RECORD last night and how the votes went, and we thought maybe some of the Members would like to get home on Thursday.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I can guarantee I think that this amendment will be treated properly by the membership.

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 27 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

Page 110, after line 18, insert the following new section:

SEC. 417. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 26, 2007, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the overall funding of this bill by .5 percent, one-half of 1 percent. We already know that the increased funding in this bill over the last year's appropriations is an additional $1.2 billion, 4.5 percent. So my amendment would take a 4.5 percent increase to a 4 percent increase. That is not a cut. If you look up the word ''cut'' in the dictionary, this is still an increase in spending of 4 percent.

We have a national debt that is at an all-time high, $8.8 trillion. I walk around in the Longworth House Office Building where my office is and I see these charts on easels out in front of Members' offices and they are decrying the national debt. I look at my children and my grandchildren and I am very concerned about this $8.8 trillion. I think we are leaving a terrible legacy to our children and our grandchildren. I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle, and I want to say that you are right when you decry the spending levels that the Republicans reached while we were in the majority.

But I want to take it back to a time when I was a teacher, and someone in the class would do something and you would try to correct this student and they would say, But he is doing it too. And you would say, It is still wrong. You are doing it. You stop it. And then you deal with this person over here.

Republicans spent too much. Democrats want to spend even more, Mr. Chairman. But as we are standing here today debating these amendments, and some people think we need to hurry up and go home, I think the American people need to hear this debate.

I heard the distinguished chairman talking about a meat-ax approach that a Republican chairman had alluded to before years ago. I would say that the Musgrave amendment is just a shave, Mr. Chairman. It is a shave that won't even give you a rash. It is 50 cents on $100. That is very appropriate.

When we look at this bill, we hear things that are very worthy of taxpayer spending in this bill. But we also hear other things.

This bill contains $204 million for land acquisition. If you take a map of the United States, Mr. Chairman, and you look and see how much land the government already owns west of the Mississippi, if you look at that map, it is staggering. I am very concerned about how the Federal Government already owns too much land.

Again, in this bill there is $204 million for land acquisition. I have friends in the Western Caucus, and I am a member of it, and we talk about what happens to communities when this property is owned by the Federal Government, what happens to the revenue stream.

This bill also has something else that is especially egregious to me, $160 million in funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, a 29 percent increase over the amount that was appropriated last year. I love the arts and I know that these things are noble. But, do you know what? When I talk to a family in Sterling, Colorado, a farming community out there in northeastern Colorado, I would have a very hard time convincing them that they need to be taxed at a higher rate, to send their hard-earned dollars to Washington, D.C. so that money can be handed out for theater productions in Sitka, Alaska. I don't think the family in Sterling, Colorado, would get that.

□ 1330

So I think when we talk about the good things in this bill, we also have to look at these egregious things and talk about choices we should make.

So again, I want to trim this. I want to give this a shave of one-half of 1 percent, which, by the way, in dollar amounts, ends up being $138 million, just a shave off of this bill, to exercise discipline in our spending just like the families back home have to do to meet their budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I just want to say a couple of things. I know, Mr. Chairman, people watching this on TV probably think they are in the Twilight Zone or caught up in the middle of Alice in Wonderland because you don't know which side to believe.

The chairman of the subcommittee said people couldn't sleep or wouldn't be able to sleep worrying about these cuts. Nobody in Grantville, Georgia, will be staying up worrying about the government cutting its own size.

We are talking about saving time. We have been debating for about 14 hours $28 billion. I don't know about anybody on the other side of the aisle, but I know that when me and my family sit down and discuss a budget, it took a lot longer for us to discuss our little pittance of a budget than 14 hours to discuss $27 billion.

The other thing, we are hearing all of this whining about we borrowed $3 trillion in the last 6 years. We ran up the deficit. And then we hear about we cut the budget $16 billion. Now listen, where I come from, you can't have your cake and eat it, too. We were either wrong in borrowing the money, or we were wrong in not spending the money, but you can't be wrong in both of them. Somebody has to make up their mind.

We talked the other night that you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

I would like to say that I think the majority is running out of time, because pretty soon, the gig is going to be up. We tried pinpointing, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FLAKE, we tried pinpointing, doing some accurate bombing or cutting on this bill; but that didn't work.

Now it's being talked about using the meat-cleaver approach. When I get those 250 programs that have been cut and the $6 billion that has been saved, and the list of the $80 billion that we are spending more, could you send me maybe a method to do some cutting? Because if we can't pinpoint, we can't use a scalpel, and we can't use a meat cleaver, how can we do it? I think that is what the taxpayers want to know. Who is going to stand up for them?

We call each other ''my good friend'' and ''my good buddy'' and ''my colleague'' and this and that. What we need to be doing is being a good friend to the taxpayer. We are not being a good friend to the taxpayer.

We talk about national parks being closed down, and yet we spend another $7 million expanding the Carl Sandburg property.

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

This amendment would cut a total of $138 million from environmental conservation and Native American programs. It makes no choice based on need or merit of the program, but it cuts 0.5 percent in this bill. This is not merely an accounting change on a table. Cutting $138 million from the bill will have very serious consequences.