

Bright	Hensarling	Nye
Brown (GA)	Herger	Olson
Brown (SC)	Hill	Paul
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Paulsen
Ginny	Hunter	Pence
Buchanan	Inglis	Petri
Burton (IN)	Issa	Pitts
Buyer	Jenkins	Platts
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Poe (TX)
Camp	Jones	Posey
Campbell	Jordan (OH)	Price (GA)
Cantor	Kilroy	Putnam
Cao	King (IA)	Radanovich
Capito	King (NY)	Rehberg
Carney	Kingston	Reichert
Carter	Kirk	Roe (TN)
Cassidy	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rogers (AL)
Castle	Kline (MN)	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Kratovil	Rohrabacher
Childers	Lamborn	Rooney
Coble	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Coffman (CO)	Latham	Roskam
Cole	LaTourette	Royce
Conaway	Latta	Ryan (WI)
Crenshaw	Lee (NY)	Scalise
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Schmidt
Davis (KY)	Linder	Schock
Deal (GA)	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Dent	Lucas	Sessions
Diaz-Balart, L.	Luetkemeyer	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lummis	Shimkus
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Shuler
Driehaus	E.	Shuster
Duncan	Mack	Simpson
Ehlers	Manzullo	Smith (NE)
Emerson	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Fallin	Marshall	Smith (TX)
Flake	McCarthy (CA)	Souder
Fleming	McCaul	Stearns
Forbes	McClintock	Sullivan
Fortenberry	McCotter	Taylor
Fox	McHenry	Terry
Franks (AZ)	McHugh	Thompson (PA)
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Thornberry
Gallagher	McMorris	Tiahrt
Garrett (NJ)	Rodgers	Tiberi
Gerlach	Mica	Turner
Gingrey (GA)	Michaud	Upton
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Walden
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Wamp
Granger	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Graves	Minnick	Whitfield
Griffith	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Guthrie	Moran (KS)	Wittman
Hall (TX)	Murphy, Tim	Wolf
Harper	Myrick	Young (AK)
Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer	Young (FL)
Heller	Nunes	

NOT VOTING—8

Brown, Corrine	Jackson (IL)	Stark
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Wu
Clay	Rogers (MI)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1646

So 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 against:

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 212, I intended to vote “no.”

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 13, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 371 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 371

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 through 2014. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am honored to stand here today in support of the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution conference report.

I want to thank my friend, the Budget Committee Chairman, JOHN SPRATT, for his incredible work on this budget. He is smart, he is fair, and no one cares more about these issues.

I also want to thank Ranking Member PAUL RYAN. I believe he is a thoughtful and bright Member of this House, even though we usually disagree on most of the issues of the Budget Committee.

I also want to thank the staff of the Budget Committee, Democratic and Republican, for their tireless effort and their commitment to public service.

Madam Speaker, the budget conference report that we are considering today represents so much more than a clean break from the past. It is a blueprint for the future. It is a roadmap for economic recovery and for investing in national priorities that will provide the American people with shared prosperity in the years and decades to come.

The conference report lays the groundwork for health care reform, clean energy and quality education. It will create jobs, support working families, strengthen our national defense and renew America's global leadership.

By cutting taxes for the middle class, \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts for over 95 percent of the American people, Madam Speaker, and investing in affordable

health care, education and clean energy in a fiscally responsible way, we are taking the first critical steps to lifting our economy out of recession and creating good jobs for America's workers. For the last 8 years, President Bush flat out mismanaged the Federal budget. How? By enacting huge tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans that led to skyrocketing deficits, by spending hundreds of billions of dollars on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan without paying for them, and by refusing to invest in the American people.

This budget cuts the deficit by more than half by 2013. And in order to get us back on a fiscally sustainable path, the budget provides a realistic assessment of our fiscal outlook. Unlike the Bush administration, we actually budget for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan instead of hiding them under the emergency spending categories. We budget for natural disasters that inevitably will occur.

This conference report cuts taxes for 95 percent of Americans. Let me repeat that, because we will hear a lot of rhetoric from the other side about taxes.

This budget cuts taxes for 95 percent of Americans. It provides immediate relief from the alternative minimum tax, it eliminates the estate tax on nearly all estates, and works to close corporate tax loopholes.

