be allocated by a specific proviso in an appropriation law for which a specific dollar figure was not included;

(ii) represented separately in any table, chart, or explanatory text included in the statement of managers or the governing committee report accompanying such law;

(iii) required to be allocated for a specific program, project, or activity in a law (other than an appropriation law) that mandates the expenditure of budget authority from accounts, programs, projects, or activities for which budget authority is provided in an appropriation law;

(iv) represented by the product of the estimated procurement cost and the total quantity of items specified in an appropriation law or included in the statement of managers or the governing committee report accompanying such law; or

(v) represented by the product of the estimated procurement cost and the total quantity of items required to be provided in a law (other than an appropriation law) that mandates the expenditure of budget authority from accounts, programs, projects, or activities for which budget authority is provided in an appropriation law.

(B) The term "dollar amount of discretionary budget authority" does not include—

(i) direct spending;

(ii) budget authority in an appropriation law which funds direct spending provided for in other law;

(iii) any existing budget authority canceled in an appropriation law; or

(iv) any restriction, condition, or limitation in an appropriation law or the accompanying statement of managers or committee reports on the expenditure of budget authority for an account, program, project, or activity, or on activities involving such expenditure.

(8) ITEM OF DIRECT SPENDING.—The term "item of direct spending" means any provision of law that results in an increase in budget authority or outlays for direct spending relative to the most recent levels calculated consistent with the methodology used to calculate a baseline under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and included with a budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, in the first year or the 5-year period for which the item is effective. Such item does not include an extension or reauthorization of existing direct spending, but only refers to provisions of law that increase such direct spending.

(9) LIMITED TARIFF BENEFIT.—The term "limited tariff benefit" means any provision of law that modifies the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities (as defined in paragraph (12)(B)).

(10) OMB.—The term "OMB" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(11) OMNIBUS RECONCILIATION OR APPROPRIATION MEASURE.—The term "omnibus reconciliation" or "appropriation measure" means—

(A) in the case of a reconciliation bill, any such bill that is reported to its House by the Committee on the Budget; or

(B) in the case of an appropriation measure, any such measure that provides appropriations for programs, projects, or activities falling within 2 or more section 302(b) suballocations.

(12) TARGETED TAX BENEFIT.—

(A) The "term targeted tax benefit" means any revenue-losing provision that provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to ten or fewer beneficiaries (determined with respect to either present law or any provision of which the provision is a part) under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in any year for which the provision is in effect;

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

(i) all businesses and associations that are members of the same controlled group of corporations (as defined in section 1563(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(ii) all shareholders, partners, members, or beneficiaries of a corporation, partnership, association, or trust or estate, respectively, shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(iii) all employees of an employer shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(iv) all qualified plans of an employer shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(v) all beneficiaries of a qualified plan shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(vi) all contributors to a charitable organization shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(vii) all holders of the same bond issue shall be treated as a single beneficiary; and

(viii) if a corporation, partnership, association, trust or estate is the beneficiary of a provision, the shareholders of the corporation, the partners of the partnership, the members of the association, or the beneficiaries of the trust or estate shall not also be treated as beneficiaries of such provision;

(C) For the purpose of this paragraph, the term ''revenue-losing provision'' means any provision that is estimated to result in a reduction in federal tax revenues (determined with respect to either present law or any provision of which the provision is a part) for a period of the—

(i) first fiscal year for which the provision is effective; or

(ii) five fiscal years beginning with the first fiscal year for which the provision is effective;

(D) the ''term targeted tax benefit'' does not include any provision which applies uniformly to an entire industry; and

(E) the terms used in this paragraph shall have the same meaning as those terms have generally in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, unless otherwise expressly provided.

SEC. 605. ABUSE OF PROPOSED CANCELLATIONS.

The President, or any executive branch official, should not condition the inclusion or exclusion or threaten to condition the inclusion or exclusion of any proposed cancellation in any special message under this title upon any vote cast or to be cast by any Member of either House of Congress.

TITLE VII—PAY-AS-YOU-GO

SEC. 701. STRENGTHENING PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

(a) LIMITATION.—In the House, in determining the effect of a bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report on the deficit or surplus for purposes of clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Budget shall disregard provisions that are impermissible offsets.

(b) DEFINITION OF IMPERMISSIBLE OFFSETS.—A provision is an ''impermissible offset'' if the Committee on the Budget determines that it—

(1) is the same or substantially the same as a change in law reducing the deficit included in a bill, joint resolution, or conference report previously passed by the House but not enacted;

(2) causes a decrease in outlays within the first time period set forth in clause 10 of such rule XXI, but causes no change in outlays over the second time period included in the clause; or

(3) causes an increase in revenue within the first time period set forth in clause 10 of such rule XXI, but causes no change in revenues over the second time period included in the clause.

(c) TREATMENT OF DIRECT SPENDING PROVISIONS.—In the House:

(1) For purposes of enforcing clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a provision included in a bill, joint resolution, or conference report increasing direct spending in any year may be deemed by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to be structured such that it artificially disguises an increase in entitlement spending by use of expiration dates or reductions in entitlement or beneficiary levels.

(2) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall cause a clear statement for any bill, joint resolution or conference report as to whether a provision increasing mandatory budget authority or outlays has or has not been structured as described in paragraph (1), to be inserted in the Congressional Record if requested by the Speaker, the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader or the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget.

(d) STRENGTHEN PAY-AS-YOU-GO.—It shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, or conference report that increases the deficit in the budget year or the five-fiscal year period following the second period of fiscal years set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of the House Representatives. The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the same basis as set forth in such clause.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the appropriate Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to reflect the timing of responses to reconciliation directives pursuant to section 201 of this resolution.

SEC. 802. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

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

SEC. 803. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

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

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

SEC. 804. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1036, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the esteemed minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding and congratulate him and the Republican members of the Budget Committee for a job well done in putting this budget together.

I also want to thank our colleague from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, the chairman of the committee for their budget. Although I'll be critical of it, still, the gentleman did his work, and the House is considering the budget at the time of the year the House should be considering its budget, in March, and in early March, which has not always happened.

When we think about our budgets, it's not as complicated as people think. It's about revenue coming into the Federal Government and revenue going out of the Federal Government to provide benefits for the American people. And it's not just about numbers for this year. It's about numbers for next year and over the next 5 or 10 years that we need to look at so that there is a balance between revenues and expenses.

Clearly, over the last 40 years, there's been a big imbalance between what goes out and what comes in. And the fact is that in 36 of those 40 years, the Federal Government has run a deficit, at least 36. I think 36 of the 40 years we've run a deficit. We balanced the budget in the late 1990s when Republicans controlled the Congress by holding the line on spending while revenues to the Federal Government were growing in a healthy economy, held the line on spending at or near the rate of inflation, and revenues surpassed expenses for the first time in some almost 30 years.

But here we are again, back in a situation where we're spending more than what's coming in, mostly as a result of the attacks of 9/11, the aftershocks to our economy. But if you look at the revenue over the last 5 years, revenues have grown at 11 percent annually in each of the last 4 years, going back through 2006. And even in 2007, revenues to the Federal Government grew, estimated to grow at about 8 to 9 percent. And so revenue growth to the Federal Government, I think, has been healthy since we reduced taxes on capital gains and dividends, per child tax credit, and relief for the marriage penalty back in 2001 and 2003.

□ 1530

And so you can see that reducing tax rates doesn't mean less revenue to the Federal Government. Matter of fact, you can look back over the last 27 years, other than a couple of small exceptions, there has been a significant effort to lower tax rates, income tax rates, capital gain tax rates; and as a result, there has been more economic activity in our country, more people employed in our country, and more people paying taxes.

And so if you look at the marginal tax rates today as compared to 1980, you see that those tax rates are significantly lower. Yet the Federal revenue, the taxes that American families pay, continues to come into Washington at very high levels of growth on an annual basis

I would argue that making the capital gains tax rate permanent, making the rate on dividends permanent, would give more people reasons to invest in America's economy allowing those rates of growth in revenue to the Federal Government to continue.

And so Washington doesn't have a revenue problem. Washington has a spending problem. And when you look at the Washington spending problems, it really rolls down to several things: one is controlling the growth of domestic discretionary spending. I think, by and large, if you look at the budgets that we've seen over the last 15 years, we've done a fairly good job of controlling domestic discretionary programs and the spending that goes there. There are some exceptions, and there is certainly some room to eliminate some of what I would call wasteful Washington spending. But if you look at the increases, most of it has gone into the area of defense.

The real problem that we have is that we continue to have an older America. The number of Americans over 65 continues to grow and will grow significantly as I and other baby boomers begin to retire.

And so when you look at the problem today in terms of the spending problem, it is in the entitlement area. And the underlying budget that the majority has put forward does nothing to reform entitlement spending. I came here in 1990 because I thought that programs like Social Security and Medicare were unsustainable unless Congress was willing to act to protect those programs.

And here we are in my 18th year. We've nibbled around the edges of a couple of these programs, but have never really done anything that would make these programs sustainable for tomorrow and for succeeding generations. As I have said hundreds of times on this floor, our generation has made promises to ourselves that our kids and grandkids can't afford.

So if you look at the budget being presented by myself and our Republican colleagues, we assume that the capital gains rate of 15 percent will be made permanent. We assume that the rate on dividends at 15 percent is made permanent and the per-child tax credit is put in permanent law as is the marriage penalty, the tax cuts that were put in place on a temporary basis in 2001 and 2003.

So our budget balances over the next 5 years, and it balances because we go in and actually do something about the spending side of the equation.

Now, if you look at the Democrat budget, they assume that the 15 percent capital gains rate goes back to 20 percent. They assume that the 15 percent rate on dividends goes to whatever the marginal tax rate for that taxpayer would be, probably an average tax rate of about 30 percent on dividends, or double that tax, that the marriage penalty comes back in for all Americans and that the $1,000 per-child tax credit goes away.

And I forgot one, of all things: the death tax that we want to see go away completely in 2010. The death tax, under the Democrat proposal, comes back in full force putting the Federal Government back into a competition with the heirs over the balance that we have in people's estates.

But the real issue in the Democrat budget is spending. If you look at the chart I'm holding here, the Democrat budget assumes all of these tax cuts go away. So you have a $683 billion tax increase in their budget, the largest one in American history; and they have it in because if you look at their spending levels, they do nothing about reforming entitlement programs or putting a lid on the growth of domestic discretionary spending.

So I think that the budget that the Republicans are putting forward here is a responsible budget, and I think, frankly, a majority of the American people would agree with me. We ought to keep tax rates low. We ought to encourage economic activity and more economic growth in America that would provide more opportunity for more jobs and better paying jobs in America, and to get the balance, do something constructive about Social Security and Medicare, especially, to modify those programs so that we can save them for future generations.

At some point, we are going to have to ante up to the piper, and the sooner we begin to address the long-term problems in Social Security and Medicare, the better off we will be.

So I would encourage my colleagues to look closely at the budget put together by Mr. RYAN and his Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee, and I ask all of our Members to consider supporting it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SERRANO). The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think it bears remembering that 8 short years ago the budget of this government was $236 billion in surplus. Since 2001, we have experienced, on the watch of this administration, the largest deficits, nominal deficits, in American history, and an accumulation of debt that's enough to blow the mind. The debt of this country was $5.7 trillion when Mr. Bush came to office. When he leaves office, it will be $10 trillion. So that explains why we are skeptical, if you will, and even more skeptical and dubious when we look at the substitute resolution that has been brought to the floor, about which the leader barely spoke until he got to the very end of his presentation a few minutes ago.

To find the real numbers in this resolution, the leader said that this is addressed to deal with a spending problem, not a revenue problem. So as we look through the spending side of the resolution, we have to go all the way to an obscure account called function 920 Allowances to find where the real action is.

Now, this function is typically an allowance function where we have things we haven't decided how to assign yet and put into allowances because we know it is a catch-all account until some decision is made as to how to treat it.

Typically, therefore, you find smaller amounts in this account; but in this particular case, in this particular resolution, $817 billion in additional cuts are called for.

If you look at the Republican resolution, initially it seems to be providing current services for just about every function. But then you get to function 920 and you see that what has been provided is taken back. And when you ask where these cuts are distributed, who bears the brunt of $817 billion in cuts over a 5-year period of time, there is no real answer because they're unallocated. We've heard them say they've added a billion dollars to veterans health care; but once they begin allocating the $817 billion, that billion dollars is likely to be wiped out.

The same can happen to defense and nondefense programs. We can't say, because $817 billion is left unresolved tucked away in this account called function 920. This is the first black hole in this budget.

This budget then goes on. You can do a little arithmetic and figure out that $405 billion is assigned to cuts in domestic discretionary spending, $417 billion is assigned to mandatory cuts. Mandatory cuts are entitlement programs like Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid; and if you look at the accounts here, you will find that basically it appears that the Ways and Means Committee is being directed to save $253 billion, is presumably out of Medicare; the Energy and Commerce Committee is being asked, told, directed to save that $116 billion out of Medicaid. These are not just small cuts, minor adjustments that you would normally find in function 920. These are emasculating cuts for programs that are critically important.

Then when we come to the reconciliation provisions, we find that the Republicans' substitute anticipates at least another $1.1 trillion in tax reduction. How that's allocated, we can't tell for sure; but the tax cuts have to be reconciled against the mandatory spending cuts. When you do that, what we find is the tax cuts equal $1.1 trillion; the mandatory spending cuts equal $412 as a $739 billion addition to the deficit. It worsens the deficit rather than improving the deficit. That's the second black hole in this particular budget.

Reconciliation actually works as a problem instead of improves it. We know that the other side intends to repeal the alternative minimum tax after 3 years. We know also that they intend to extend the tax cuts that were enacted in 2001 and 2003. The total of these would come to $2.5 trillion easily over a period of 5 to 10 years; and if that's the case, the third hole, the third hole that this resolution leaves is a big hole in the bottom of the budget.

So what we've got here is work that is not really a completed product. It is not a finished product because function 920 leaves $817 billion still to be distributed, still to be determined. By whom? Apparently by the appropriators or someone like this, but not today on the floor. When you vote for this today, it has tremendous consequences.

Let me just offer one illustration of what the consequence might be.

After the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, which are truly sizable, they are starkly large, there is a cut called for of $115 billion in savings by the Education and Labor Committee. Now, where would the Education and Labor Committee go to get such cuts? They would go to student loans.

We have just done something phenomenal. In last year's budget, we were able to make some rearrangements and reduce the interest rate over time and subsidize student loans from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent. A phenomenal accomplishment. This indicates that the reduction in interest would be abolished, reversed, as one way of achieving that direction to save $115 billion.

We just passed a College Cost Reduction and Access Act. One of the things it did would take Pell Grants up to $5,400 over time. That, too, would have to be repealed in order to meet $115 billion.

So watch out for the black holes. Watch out for the things that won't easily appear as you read the language here. If anyone votes for this, we are voting, in effect, in my opinion, to go back to where we were over the last 7 years in a period of endless deficits and mountainous debts. This is not the way to go. This is not good work. This is not a finished product, and we should not support this as an amendment to the base bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to our minority whip, Mr. BLUNT.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget he brings to the floor. I think it's clear, looking at that budget, that the specific cuts that have just been suggested don't have to be the cuts that are made. That's up to those committees.

Now, I personally, as a former university president, would not go to student loans as the first thing to look at of all of the things that are in the Education and Labor Committee to decide what the Federal Government's doing that it could be doing better. This is a budget that's willing to take that kind of responsibility. This is a budget, a budget that's being presented by Mr. RYAN, that's willing to look at the things that otherwise will overwhelm us in the future.

The mandatory spending in the Federal Government is going to be overwhelming if it is not dealt with. This budget deals with it. I had people yesterday, reporters, asking, well, how could you slow the growth of these mandatory programs from 5.2 percent to 3.8 percent? That would be $400 billion over 5 years.

□ 1545

Now, the key is slow the growth. The other key is they would still grow by 3.8 percent. And the final key is we're going to have to look at these programs and not just think about them in terms of whether we care based on how much money we spend, but whether we care based on the service we provide.

And we can look at these programs, as this budget anticipates we will, in a way that makes us look at health care so that people have more rights to have choices in health care, so they have more rights to their information in health care. We can look at health care. We can look at Social Security. We can look at things that provide a better service in a better way for taxpayers and recipients.

Just simply not exceeding inflation as our goal doesn't mean we're going to provide worse service. It means we're going to really look at these programs seriously. This budget has the courage to do that. I rise in support of it and hope that my colleagues will join me.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this week, the House has in front of it two well-thought-out but starkly different visions of where to take the country. We have put forward a budget that is true to our principles. We believe that you grow the economy and create opportunity for people by stopping the practice of running the government on borrowed money, by investing in the education, health care, and development of our people, and by expanding opportunities for economic development both here and around the world.

The minority, true to its principles, has introduced a budget which follows its strategy. I think this is a sincere and well-thought-out budget whose principles are just wrong. And if anything, I think that this budget is nostalgic because it does remind us of the 6 years in which the minority had the majority in both the House and the Senate and the White House. And it follows a tried and true, but failed, strategy, which is to say that you reduce taxes by more than you cut spending, and you borrow the difference.

Now, if I add this up correctly, in reading the minority's budget, it calls for spending cuts in the area of $800 billion over 5 years. Perhaps there's a different interpretation, but it would seem to me that there is entitlement spending reduction there and also discretionary. And it calls for reductions in revenue over a 5-year period in the vicinity of $1.2 trillion. So it would appear to me that there is about a one-third or $400 billion difference between the reduction in revenues that is called for and the reduction in spending that is called for. That is, if nothing else, traditional to the practice of borrowing money to run the government.

Second, I have a concern about the specificity of the spending cuts that are put forward. Our friend from Missouri, the minority whip, just talked about the instructions to cut spending in the Education and Labor Committee's area. And our friend said that, as a former university president, he would not first look to cut student loans as a way to deal with the cuts that are required under the minority's budget. Well, I would respectfully say to him, Mr. Chairman, through you, that to my knowledge there is only two other places one could look to find those cuts: The first would be in the pensions of Americans through the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and the second would be through the school nutrition program, through school breakfasts or lunches.

So, one can say that you don't want to cut student loans, but if you do, then you've got to turn either to the school lunch or breakfast program, or the pensions of Americans.

We, frankly, disagree with that approach. We took a very different approach on student loans, as the chairman said. What we did was to cut student loan rates in half and expand opportunities for Pell Grants and other scholarships, and we did so without borrowing money. What we did was to go after what we felt were unjustifiably high subsidies for the student loan banking industry. So, this example, I think, shows the difference in philosophies.

In order to finance tax cuts which are skewed toward the wealthiest in our country, the minority would borrow a substantial amount of money on top of the debt it has already run up, and it would pay for it in part by cutting either student loans, by raising interest rates to students, or cutting school lunches and school breakfast programs, or somehow getting money out of the Pension Guaranty Corporation. We would not do that. What we did was to cut student loan rates in half, increase Pell Grants and other scholarship opportunities, and pay for it without borrowing money by reducing what we view as a corporate welfare subsidy to the student loan banking industry.

This is a very big difference. It's a legitimate difference. We think it's why the gentleman's amendment should be rejected.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield myself 6 minutes, and I'm going address the House in the well.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to start off by thanking my friends from New Jersey and South Carolina. They did put together a credible budget that adds up. We did, too.

Budgets are about priorities; they're about values; they're about what way you think the country should go on a fiscal ship. Let me walk through our budget and how it's different.

Number one, my friend from New Jersey and the chairman himself said that by calling our budget that makes today's tax policy a permanent tax cut, I want to thank them for saying that. By keeping tax rates where they are today, which is what we propose, a tax cut, then the opposite of that is a tax increase. They have proven my point. Their budget raises taxes.

Now, let me simply show you, Mr. Chairman. This red line is the baseline that the Democrats have chosen to adopt for their budget. This blue line is the baseline we've chosen on revenues to adopt for our budget. The blue line says, make the child tax credit permanent, repeal the marriage penalty forever, make the income tax rate not go up, keep the death tax repealed, keep the lowered tax rate on capital gains and dividends. What does the Democrat budget do? It raises taxes $683 billion on everybody, not just rich people.

What do we do on the alternative minimum tax? Here's what the Democratic budget proposes to do: It proposes to patch it for a year by swapping it out with another tax increase. Then, by 2009, about 30 million people are going to get hit by it; 2010, 31 million people. On and on and on. We propose to make sure no new people get hit by the alternative minimum tax, then we phase it out completely. That's point two of what our budget achieves.

Point three, and I think you're going to hear this a lot, we cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, cutting here, cutting there. You hear this sort of legislative gobbledygook about function 920. Well, as we looked at the Democratic budget, we really couldn't find any savings, but we did, we found a sliver of savings in the budget. Where was that sliver of savings kept? Function 920.

What matters in a budget resolution are two numbers, the discretionary number, the 302(a) we call that, we do that, and the direction to the committees, we do that. We do it just like the Democrats did it. That's how we wrote our budget. But there's a difference. You may not be able to see this. For those who are watching on TV, you may have to zoom in. The CBO baseline is the red line. The Republican substitute is the blue line. Not a huge gap of difference in spending. We are simply saying let's not spend that money as fast, and by controlling the growth and the increase in spending, we can make sure we don't raise taxes on the American people. We can repeal the alternative minimum tax. That's the difference in values between the two of us.

Let me give it to you in a different way. What we Republicans are proposing to do is, instead of spending $15.82 trillion over the next 5 years, let's instead spend $15.32 trillion over the next 5 years. Don't spend 15.8, spend 15.3. What's the difference? We're not cutting the child tax credit in half. We're not bringing back the marriage tax penalty. We're not raising every single income tax payer's tax rates across the board. We're not raising the tax on pensions and 401(k)s by raising the tax on dividends and capital gains, and we're not going to keep taxing people when they die. At the end of the day, though, what are we doing for our children and our grandchildren? That's what we should be talking about in budgeting.

Budgets are moral documents. There is a moral imperative before this country, before this Congress, and that moral imperative is, what are we doing for future generations? In just one program, in just one program, the Medicare program, one of the most important programs in the history of the Federal Government, the Democrats' budget proposes to increase its debt by $11 trillion. The debt for Medicare right now stands at $34 trillion; that's the unfunded liability. What are the Democrats doing by doing nothing, by going 5 years with blinders on? $45 trillion. That breaks down to $395,000 per household, each household would owe to make Medicare whole.

What are we doing? We're reforming the program. We're making it work better. We're giving it changes that are needed so that we can make it sustainable, so we can save the program for the baby boomers.

We lower the Medicare debt and unfunded liability by $11 trillion to 23. The Democrats raise the debt to Medicare alone by $11 trillion; we reduced it by $11 trillion. At the end of the day, it's about priorities.

We also call for a 1-year moratorium on earmarks. We're simply saying, let's just take a time-out from pork for a year in Congress. What do we achieve with that? By not doing earmarks for 1 year and by saving that money in this budget, we can make sure we don't raise taxes on every household by $500 per child. We can make sure we don't return to the days of taxing people when they're married. Just those two things can be accomplished by saying ''no'' to earmarks for a year, having a time-out, saying let's have Democrats and Republicans from both parties from both the Senate and the House get together and figure out how to clean up this system and, in the meantime, save the money. So we don't tax people for having kids and we don't tax people for being married.

At the end of the day, you're going to hear all this rhetoric about cuts, about devastation, about how wrong it is and how immoral it is. We're simply saying, instead of spending $15.8 trillion, spend $15.3 trillion. We're still increasing spending, but let's not increase it as fast as Washington has been spending it so we can save that money, so we can make sure we don't raise taxes on Americans. That's what our budget does.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, this week, or just today, rather, it was found out, we discovered and it was reported, that the United States is running a $176 billion deficit in February alone. Earlier this week, we also found out that the Iraqis have a surplus of over $50 billion.

We also know that the American taxpayers have paid for 20 Iraqi hospitals to be refurbished and 80 health clinics to have been built and 60 more planned. And the Republican budget, in the area of health care, cuts $370 billion from Medicare and Medicaid.

The Iraqis, due to the American taxpayers, will get 6,700 schools rehabbed. The Republican budget eliminates the Pell Grant increases that Congress proposed this year.

We're also increasing our funding and training of the Iraqi teachers. The Republicans plan to reduce the military retirement and health care benefits by $1.3 billion. And while Iraq is running a surplus and not spending their resources on improving their country, the entire deficit over the entire period of time that the Republican budget has is a little over $700 billion.

President Kennedy once said, ''To govern is to choose,'' and my friends on the other side have made some choices. While the Iraqis run a surplus, they've made sure that America runs a deficit. While Iraq and American taxpayers are asked to make sure that we rebuild schools and hospitals in Iraq, here in the United States their budget cuts those very investments.

In fact, the Democratic budget turns this ship around of inheriting $3.8 trillion in new debt that has accumulated over the last 6 years and ensures that we invest in American schools, in American hospitals, in American health clinics, and in American teachers. And it ensures, also, that we have a middle class tax cut. So, it makes sure that, while we are doing what we are supposed to do in Iraq, we don't do it at the expense of what we need to do here at home. We have invested in Iraq, and our budget ensures that we invest in America.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to simply say to my friend from Illinois, cutting military benefits? Where did that one come from? Not true, not even anywhere in our budget. You know what? Medicare goes up, spending goes up. Education? Spending increases. I don't know where these cuts are coming from that he's talking about, but that's not in our budget.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, our assistant minority whip, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

First of all, let me respond to some of the assertions made by our friend from Illinois. He tries to portray this as a choice, a budget document that represents a choice between the Iraqi people and the American people. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

This budget document is not a choice about that. This budget document represents a choice about the future of where we're going in this country. This represents a choice about whether we here in Washington are actually going to do something for the American people.

You know, if you think about the American people right now when they're watching us on TV, you know, I don't blame them when they look at the TV in disgust and say, you know, they just don't get it up in Washington.

□ 1600

They believe, and they're right, that Washington is broken and we have got to do something to fix it. Frankly, we have got to get the Federal Government working for the people again. But that means we have got to spend less.

The gentleman from Wisconsin talked about the fact that there is absolutely no treatment, no curtailment of anything having to do with the earmark question. Earmarks are just the tip of the iceberg as far as our spending culture is here in Washington. Let's go ahead and take the first step. Let's reform that process because we have got to spend less.

Let's face it: gas prices, they're too high. The American public is sick and tired of excuses coming out of Washington. But the way to fix it is not to put more burden on the American family while they are already facing the prospects of $4-a-gallon gas this summer. That's just not what we do. People across this country are worried about their health care. They're worried about their jobs. This stuff about we're going to provide you with middle-class tax cuts, have you looked to see what's in this document? This document will lead us to the largest tax increase in American history.

The choice here is not between whether we are going to provide for our national security and the people of America. The choice here is whether we are going to trust in the people to control their own destiny.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have to remind ourselves exactly where we are with the policies that took place in 2001 and 2003 and what has happened to our budget. You will see that we dug ourselves out of a ditch from 1993 to 2001, and it had a surplus. And overnight that surplus has absolutely collapsed. And we need a chart because there is a lot of partisanship on the floor. If you tried to describe this, people would think you're being partisan because they can't believe that you could do this to the budget.

In fact, in the 10 years after 2001, we had a projected surplus of $5.5 trillion. After the policies of 2001 and 2003, it looks like we are going to have a $3 trillion deficit, not a surplus, a swing of $8.8 trillion.

Now, a $5.5 trillion surplus. Everybody knows that the Social Security program is in trouble. In 2001 we had a shortfall of $4 trillion in the Social Security program. If we had $4 trillion in the bank in 2001, we could pay Social Security for 75 years without reducing benefits. We had a surplus of $5.6 trillion, not just the $4 trillion we needed to solve all of the problems in Social Security.

When we started in 2001, one of the questions that Chairman Greenspan had to answer was, what's going to happen when we pay off the national debt? Because by 2013 we would have paid off the national debt and put all the money back in the trust funds. Zero debt, zero interest on the national debt. Now it looks like in 2013 we're going to have to pay $300 billion a year in interest on the national debt because we messed up the budget. And $300 billion at $30,000 each is enough to hire everybody now drawing unemployment with money to spare with a $30,000-a-year job. That's $30,000 a year for everybody drawing unemployment. You've got money left over before you run out of people.

Now, we have heard that by cutting all these taxes, we increase revenues. Well, let me just show you this chart that shows the income tax revenues over the past years going back to 1960. The color code says that green is a year in which you had a record revenue. Red is a year in which you did not have a record revenue. You look back since 1960 through recessions, depressions, good times, bad times, high taxes, low taxes. We had record revenues every year but two, and the following year you had a record revenue. So we always get record revenues. Whoops, excuse me. Until 2001 and 2003, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 consecutive years without record revenues. So we didn't get record revenues.

And we hear that people are bragging about jobs that were created during this time. Let's look at the chart, get rid of the arithmetic. The worst job performance in this administration since Herbert Hoover. You've got to go back to Herbert Hoover to find job performance any worse that this.

So we've gotten into the ditch. We're trying to get out of the ditch. The Democratic budget makes the responsible decisions to try to get us out of the ditch. We've had tough decisions.

And other things like earmarks, we have heard this thing about earmarks: just cut out the earmarks and we will save some money. Let's have a word about how these earmarks work. If you have an appropriation of $200 million and I have got a little earmark for $1 million for a program in my district, that comes out of the $200 million. If I don't get an earmark, $200 million. If I get an earmark, $200 million. Get rid of the earmarks, and you're not saving the taxpayers any money. What this Republican budget does is it has a fantasy of about $800 billion in unspecified cuts. We don't know where these cuts are coming from. It might be health care. It might be student loans, school lunches, food safety, airline inspections, homeland security, port security grants, public safety. We've already tried to cut back on the COPS program.

This budget makes no sense unless you actually name the cuts, because the fact of matter is you're probably not going to cut student loans. You're probably not going to cut the school nutrition program. You say you're going to cut, and you don't do it. And so you've had the tax cuts. You got us in the ditch. And then when the spending cuts come around, nothing happens. So until they start naming what will be cut, this entire budget proposal substitute makes no sense.

I would hope that we would adopt the Democratic budget. I would have hoped that we had had the Congressional Black Caucus budget, but the Democratic budget makes a responsible attempt to reduce the deficit, go into surplus, and make the expenditures on the priorities that we desperately need.

We should reject this substitute and adopt the underlying bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to make three points.

The gentleman's revenue chart makes our point. After the dot-com bubble, we went into recession and revenues went down. After the tax cuts, and his own chart makes the point clear, revenues went up.

Point number two, this budget, the Democratic budgets, has the single largest increase in the national debt in any given year in the history of the country.

Point number three, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman just acknowledged more or less, their budget raises taxes. We don't believe we should be raising taxes at a time when people are paying a lot just to live in a time when we're about to go into recession.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Republican substitute. And there is a clear difference between the two proposals on the table.

The key to managing, and budgeting, is to set priorities. Everybody knows that that has had a family or run a business. You have to do this. You have to make tough choices, and you can't have everything you want when you want it.

But the Democrats have refused to set priorities, Mr. Chairman. They simply want to spend more on everything and everyone within the reach of the Federal Government. And to pay for all this new spending, well, they simply want to raise taxes, this time by $683 billion, the largest tax increase in American history.

If you want me to bring it home in South Carolina terms so all my folks in South Carolina can understand it, this is a $2,500 tax increase for the average South Carolina home, $2,500.

The Republican substitute achieves a balance by 2012 without raising taxes. Also, this substitute attempts to repeal another looming tax increase by completely repealing the AMT, the alternative minimum tax, by 2013.

Our country's on the verge of a financial crisis, Mr. Chairman. The total unfunded entitlement liability, Medicare and Social Security, this country faces is $53 trillion. Former Comptroller General David Walker said, ''You are not going to tax your way out of this problem. You are not going to grow your way out of this problem. You are not going to do it by constraining spending. You are going to have to do it by a combination of things, and the biggest thing you are going to have to do is entitlement reform, Social Security and Medicare being the greater challenge. And we need to start soon because time's working against us. That $53 trillion number is going up between 2 and $3 trillion a year by doing nothing.''

The Republican substitute reduces the $53 trillion unfunded liability by $11 trillion. It makes an attempt to secure the future existence and benefits of major entitlement programs, especially Medicare and Medicaid, which are currently on an unsustainable path to spending.

Mr. Chairman, therefore, I not only firmly support this Republican substitute but insist on it so we don't raise taxes any higher on the American citizens.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have heard about this average tax cut. I just want to show a chart of what they mean when they talk about ''average.''

This is a $20 billion tax cut that's in the Republican package. It's involving personal exemption phaseout and the elimination of ceilings on itemized deductions. This is $20 billion, which is an average $100 for every man, woman, and child. And here's how you distribute the average for this tax cut: if you make over $1 million, you get $17,500. If you make $200,000 to $1 million, you get about $650. If you make $100,000 to $200,000, you get $11 out of this tax cut. And if you make under $100,000, you get on average zero. This is what they call an ''average'' $100-a-person tax cut.

When they talk about the biggest tax cut and all this kind of stuff, let's be clear. What is repealed or what we allow to expire are the kinds of policies that got us into the ditch to begin with. We need to let them expire, get back on the right track, balance the budget, and address our priorities.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a senior member of the Budget Committee, (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I certainly thank him for his leadership and all he does to protect the family budget from the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, today the American people are truly presented a tale of two budgets. Look at the Democrat budget: a $683 billion tax increase, the single largest tax increase in American history. And, Mr. Chairman, it's about $3,000 out of every American family paycheck a year. This is written in the law. This isn't something they are planning. This is something written into law. And I hope, Mr. Chairman, that they'll reflect upon how this impacts working families in their district because I can assure you I hear from families in my district.

I heard from the Vance family in Maybank, Texas, in the Fifth Congressional District. They write: ''Dear Jeb, both my wife and I are cancer patients, and I can't for the life of me understand why anyone would think this Nation could survive such a huge tax increase at this time. As it stands right now, I would have to sell my house, lose my small business, and go without health insurance'' to pay the Democrat tax increase. The Republican budget: no tax increases.

Let's look at the spending side. No news here. The largest single budget in American history. More government programs, more government spending, more of the same. The Republican budget actually has spending control, holds discretionary spending to 4.3 percent, and still funds our Nation's priorities.

Let's look at the national debt. What did the Democrats bring us? The single largest 1-year increase in the Federal debt. The Republican budget balances the budget in 2012 without, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, without tax increases.

Let's look at earmarks. The Democrat budget: status quo. They want to continue the earmarks. While they are raising taxes on hardworking American families $3,000 a year, just look at what they did last year.

□ 1615

There was $100,000 for landscaping for the L.A. fashion district; $300,000 to train people to work on Hollywood movie sets; $2 million, $2 million so they could create a monument to one of their Members, all while putting the single largest tax increase on American families. Now let's think about entitlement spending: Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. They're not going to be around for my 6-year-old daughter or my 4-year-old son unless we reform these entitlements.

The Democrat budget? Stone cold silent. What does that mean? Listen to our former Comptroller General: ''The rising cost of government entitlements are a fiscal cancer that threatens catastrophic consequences for our country and could bankrupt America.''

The Republican budget reforms these programs. It is a budget for the next generation. Theirs is a budget for the next election. Two completely different visions, Mr. Chairman. Theirs is a vision of more government, less opportunity, and higher taxes. Ours is about greater economic security and a brighter future for our children. We don't want to be the first generation in America's history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living. And that's what they do by remaining stone cold silent on the greatest fiscal challenge to our Nation. We can have a brighter future for our children, but we must enact the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader of the House, Mr. HOYER, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I'm always interested to listen to some of the representations made on this floor. I have been here some time, as all of you know.

Ronald Reagan said ''trust but verify.'' For 27 years, all but 8 of those with Republican Presidents, I have heard representations from the floor by Republicans about what their deficits were going to do.

For every one of those 27 years that Republicans were President of the United States, every one without exception, we ran huge deficits. And this year will be no different. The Republicans have had monopoly on policymaking in this town for essentially 7 years. This past year, we had some authority because the American people wanted change. But clearly, the President of the United States would not agree with us, and we had to do what the President would agree to so that, essentially, without restraint, the Republicans have had, for the last 7 years, the authority to do whatever they wanted to do.

The first 8 years I was here, Ronald Reagan was President. He ran $1 trillion in deficits. Then George Bush became President, a little over $1 trillion. This President, a little over $1.6

trillion. President Clinton was President for 8 years, only 8 years that we have had the Presidency, and America ran a net surplus.

So when you hear the protestations of the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee and the gentleman who just spoke from Texas, listen to them, but verify. Look at the record of Republican fiscal irresponsibility undiminished in the 27 years I have been here.

Mr. RYAN, for whom I have a great deal of respect, and I have very substantial differences on how you get from here to there, is he correct that we need to look at our entitlement system? He is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, as he knows, I went to the Senate and testified on behalf of a resolution that does that. There is a resolution here that does that, as well. We have to do that. There is no alternative.

Have they done that over the last 7 years of this Presidency? They did not. Did we do it in 1983 with Ronald Reagan as President, Tip O'Neill as Speaker of the House? We did. And we made Social Security secure for the next 60 years. But when we were running up those deficits that Ronald Reagan said we were not going to run up, the Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid crisis that confronts us was decades away.

Today, the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. It is years away. However, the solution is not to cut medical services for senior citizens and to cut education for our college students. The solution is not to put the car in reverse. The solution, as Ross Perot said, is to lift up the hood and fix it. And that is what the Spratt budget is doing. The Spratt budget is saying to all the Members of this House and to this Congress, we must act responsibly. Responsibly is not only acting fiscally responsibly, but also investing responsibly in the future of our country.

I would urge my colleagues to reject this tired, tired, tired shibboleth about "the biggest tax increase in history." Frankly, the biggest per capita real tax increase in my tenure was under Bob Dole and Ronald Reagan in 1982. And then, of course, George Bush was defeated, presumably because he tried to help balance the budget. And in fact, George Bush made a significant contribution because it was the George Bush agreement on pay-as-you-go, the 1997 Newt Gingrich-Bill Clinton agreement on pay-as-you-go that got us those 4 years of surplus of which I have spoken.

JOHN SPRATT was involved in the leadership of that effort. Tom Kahn of the committee was involved in that effort. And as a result of that effort, we brought surpluses, 4 years. Surprisingly, one of those years was a real surplus. And when I say "real surplus," notwithstanding the Social Security income that we are counting to get to either balance or surplus which is really not what we should be doing, I agree with that, on either side of the aisle.

But ladies and gentlemen, John Spratt's budget meets the test of verification. It meets the test of reality. It meets the test of saying we need to pay for what we buy and not pass it along to our children and grandchildren. The budget vote is one of the most important that we make. Not because the American people really will look closely at the budget or because they think it has great consequence in their lives. It is very difficult to see the consequence of the budget because the budget then needs to be carried out in appropriations, authorizations, and policy.

But ladies and gentlemen of this House, we know that it speaks to whether or not we have the courage of our appropriations. The gentleman that spoke before me from Texas talked about earmarks. I am always interested to hear Republicans talk about earmarks. They came to Congress and quadrupled, quadrupled, four times, the number of earmarks.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a friendly point on that?

Mr. HOYER. I am always pleased to yield to a friendly point. Do I get to make the judgment as to how friendly it is?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right. Earmarks proliferated under Republican watch. You're right about that. Both parties are guilty. That is why we should have a moratorium and clean the system up.

Mr. HOYER. I am reclaiming my time.

The tears, the crocodile tears that flow from the eyes of the ranking member of the Budget Committee about this awful thing that we called "congressional investments." It is so sad that for 6 years they were unable to discipline themselves. And by the way, last year, they were unable to discipline themselves. And guess what? This year they wanted a moratorium for 6 months.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield on that point? This budget is a 1-year, for-the-rest-of-the-Congress moratorium.

Mr. HOYER. You have gone much longer than your caucus wanted to go. I understand that. But the conference wanted to go for 6 months.

I thought it was such an interesting proposal because it meant "we will go just long enough until we really do appropriations and when it really means something." Too often, "hypocrisy, thy name is ourselves." I say it on both sides of the aisle.

Now, I'm for, as everybody knows, congressional initiatives. But I am for paying for them. When we quadrupled them, we borrowed for them from the Chinese, from the Germans, and from the Saudis. As a matter of fact, this President, as my friend knows, has borrowed more money from foreign governments than all of the other Presidents combined. Trust but verify.

Every year that I have been here, ranking members have risen, one of whom is now the chairman of the OMB, and told me what a bright future it would be if their budgets were adopted. Now, the problem is that sometimes they can't get agreement between Senate Republicans and House Republicans on what that beautiful budget ought to be. We passed a budget last year. We lived within that budget last year. We need to do so this year. And we are trying to pay for things. We had a stimulus we didn't pay for. Some of us were concerned about that, but you can't stimulate and depress at the same time.

So my colleagues in the House, Republicans and Democrats, vote for our children and future generations today. Vote for the John Spratt Democratic budget. Reject this budget that pretends it's going to bring you balance but has never done so once, not once in the 27 years that I have been here. Vote for the Spratt budget. It is good for our country. It is good for our people. It is good for our future.

Let me first thank the chairman of the Budget Committee, JOHN SPRATT of South Carolina, for all of his hard work, patience and intelligence in producing this Democratic budget resolution—which is nothing less than a blueprint of our values and priorities.

Let me also thank my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus for offering their important budget alternatives—alternatives that reflect our shared commitment to the American people and a stronger America.

Now, before I discuss what I believe to be the vastly superior and realistic Democratic budget, let me briefly address the Republican budget substitute that we are now debating.

I both like and respect the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking member on the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN. He is a thoughtful, diligent Member.

And, I believe that were it up to him, he might actually try to implement the provisions in the Republican budget substitute.

But the problem, of course, is that he would be fighting a lonely, losing, untenable battle.

This we know: many, many Republicans would not support the deep, draconian cuts to domestic programs called for in their own budget.

The fact is, this Republican budget only reaches balance in 2012 by slashing funding for mandatory programs by $412 billion.

This Republican budget would cut Medicare and safety-net programs; cut Medicaid, thereby jeopardizing health care for more than 50 million children, parents, seniors and disabled Americans; cut—and possibly eliminate—the recently enacted increase in Pell Grants; and cut funding for military retirement and health care.

Furthermore, the Republican budget implies very deep cuts in discretionary programs, devastating public health, education, safety net and infrastructure programs.

This Republican budget fails to reflect the values and priorities of the American people.

In contrast, the Democratic budget continues to move our Nation in a new direction and to clean up the fiscal train wreck caused by failed Republican economic policies over the last 7 years.

Remember, in just 86 months, Republicans have turned projected budget surpluses into record deficits—including a projected $386 billion this year and another $340 billion next year—and added more than $3 trillion to the national debt, which today stands at $9 trillion.

Our Democratic budget restores fiscal responsibility, adhering to pay-as-you-go budget rules and bringing the Federal budget back to balance by 2012.

It rejects the drastic funding cuts in the Republican substitute and the President's budget, which includes cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, State and local law enforcement programs, and environmental protection.

It strengthens our economy, providing crucial funding for our innovation agenda, efficient and renewable energy programs, education, and infrastructure.

It provides tax relief for hard-working Americans, including a reconciliation instruction that provides offsets for a new one-year patch of the alternative minimum tax.

And, our Democratic budget makes America safer, providing for a robust defense, boosting homeland security funding, and rejecting the President's cuts to first responder programs.

This is a budget that we can be proud of. And, it stands in stark contrast to the irresponsible fiscal policies of the current administration and former Republican majorities in Congress.

I urge all of my colleagues:

Vote for fiscal responsibility, and a bright future for our children.

Vote for the budget that reflects our values—and meets the needs of the American people.

Vote for this Democratic budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield myself 1 minute simply to praise the majority leader before he leaves because he has been a man who has sincerely discussed and talked about the need to reform entitlements most of his career. And we need to talk to each other more often. I want to praise him for his leadership on entitlements.

I also want to say that this budget proposes to borrow more in one year from foreign governments than any has in history. Also, Mr. Chairman, let's take a look at the 2003 taxes.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on his last point?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with him, and the reason for that, of course, is while you cut revenues, you didn't cut spending when you were in charge.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, my point is the Democrats' budget, the Spratt budget, has the single largest increase in national debt in any given year, which comes from largely foreign governments these days.

My other point was I understand why my friends on the other side of the aisle are so dismissive of these tax cuts in 2003. Only three Democrats who are here today voted for them. All but three of them voted against them. They voted against reducing the marriage tax penalty. They voted against expanding the child tax credit. They voted against lowering tax rates across the board. They voted against lowering dividends and capital gains and repealing the death tax.

I simply would say that, as this chart shows you, even after all of those tax cuts, look what happened. Receipts went up. Four straight years of income tax receipts increased. Do you know why? People went to work. They got jobs. They paid taxes. Economic growth, even at those lower tax rates.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. HOYER. It is too late to ask you to yield, I take it, on the employment issue.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I thank him for his extraordinary leadership on this budget. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of fiscal responsibility, and my conscience therefore demands that I rise in support of the Republican budget.

Now, the American people deserve to know the truth. We have a $9.3 trillion national debt, but that is not the whole story. The American people also deserve to know that we have some $53 trillion in unfunded liability in Social Security and Medicare over the next 75 years. Frankly, if this government were a business back in Indiana, it would have to file bankruptcy.

Republicans are offering an alternative budget to deal with this fiscal crisis at the national level based on spending restraint and entitlement reform. It balances the budget without taxes and without earmarks.

But the answer from the Democrat majority? Get this: The largest budget in American history, $3.1 trillion. The largest 1-year increase in the public debt in American history, some $646 billion. Higher taxes and nothing to reform earmarks or the very entitlement spending that threatens the economic vitality of our children and our grandchildren's future.

□ 1630

In 2006, the American people voted for change in Washington, D.C., but they weren't referring to what would be left in their pockets after the Democrats took control. We must balance the Federal budget with fiscal discipline and reform, not with more spending and more taxes. We must reject the policies of the new liberal Democratic majority in Congress and reject their budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal discipline and reform, to end earmarking as usual, and to stand for fundamental entitlement reform in Washington, D.C. Vote for the budget priorities of the Republican minority in Congress. They are, I believe with all my heart, the budget priorities of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I want to inquire of the time, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CAPUANO). Both sides currently have 10 minutes each.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

We have heard throughout this debate the charge repeatedly that we are raising taxes by as much as any tax increase since the history of time. The charge won't really bear itself out. But let me just turn to third parties. Don't take it from me, let me turn to third parties who have a tremendous interest in the Federal budget and in the deficit in particular. None is more respected or more truly nonpartisan than the Concord Coalition, and here is what the Concord Coalition says:

''Allowing some of the tax cuts to expire would not be the result of Congress' raising taxes. It would be the result of sunsets that were included when those tax cuts were originally enacted to avoid the level of fiscal scrutiny that PAYGO is designed to ensure.''

Now, I have a chart here which is a replica of our famous eye chart to test your visual acuity. I am not sure whether you can see it, but the bottom line is instructive. We will reach surplus, starting from a CBO baseline, our budget will take us to surplus by the year 2012. That surplus will continue throughout time, 2012, 2013. And if you total that surplus up between 2012 and 2018, the total amount you get is $1.4 trillion.

Out of that $1.4 trillion in surpluses, a lot of money can be derived if we so choose to offset tax cuts. And toward that end, we have pledged ourselves as specifically and explicitly as we possibly can in the budget resolution before you in commitment to the middle-income tax relief. And anyone who has any doubt of this should come and read this paragraph in our budget resolution itself, not in the report, it is in the budget resolution itself, which says the following:

''It is the policy of this resolution to minimize the fiscal burdens on middle-income families and children and grandchildren, to provide immediate relief for tens of millions of middle-income families who would otherwise be subject to the AMT, the alternative minimum tax,'' and, by the way, we provide a 1-year patch. Talk about tax cuts, we have got a tax cut, and it is offset in our bill.

To extend the child tax credit we commit ourselves; to extend the marriage penalty relief, we commit ourselves; to eliminate estate taxes on all but a small fraction of estates, we are committed to that; to extend the research and experimentation tax credit, we are committed to that; to extend the deduction for State and local sales taxes; to extend the deduction for small business expenses; to enact a tax credit for schools.

This resolution assumes that the cost of enacting these policies is offset by reforms within the Internal Revenue Code that promote a fairer distribution of taxes across families and generations and economic efficiency and higher rates of tax compliance. And we put money in the bill for program integrity, for the IRS to bear down and try to close the tax gap.

When you take what we can reap from doing that, it may not be as great as it would seem since the tax gap is estimated to be $500 billion, when you add to that the $1.4 trillion in surpluses per our projection of our budget, you have a lot to work with, not just for tax relief, but for other things as well. Debt retirement, the retirement of the baby boomers, all of these things will be demanding.

That is why we put this decision off until a later time. It is not pressing now. It doesn't have to be committed to now. The tax cuts don't expire until December 31, 2010. In the interim, nobody's taxes are going up because of what is done here on the House floor today, and nobody's taxes are going down, because it doesn't work that way.

Over time, we think that we have got a partial solution here. If we can simply adhere to the budget that we are proposing in House Concurrent Resolution 312, we believe that we can produce surpluses along this bottom line, a substantial portion of which can be used to offset tax cuts.

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

Mr RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to who has the right to close. There seems to be difficulties about that.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has the right to close.

Mr RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

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

You know, our friends on the other side of the aisle may not like and may have problems with our budget, but the one thing they can't say is that we are not doing what we say we are going to do. We have said that we are not going to raise taxes, and it doesn't. We said we will balance the budget in 5 years without raising taxes, and it in fact does that. We have said that entitlements are a big problem and that they will swamp this budget and the next generation with debt if we don't deal with them, and this budget begins to deal with it. They may not like that, but we are doing what we say.

And there is an old saying that says ''do what I say, not what I do.'' That is what somebody who intends to have their actions be different than their words says, ''do what I say, not what I do.''

Let's take a look at this Democratic budget, which I would argue is the ''listen to what I say, don't watch what I do budget.'' We have heard over the last year how PAYGO and all these other things were going to result in and lead towards a balanced budget and that is where they wanted to go. But yet this budget nearly doubles, actually more than doubles, the deficit from the last budget passed under Republican rule.

Our friends on the other side say that they want to eliminate the alternative minimum tax, at least they say for whatever they define as ''middle-class taxpayers.'' But yet in this budget, this budget counts on and continues the revenues from the alternative minimum tax at its current rate or higher for the entire 5 years of the budget.

Our Democratic friends have always talked about how they want a tax cut for the middle class. But yet as has been mentioned, this budget counts on all of the money, all of the tax increases that have been described. It counts on eliminating the marriage penalty credit and the child care credit; it counts on raising the tax rates all the way from the 10 percent rate to 35 percent, raising them all.

They talk about health care, that they want to cover everyone with health care, universal health care and all of that. Is any of that in this budget? No. There are no changes to anything like that in the budget. They were offered the opportunity to put that in the Budget Committee and they didn't do it.

They talk a lot about the death tax, that the death tax is strangling farmers and small businesses. And it is. And what does this budget do? It takes the death tax back up to the rates it was 10 years ago. It increases the death tax over where it is now.

Then there is the big issue of entitlement reform. All of the analyses, liberal, conservative, in the middle, everyone agrees if we don't reform Medicare, Social Security and Medicaid, they will bankrupt this country. What do they do to reform those in the next 5 years in this budget? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

Yes, my friends, Mr. Chairman, this is the ''listen to what I say, but don't pay attention to what I do'' budget. It is like the Wizard of Oz. Watch the smoke in the front, but don't pay attention to what the man behind the curtain is doing. This budget, if you look at it, is what the man behind the curtain is doing and really wants to do, but it is not what is right or what is good for America or for taxpayers.

Mr SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

May I begin by thanking the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, the chairman of the Budget Committee, for his masterly work in bringing this budget before us. It is fiscally sound. It is a responsible blueprint to build our economy, moving us forward and strengthening our national security. The Democratic budget, which is the budget for our country, puts the future first. It is about future generations, and it moves us to surplus by 2012.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the fiscal soundness of this budget.

While being fiscally sound, the budget is also a plan again to get our country moving. It is a budget for the future by putting family budgets first, helping make affordable everything from energy to groceries to college education, helping families avoid foreclosures, and lowering, lowering, taxes. It provides for us to have middle-income tax cuts. This is about America's families and their economic security.

It invests in the future by investing in renewable energy to make America more energy independent and secure and to create green jobs. It is a blueprint for a green revolution in our country.

It creates a new generation of innovators by investing in math, science, engineering and technology, to keep good-paying jobs here in America. In total, we provide $7.1 billion more than last year for education and job training.

It rebuilds America's crumbling infrastructure, which again is an engine of job creation, and makes health care more affordable for families and veterans. VA health care will receive a $3.6 billion increase to care for the men and women who have defended America.

I read this list of provisions in the bill to show that this budget is really a statement of our values. It shows to the American people that we indeed care about them and the budget that we write is relevant to their lives. These are priorities that leading economic experts have said will put our Nation on solid economic footing.

Our budget is also a plan for a stronger America that begins to restore military readiness and better protect Americans against terrorism. Many of you know that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee is also the second-highest ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee, so he brings to this budget process a full knowledge of our national security needs, a full commitment to our military and their families, and dedication to our veterans which has been unsurpassed.

In this bill in terms of national security, ours is a plan to make Americans safer and stands in stark contrast to the President's priorities in Iraq. That misguided war has badly strained our military, distracted us from the fight against terrorism, and damaged our reputation in the world. In fact, the funds committed to that war, some say $3 trillion, huge amounts of money, not only are an opportunity cost for investments here at home in our own education and reconstruction and military readiness, but the deep debt that we are incurring because of the war in Iraq is damaging to our economy. We cannot continue to borrow to pay for the war in Iraq and not see it have an impact on our economy, and that is in addition to the rising cost of oil prices that are related to the war in Iraq as well.

We begin in our national security to reestablish America's strength by rebuilding our military, investing in equipment and training that our military requires, and making caring for our troops, veterans, and military families a top priority.

Our plan stands in stark contrast to the President's priorities and the Republican budget, which would undermine health care for seniors and working families by cutting Medicare and Medicaid over half a trillion dollars over the next 10 years and charge veterans and military retirees more than $18 billion in new fees over 5 years. Our budget does not do that. The Republican budget puts the burden of additional fees on our veterans.

The Republican budget eliminates essential funding for State and local law enforcement and cuts EPA grants that would help protect our planet and our health.

□ 1645

On inauguration day 2009, President Bush will move out of the White House. But, unfortunately, his fiscal legacy will remain unless we can reverse that.

The Bush administration turned a projected $5.6 trillion surplus, I heard our distinguished majority leader talking about this earlier, into a $3.2 trillion deficit. That is historic, that is a historic fiscal turnaround of epic proportions, nearly a $10 trillion swing in fiscal soundness. The President leaves a record of breathtaking fiscal recklessness.

Budgets are more than just accounting documents. Budgets, our Federal budget, I believe, should be a statement of our national values. What we believe in our Nation should be reflected in the allocation of our resources, in our budget.

With this budget, the New Direction Congress and under the leadership of Chairman SPRATT is saying that we value families and their economic future, we will fight to insure their hard work is rewarded, and that the American Dream is renewed.

With this statement of our values, we are saying that we do value our valiant men and women in uniform. We will insist that they receive the tools and training they need to perform their mission, and that when they return home, they will come to high quality health care.

And we were saying in this statement that we value our children. We will invest in their education, their health care, and their future, and do this without leaving them a legacy of debt.

My colleagues, we must make clear that the American values are the values of this House. We should have a statement of the values of the American people in the budget that we put forth, and we do today, to invest in our children's health and education and strengthening families, to provide for the national security of our country by rebuilding our military and respecting our responsibility to our veterans, by investing in the future and innovation and new energy technologies and the education that goes with it. We must make clear that this is a budget plan for a stronger America, for stronger families, for a stronger economy, and a stronger military.

I urge my colleagues to support with great pride the budget put forth by Mr. SPRATT in the Budget Committee this evening.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will just take 30 seconds for myself.

I would simply say our budget does not have the veterans fee increases. That is in the President's budget. That is not in our budget.

Also, our budget does not cut Medicare and Medicaid by a half a trillion dollars. Under our budget, Medicare and Medicaid increases every year, one year after the other. We simply think it should not increase as fast as it is because we want to make it more solvent.

Third point, they say this is a new vision budget that they are proposing. All they are really doing is bringing us a CBO baseline and slapping another $280 billion on top of it. That's what their budget is. The problem is that the CBO baseline requires the largest tax increase in history. That's what we don't support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the new Member from Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Speaker is absolutely right, but this is about their values, not America's values. We hear it's about the children. The Democrat Party's budget, the one that they have proposed, is going to bankrupt our children. They are not going to live at a standard of life as we live today because of their budget, if this is put into place.

The Republican budget is about the children, because it will save their future. Our budget is about the children's well-being. The Democratic Party's budget is about their values, bigger government, greater control of people's lives. They want to do that. They want to take money away from hardworking American citizens and build a bigger government, and they want to tax them to death, tax them into bankruptcy.

But our budget doesn't do that. It actually helps to balance the budget. It helps to have a future for our children. That's the difference. Our budget is about the children. It's about families. It's about businesses. It's about having a strong financial future for small business. That's what our budget does. Their budget guarantees a bigger future for government bureaucrats.

I encourage anyone in this House who is interested in, truly, our children and furthering the best interests of America and the middle class to vote for the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I just ask the chairman of the Budget Committee, are you the last person? You are going to close next, no more speakers on your side; is that right?

Mr. SPRATT. I reserve the right to close. I have no further speakers.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. All right. I will address the House from the well for the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would like to say thank you to a few people. I would like to take this moment to recognize the hard work of the minority staff of the Budget Committee.

I want to thank Austin Smythe, our new staff director; Chauncey Goss, Pat Knudson, Charlene Crawford, Tim Flynn, John Gray, Jim Herz, Charlotte Ivancic, Angela Kuck, Paul Restuccia, Jon Romito, Stephen Sepp and Clete Willems; and our interns, Sigurd Neubauer, Dustin Antonello, and Ryan Michaels.

I am very fortunate to have very bright, very talented, and very dedicated coworkers on the Budget Committee. I also want to thank the chairman for being a gentleman and for his staff for being professional as well.

I have a problem with the budget the chairman has brought to the floor. We have a different vision. It's good that we have these choices. We owe the American people a choice. We owe them two different visions to choose from in this country.

That's what's good about elections. Lately, the differences have been muddled. I'm glad we are making them more clear. What do we want to do with our budget?

We believe that we should do a few things. We should balance the budget, number one, and we shouldn't raise taxes. We think that it's really tough for people to afford just the cost of living today. You are filling up your gas pump at the highest prices you have ever paid before. You are paying health care costs the highest you have probably ever paid before. Food prices are up $70 a month for the average family these days.

The last thing the American taxpayer needs is a big tax increase, an average of $3,000 per family per year. That's what the Democrat budget has.

Now, the Democrats like to say they have this policy document in their budget. On page 48, it's the policy that we don't want these taxes to go up. Then they say, later on, but we are balancing the budget.

The first 27 pages are ones that matter in this budget, the numbers. They can't have it both ways. They can't look the American people in the eye and say we are balancing the budget and we are not raising taxes, because the only way they balance the budget, you can bring out all these left-of-center experts that tell you otherwise, but according to the numbers, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the only way they balance the budget is by enacting the largest tax increase in American history.

So the question is, at this time of economic uncertainty, at this time of job loss, at this time where we possibly could go into a recession, at this time of high prices of living, can we afford the Democrats' tax hike? I would like to know. I would like to get e-mails and calls from people to know, can we afford this?

What is our vision? Our vision is to balance the budget without raising taxes. The key thing is we have got to save money. We are not even proposing to cut spending. We are saying instead of spending $15.832 trillion over the next 5 years, let's spend $15.32 trillion over the next 5 years. Instead of growing spending at 5.2 percent, let's grow it at 3.8 percent.

In that, we are saying let's put a down payment for reform on our children and grandchildren so we can make Medicare and Social Security more solvent, so we can say to the seniors of this country we want Social Security and Medicare to last for you and for our kids.

But we also say, this Congress is broken. Most people get that. We don't call earmarks congressional initiatives or investments; it's pork. If we just do away with the pork for 1 year, we can put a down payment on making sure we don't have our taxes increased. For 1 year, we can make sure we don't raise taxes on everybody who has children by $500 per child. We can make sure we are not going to tax people simply because they are married if Congress just says ''no'' for pork for a year.

So what's the question? Do we want pork or paychecks? More money in workers' paychecks or more pork up here in Washington?

I agree that earmarks are necessary and are a function of this branch of government. It's out of control. It's broken. It needs to be fixed.

Let's stop them for a year, fix this problem so that it has the integrity and the faith that the American people deserve. While we are doing that, let's balance the budget without raising taxes. That is what our budget does.

Yet you hear this same old thing in Washington every year. What they always say is, if you are doing anything other than spending as much as they want, you are cutting spending. If you are not throwing all this money at new programs, you are cutting spending, you are hurting the veterans, you are hurting children, you are hurting people, you are doing this, you are doing that. We are simply saying we need to control our spending in this town.

You see, Washington doesn't have a tax revenue problem. Plenty of money is coming in. Washington has a spending problem. We have got to get our handle on that spending.

By controlling that spending, by growing it at a slower pace, by putting a down payment on reform, by making Medicare more solvent, we can do those things while we balance the budget without raising taxes.

That's the choice. We can have their plan with the largest tax increase in history, more and more and more spending, more earmarks, more pork, less money in our paychecks, or we can have our plan: control spending, balance the budget, keep more money in your paychecks.

Because you know what? Paychecks aren't going as far as they used to. They don't cover as much groceries, as many gas tanks. They don't cover as much of health care bills as they used to. We believe it's the people's money; they believe it's Washington's money. That's the basic difference at the end of the day.

We believe people ought to keep more of their own money because it is their money. They believe it's Washington money, and they want more of it.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, for purpose of closing, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, like Mr. RYAN, I want to express my heartfelt gratitude to the staff on both sides: Tom Kahn, Sarah Abernathy, Ellen Balis, Arthur Burris, Linda Bywaters, Barbara Chow, Marsha Douglass, Stephen Elmore, Chuck Fant, Jason Freihage, Jose Guillen, Jennifer Hanson-Kilbride, Dick Magee, Sheila McDowell, Diana Meredith, Gail Millar, Morna Miller, Namrata Mujumdar, Kimberly Overbeek, Kitty Richards, Diane Rogers, Scott Russell, Marcus Stephens, Naomi Stern, Lisa Venus, Greg Waring, Andrea Weathers, and interns Les Braswell and Tina Shah.

We have had a fast track on which to bring this resolution out of committee onto the floor to passage. Without their assistance, long nights, weekends, you name it, we certainly could not have done it. We certainly could not have done it without the presentation we put on the last 2 days. To them, I am deeply indebted for all of their help, both sides of the aisle, my staff in particular, which I think is one of the best committee staffs of any committee on the Hill in either House.

If I had a chart of my choice, I would have a counterpart to Mr. RYAN's chart, which said, can we afford the Democrats' tax? It would say, can our children afford the Republicans' debt tax? Because the legacy of this administration, 8 years, is nearly $5 trillion in additional debt, a phenomenal increase in debt that will have to be borne by our children.

When I say that our first objective in taking on this budget was to move it to balance, that's not some economic goal. That's not some green eyeshade objective. That's because I think we are morally wrong in leaving this mountain of debt to our children and our grandchildren.

□ 1700

If I had a chart, it would say just that, because I would assign the blame, the primary blame, to our Republican colleagues for the last 7 years.

We have brought to this floor a budget resolution, the base bill on which we will vote. After we vote on the Ryan amendment, we will vote on the base bill. I would ask for a vote against the Ryan amendment and for the base bill, H. Con. Res. 312, which is the Democratic-reported budget resolution.

We set as our first objective balancing the budget within a reasonably foreseeable period of time. The day we chose was 2012, and we hit that day. In fact, by our calculations, using CBO numbers, we will have a surplus that year under certain assumptions of $178 billion. That surplus will grow as time moves on; and by the year 2018, we will have accumulated $1.4 billion in surpluses. Now, I know they will be dissipated and used for other purposes, but I am suggesting here and have been suggesting that is one of the ways that we will pay for the tax cuts, particularly the middle-income tax cuts to which we have explicitly committed ourselves. That is one way we will make certain that they are cared for and extended.

Secondly, even though we are committed to balancing the budget, we are also morally committed to doing other things that shouldn't be held up or put aside while we try to bring our books in order, one of which is the education of our children. The President's budget basically flat funds education for the next 5 years.

I am proud to say that our budget provides $7.3 billion, $7.1 billion more than the President requested in his budget for the education of our children.

And watch out for education when they begin to, if you adopt the Ryan resolution, when they begin to distribute these undistributed, unallocated cuts, because education is right there in the bore sights.

Secondly, veterans health care. Of all of the promises government makes, the promises we make to our veterans ought to be upheld. And right now we have an increasing caseload. Therefore, we are proposing $3.6 billion over and above current services in order to pay for the additional case loads.

CHIP, children's health insurance. I am proud to claim a little paternity there. I was involved in 1997 when we created the program in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. Now we are saying that we can balance our budget and still balance our priorities by seeing that our children, all of our children who don't have health insurance, can get health insurance. We provide for that. We provide for that in this budget resolution.

Finally, we provide for innovation, competitiveness, energy, research, things that will keep our economy on a competitive edge. For all of these reasons, we think we have brought to the floor a good budget resolution which is worthy of the support of not just the Democrats on this side, but Republicans as well. It moves us toward balance, and it has balanced priorities. It is good for America and good for our economy.

I, therefore, request a vote in favor of the Spratt resolution, H. Con. Res. 312, which is the base bill and against the Ryan resolution which, if it were adopted, and I don't think it will be, but were it to be adopted, it would displace our bill. Vote for the base bill, H. Con. Res. 312, and vote to do these things that are so important to our economy, our country, our families, and our children. This is a good bill and I commend it to you for your support today.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 263, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

AYES—157

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Young (FL)

NOES—263

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bordallo
Boustany
Fortuño
Hooley
Hunter
LaHood
Oberstar
Rangel
Renzi
Rush
Tancredo
Waters
Weller
Woolsey
Young (AK)

□ 1730

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. GUTIERREZ, SAXTON, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Messrs. HOYER, COHEN, FRELINGHUYSEN, FATTAH, TURNER and Mrs. SCHMIDT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. FLAKE, EHLERS, FRANKS of Arizona, SHULER and McINTYRE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 312 and congratulate Chairman SPRATT for putting forward a budget that reflects the values of American families.

Again this year, President Bush proposed a reckless, fiscally irresponsible budget that would have neglected key investments and made significant cuts to critical services while driving up an already unsustainable deficit. Democrats reject Republican policies that have led to record debt and a weakened economy and today offer a budget that invests in families, makes America safer, strengthens our economy and improves our global competitiveness.

This budget proposal recognizes that smart investments in our country today will result in significant savings in the long run. H. Con. Res. 312 invests in renewable energy and "green collar jobs". Record gas prices are straining family, business and government budgets. This investment in the Midwest will reduce our dependence on oil, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and create new jobs in our communities.

While the President proposed to cut education, the Democrats budget provides for a significant investment in our children by including $7.1 billion above the President's request. This funding will provide needed increases for No Child Left Behind, Head Start and Special Education. The underfunding of these programs under Republican leadership has led to reduced opportunities for our students and increased taxes for homeowners. The Democratic budget makes an important step in living up to the federal government's promises on education funding. It also provides funding for the America COMPETES Act, allowing for the education of the teachers, scientists, engineers and mathematicians we need to remain competitive in the global economy.

The Democratic budget invests in health care. It provides health care for all children and makes significant investments in health research and public health. Importantly, this budget rejects the draconian cuts to Medicare and Medicaid proposed by the President. Democrats recognize that access to health care includes access to quality health care providers.

In contrast to claims made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this budget does not raise taxes on the middle class families. It fact, it includes a 1-year fix for the Alternative Minimum Tax and extends middle class tax cuts including the child tax credit, the marriage penalty relief, and the deduction for state and local sales taxes. It also calls for immediate action on the foreclosure crisis and provides for an affordable housing trust fund to help families find safe, stable housing and to begin to create wealth.

Democrats support investing in our communities. This budget recognizes the declining status of our nation's infrastructure and makes it a priority to invest in the necessary rebuild and expansion. In Minnesota, because of the tragic bridge collapse last August, we are all too aware of the need for upgrade and repair to our infrastructure. In addition, families are spending too much time and too much money commuting. This budget will allow for investment in transportation—both to increase options and to improve safety.

I also commend the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus for putting forward alternative budget proposals. I strongly support the emphasis on diplomacy and investments in global health proposed in these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget reflects America's priorities and will put this country back on track by reducing our debt and investing in our future. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 312.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, this budget is a commitment to restoring fiscal responsibility while providing for programs that boost economic growth, create new jobs, and provide tax relief to millions of middle-class families.

When the President presented the last budget proposal of his administration last month, he cemented his legacy of fiscal irresponsibility. Since January 2001, a $5.6 trillion 10-year surplus has been converted into record deficits and mounting debt.

The budget, which will outline Congressional spending for the next fiscal year, rejects the President's original proposal of cutting Medicare/Medicaid, key education programs, and the COPS law enforcement agency grant programs.

In contrast to the Administration's budget proposal, this budget passed by the House reaches a balance by FY 2012. It ensures that, under the adopted pay-as-you-go principles, any new spending is offset and does not add to the deficit.

With over 20 million middle-class American families facing the burden of paying the Alternative Minimum Tax, AMT, we have included fiscally responsible legislation that will provide a one-year 'patch' and provide AMT relief to those families.

This is a budget that defends our Nation and provides for our Nation's veterans and wounded heroes. It increases veterans funding for FY 2009 by $3.6 billion above current levels and $38 billion over the next 5 years. Our budget also allows the Department of Veterans Affairs to treat 5.8 million patients in 2009 and rejects the $2.3 billion in health care fee increases imposed by the President's budget proposal.

The budget also prioritizes resources to restore military readiness that has been worn down by repeated deployments and more than 6 years of war. As chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, I am fully aware of the need to restore the strength of our military and protect our country from future attacks.

Despite the President's insistence on not expanding children's health insurance program, CHIP, this budget includes a reserve fund to provide up to $50 billion for CHIP. The President's budget proposal also cuts Medicaid by $94 billion over 10 years and a whopping $479 billion from Medicare over the same period. That is unacceptable and Congress rejects those cuts.

I urge all my colleagues to support this fiscally responsible budget that properly funds our nation's priorities.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I support this budget resolution, which will lay the foundation for the decisions about spending and taxes that we must make this year.

Our first responsibility as Members of Congress is to provide for our national defense and homeland security, in order to safeguard the lives and liberties of the American people.

For that reason, and as a Member of the Armed Services Committee, I am glad to be able to say that this budget meets that responsibility by providing $537.8 billion for national defense, which is in line not only with the amounts requested but also the recommendation of our committee.

I also support the budget because it puts the needed priority on moving to restore the capabilities so seriously eroded by repeated deployments and more than 6 years of war. And, even more important, it includes instructions to properly care for the men and women in uniform by rejecting TRICARE fee increases, providing funding to continue addressing problems such as those at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, and calling for enhanced pay and benefits to improve the quality of life of our troops and their families. It also calls for allocating $4.9 billion more than in the current fiscal year for veterans' health care.

But that is not the end of our responsibility. We also need to act responsibly to change the policies that over the last seven years have brought us deeper budget deficits and massive increases in the national debt even as we make needed investments in our society here at home.

This budget meets that responsibility as well. It lays out a path that can bring the budget back to balance. It includes an essential aspect of fiscal responsibility by following the ''pay-as-you-go'' approach now embodied in our House rules, requiring that any entitlement spending increases or revenue reductions be offset, so that the bottom line of the budget is not worsened.

At the same time it allows for funding priority investments in education, children's health care, veterans' health care, and innovation but also accommodating tax relief for middle-income Americans. It rejects President Bush's proposed cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and assistance to local law-enforcement agencies while accommodating $50 billion over 5 years for the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP). It also allows for substantially greater appropriations that the president has requested for education, and energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

And it includes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to accommodate middle-income tax cuts, such as extension of the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket, elimination of most estate taxes, extension of the research and experimentation tax credit, extension of the deduction for state and local sales taxes, and a tax credit for school construction bonds. In addition, through a reconciliation instruction to the Ways and Means Committee, it allows for action to protect more than 20 million middle-income taxpayers from exposure to the alernative minimum tax, which was never intended to apply to them.

As a member of the Committee on Science and Technology, I applaud the fact that the budget will allow an additional $1.98 billion over the amounts appropriated for this fiscal year for science, space, and technology.

That amount will fully accommodate the commitments made in the America COMPETES Act—a measure I was proud to cosponsor and champion in the conference committee—for the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy Office of Science.

Further, the budget includes increased budget authority for energy technology research programs such as those at the Advanced Research Projects Agency for Energy, ARPA–E and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which include help for small manufacturers and technology companies through the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and Technology Innovation Program.

These programs have great potential to increase our economic growth and to foster innovation. As the global marketplace becomes more competitive, it is essential that we compete on the basis of improved skills and greater productivity, rather than follow the destructive path of trying to compete solely on cost with the half of the world's workers who earn less than $2 a day.

That is the purpose of the America COMPETES Act, and why it is so important that we provide adequate funding for it. And it also the point of the resolution's provision saying the House should provide sufficient funding so that our Nation may continue to be the world leader in education, innovation, and economic growth and so we can stay on a path toward doubling funding for the National Science Foundation, basic research in the physical sciences, and collaborative research partnerships, and toward achieving energy independence through the development of clean and sustainable alternative energy technologies.

In addition, as a member of the Natural Resources, and as a westerner, I also support the budget because it will allow for an increase of more than $6 billion in the amounts available for protection of our water and air and the sound management of our public lands and other natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, it is said that to govern is to choose—and today's debate demonstrates the truth of that adage because the House must choose among four competing proposals for how the budget should be shaped in the years ahead.

Before deciding to support the resolution approved by the Budget Committee, I carefully reviewed the three competing alternatives, and in each I found some things that I think have considerable merit. For example, I liked the additional investments in education, job training, and employment included in the alternative advanced by the Congressional Black Caucus, as well as the provisions regarding unemployment insurance, food stamps, and housing assistance highlighted in the Progressive Caucus alternative. And the Republican alternative includes procedures for a legislative line-item veto similar to legislation (H.R.

595) I have introduced under the name of the Stimulating Leadership in Limiting Expenditures (or "SLICE") Act and would place a moratorium on spending earmarks pending review of the earmarking process by a bipartisan panel—two ideas that I think could result in worthwhile reforms.

But, on balance, I have concluded that the version now before us, developed in the Budget Committee under the able leadership of its distinguished Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr SPRATT, is the best choice. It is a sound proposal that will enable our government to meet its responsibilities, at home and abroad, in a way that is fiscally sound and respectful of the need to provide tax relief for middle-income Americans and promoting a sound economy.

I will vote for it and I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of North Carolina's children and our working families, I rise in support of this budget resolution and I congratulate you, Chairman JOHN SPRATT for your visionary leadership in crafting this important document.

With this budget resolution, the Democratic majority will succeed where our Republican predecessors failed. To budget is to govern, and this resolution will produce a balanced budget with balanced priorities.

As the only former State schools chief serving in Congress, I am particularly pleased about this measure's provisions for education and innovation. Specifically, rather than continue the Republicans' record of passing a crushing debt burden on to future generations, the Spratt resolution contains tough budget discipline for a new direction for the Federal budget. The Spratt resolution rejects the President's proposed education cuts and instead provides greater investment in our Nation's schools, including the school construction bonds Chairman RANGEL and I have been working on for nearly a decade and increased Impact Aid for federally impacted local public schools. It provides $50 billion for children's health insurance. And it protects millions of middle income families from the onslaught of the alternative minimum tax.

As a Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I am pleased that after 7 years of this Administration failing to address fully some of our most pressing security needs, the Chairman's mark provides the necessary resources to meet critical threats to the Nation. Specifically, the Chairman's mark places high priority on rejecting the President's cuts to first responder support. This includes the State Homeland Security Grant Program through which States may direct grants to local law enforcement, firefighters, emergency medical services, and other preparedness officials to address a wide array of public safety needs. The Administration proposed cutting this proven security initiative by $705 million, and the Spratt budget rejects that misguided cut. The Chairman's mark also rejects these other mistaken budget cuts: $463 million from firefighter assistance grants that give local firefighters the tools they need to do their dangerous jobs protecting the public; $173 million from Byrne Justice Assistance Grants flexible funding for local criminal justice efforts; $599 million from the Community Congress Oriented Policing Services COPS funds that help local communities hire, train and retain police officers and to improve law enforcement technology. I strongly believe the homeland security starts with hometown security, and I strongly support the Chairman's mark as it provides essential services for local first responders. Unbelievably, for the sixth year in a row, the President's budget proposes to eliminate the State Criminal Alien Assistance fund of $417 million which helps States cope with the costs of incarcerating undocumented aliens who commit crimes. I am pleased the Chairman's mark rejects this misguided budget cut.

I was disappointed to see the President's proposed budget contains the failed Social Security privatization plan, and the leading Republican Presidential candidate just this week embraced this risky plan. When the President first proposed privatizing Social Security, I toured the country to oppose this risky gamble with Social Security. The American people have spoken loud and clear that they want their Social Security benefits to be an ironclad guarantee instead of a risky gamble like the Republicans continue to propose. The Bush/McCain plan is a bad idea. I am pleased the Chairman's mark rejects this risky Social Security privatization scheme.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I have become increasingly concerned about the legacy of debt this Administration is passing on to future generations. The $5.6 trillion projected surplus that the Administration inherited when it took office has been transformed into a $3.2 trillion deficit. More than 80 cents of every dollar of new debt since 2001 is owed to foreign investors, including foreign governments. The high level of indebtedness to foreign investors heightens the American economy's exposure to potential instability or even from financial threat from unfriendly foreign governments, and places additional burdens on our children and grandchildren. It is a massively irresponsibly tax on posterity.

There are many reasons to support this resolution, but in my brief allotment of time, I want to say that I support this resolution on behalf of my grandchildren and all the children of this country and their families who deserve a budget that puts their needs first. That's the definition of a budget that's truly balanced.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 312, the Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2009. This proposal fulfills an important commitment that we have made to the American people by investing in fiscally responsible tax relief to millions of households and in programs that strengthen the economy, make America safer, and help families struggling to make ends meet in an economic downturn.

On February 6, I expressed my strong concerns over the misguided budget request that the President transmitted to Congress. I am very pleased to see that the budget before us today restores many of the important programs that the President proposed to cut, while achieving balance by 2012. It is more vital than ever that we remain responsive to the needs of the American people, while maintaining strong fiscal stewardship to ensure our financial obligations are not passed along to our children and grandchildren.

Any budgetary blueprint that we expect to bolster the economy must also include an investment in education and job training programs that will promote new employment and ensure our workforce can adapt to the jobs of the future. Unfortunately, those programs were not priorities for this Administration. Under the President's proposal, Rhode Island would see $1.5 million less for after-school programs and a cut of almost $6 million for career and technical education. In contrast, the Democratic budget resolution would provide $7.1 billion more than the President for vital education, job training, and social services programs nationwide in 2009.

I am pleased that this resolution addresses the President's failure to make higher education affordable for students with economic challenges, especially in Rhode Island, where college tuition has risen 45 percent in 4 years. This measure also includes crucial funding for the Democratic innovation agenda and the America COMPETES Act, which will enhance our edge in math and science education and research. To maintain our economic advantage in the coming years, our Nation must invest more in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, STEM, education.

Also critical to America's economic prosperity is a budget that promotes fiscally responsible tax relief to millions of families struggling to make ends meet. In particular, this measure includes a 1-year patch to keep millions of hard-working, middle-class Americans outside the ever-widening net of the alternative minimum tax, AMT, and it is fully offset. In addition, the Democratic budget will extend the R&D tax credit, which will spur economic growth, create new jobs, and help struggling small businesses regain their competitive edge.

Community development and social services programs will play an important role for businesses and families as we attempt to reclaim our economic prosperity, and I am proud to support a budget that funds these initiatives. This budget restores community and regional development programs, like the Community Development Block Grant, CDBG, program, which provides vital funding for economic and community development in both urban and rural areas nationwide. The House Democratic budget resolution also reverses cuts to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, and the Weatherization Assistance Program, which helps people actually reduce their energy consumption. These programs are vital to places like Rhode Island where families are struggling with astronomical heating costs.

This budget resolution also includes $1.2 billion more than the President's budget for energy programs. As families face unprecedented costs to heat their homes and put gas in their cars, it is imperative that we fund efficient and renewable energy programs. H. Con. Res. 312 does this by encouraging the production of renewable energy alternatives, increasing energy efficiency, investing in new energy and vehicle technologies, and training workers for "green collar" jobs. This resolution also encourages mass transit by increasing funding for Amtrak. I am proud that Rhode Island has already started many of these initiatives, but Democrats recognize that we need to support them on a broad, nationwide basis.

Equally important during this challenging economic time is the continued need for strong health care funding. The Democratic budget measure rejects the President's proposed 10-year cut of over $500 billion to both Medicare and Medicaid, two vital safety net programs serving our Nation's elderly, low-income, and disabled citizens. It also provides an increase over the President's proposed discretionary health care budget to fund programs that emphasize support for disease-prevention, food safety, and access to quality health care for underserved populations. I am also very pleased to see that this budget will accommodate up to a $50 billion increase to expand children's health insurance to cover millions of uninsured children.

Health care also remains the highest priority for our Nation's veterans and the brave men and women currently serving in our Armed Forces. This resolution appropriately addresses veterans' needs by rejecting the President's proposed new fees and increasing veterans funding by $3.6 billion relative to the amount needed to keep pace with inflation. This will provide increased resources for the VA to treat 5.8 million patients in 2009, including 333,275 Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans. We cannot lose sight of the fact that the VA will play a larger role in the coming years as more servicemembers return from ongoing conflicts.

As the Chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, Science and Technology, I am proud to support a budget that properly invests in our homeland security. Unlike the President's budget, this resolution provides robust funding for programs important to State and local law enforcement in Rhode Island, including the State Homeland Security Grant Program, which awarded $34.8 million to Rhode Island from 2004 to 2007, and the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, LETPP, from which Rhode Island received $11.5 million from 2004 to 2006. By passing the Democratic budget, we can give local law enforcement officials in Rhode Island the tools they need to continue to keep our citizens safe.

The Democratic budget resolution also makes America safer by investing in our Nation's transportation systems, including highways and waterways, providing sufficient funding as well as a reserve fund to facilitate new infrastructure initiatives. This budget also meets the President's funding level for the Department of Defense, but shifts resources to high priorities such as nuclear nonproliferation programs, which was a recommendation of the 9/11 Commission. Finally, this resolution responds to the current hardships faced by our servicemembers by funding quality of life improvements for the troops as well as their families.

In this time of uncertainty, the American people are relying on us as decisionmakers to put forth a plan that will restore our economic prosperity, strengthen our national security, provide relief where it is needed, and promote fiscal discipline. Today, I am pleased to rise in support of a Democratic proposal that will accomplish each one of these goals. This budget resolution represents a new roadmap toward achieving the true priorities of Americans, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on this measure.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me take this means to congratulate Budget Committee Chairman JOHN SPRATT, also a senior and well-respected member of the House Armed Services Committee, for crafting a strong, balanced budget for fiscal year 2009. I am pleased to support this bill that would provide for a strong national defense, would put our country on a path to budget surpluses in 2012, would promote tax relief for middle-class American families, and would invest in programs that have been priorities for those living in rural Missouri.

On defense, the House Budget Resolution would prioritize resources to restore military readiness that has been worn down by repeated deployments and more than 6 years of war. The resolution would reject TRICARE fee increases, provide funding to continue addressing problems such as those identified at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, and would call for enhanced pay and benefits to improve the quality of life of our troops and their families.

On rural affairs, the House Budget Resolution would bolster commodity support, agricultural research, and animal and plant inspection programs. It would assume sufficient resources for the Farm Bill, which provides Missouri farmers with a secure economic safety. It would also set aside critical funds for rural development, for food and nutrition programs, and for conservation.

Also important to Fourth District residents are commitments in the House Budget Resolution to infrastructure improvements, to local police and firefighters, to the health care needs of Missouri's senior citizens and low-income children, to education, and to our cherished veterans.

The resolution would provide immediate and long-term relief from the alternative minimum tax and provide for additional middle-class tax relief and enhanced economic equity through tax policies. And, importantly, it would adhere to the "pay-as-you-go" rule adopted by House Democrats early in 2007. That rule requires new entitlement spending or revenue reductions to be offset so the budget remains in balance.

On behalf of the rural Missourians I am privileged to represent, I am pleased to support Chairman SPRATT's work product.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAPUANO, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, pursuant to House Resolution 1036, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 991.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 207, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—212

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

NAYS—207

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake

Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Boustany
Hooley
Hunter
LaHood
Oberstar
Rangel
Renzi
Rush
Tancredo
Weller
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1750

Mr. SHULER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

RECOGNIZING THE EXCEPTIONAL SACRIFICE OF THE 69TH INFANTRY REGIMENT, KNOWN AS THE FIGHTING 69TH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 991, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 991.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Berman
Boustany
Cramer
Gohmert
Gutierrez
Hooley
Hunter
King (IA)
LaHood
Lewis (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
Meeks (NY)
Oberstar
Rangel
Renzi
Rush
Tancredo
Tierney
Waters
Weller
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1759

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I was detained in the elevator while attempting to reach the House floor to cast my vote on rollcall 142 earlier this evening. Had I been able to reach the floor before the vote was closed, I would have voted "yea."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5464

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as an original cosponsor of H.R. 5464, the A Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act.

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

There was no objection.