You see, all of us believe in altering the Tax Code. We believe that we should reduce the tax burden on the middle class and those trying to get into the middle. We believe that corporations shouldn't be allowed to shirk their responsibility by hiding their profits in offshore tax havens.

The other side believes we should reduce taxes for the very wealthiest. It's a simple difference in philosophy. Most importantly, this budget, the Democratic budget, actually invests in the American people. What a welcome change from the past 8 years.

We invest in health care reform, not just to improve health care quality and improve coverage, but to reduce the crushing burden of health care costs on American businesses. Everybody likes to talk about health care reform. This budget actually lays the groundwork to get it done.

We invest in clean energy in order to create jobs, improve the environment and reduce our dependence on foreign oil. We invest in renewable energy and energy efficiency. Everybody likes to talk about energy independence, but this budget actually lays the groundwork to get it done.

And we invest in education to reclaim our place as the best-educated workforce in the world. We work to expand early childhood education and to make college more affordable. Everybody likes to talk about improving education. This budget actually provides the basis to get it done.

And this is a budget that will allow Congress, if and when the time comes, to vote up or down on health care reform and education reform and avoid

the infamous obstructionism so characteristic of the other body and the other side of the aisle. It certainly doesn't guarantee passage of such reforms, but it will allow for and require a straight up-or-down vote in each Chamber.

Now I know that change is hard. I know some of my colleagues want to cling desperately to the failed policies of the past. But the good news is that despite all the nasty press releases and television ads and talk radio attacks on the President, the American people still support President Obama's vision for America.

That's why this budget is so very important. This is a budget with a conscience. It is a budget that believes in the American spirit, and it's a budget that fulfills the promises that the President made to the American people.

Madam Speaker, we are at a crucial moment. Our country can meet its potential, our children can have a better future, our economy can once again create good-paying jobs. But in order to make that happen, we need change. We need to move in a bold, innovative new direction. We need to pass this budget.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, while my colleagues didn't need to listen to the remarks of my distinguished colleague, I know that they will very much want to hear my remarks. And so I would like to make a point of order that the House is not in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman makes a point of order that the House is not in order.

The gentleman will suspend. The House will come to order. Members and staff standing and engaging in conversations will take their seats.

Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. DREIER. I just made it. I mean, you determine whether or not the House is in order, Madam Speaker. It didn't seem to me that it was.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will answer the question.

Do you withdraw your point of order?

Mr. DREIER. Sure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Worcester for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

It sort of feels like Groundhog Day. We just completed debate on this same-day rule and now here we are proceeding with the rule on the budget conference report itself.

When we ended the debate just a little while ago, my friend was saying

that those of us on this side of the aisle have no interest or desire to work with President Obama, that all we say is "no" time and time again. I have got to say that repeatedly we have come forward with alternatives, and we very much want to work in a bipartisan way. And so this notion of trying to claim that we as Republicans are saying "no" is preposterous. Everyone is aware of the fact in this House and in the executive branch that we have come forward with proposals, which is exactly what we did. We had two alternatives that were considered here on the House floor when we considered the budget, itself, and now we have this conference report.

I have got to say that the underlying budget conference report, itself, Madam Speaker, that is before us, to quote my friend from Worcester, is really the same old, same old, a term that he loves to use, as, really, it's the same package that we looked at just 4 weeks ago. Democratic leadership, I know, has tweaked a few things on the margins, but the exact same failed policies are still fully intact on this budget.

My friend correctly points to the fact that the American people are hurting. We know very well that we have a shared goal, but it's how we do it. Unfortunately, this budget recklessly spends money that we don't have, and it sets the stage for tax increases that we can't afford. It makes the fundamental mistake that led to our economic crisis in the first place—profligate, unaccountable and irresponsible behavior. And it allows the Democratic majority to ram through massive, complex legislation down the road without any pretense of consensus building.

My friend said again that we just say "no" to the President. We want to have what the President talked about in his campaign, what the Speaker has repeatedly talked about. We want to work to build a consensus here, but, unfortunately, the budget itself lays the groundwork to completely obliterate any notion of bipartisanship.

Apparently they are not content with merely shutting out Republicans from the legislative process. They are finding moderates within their own party, those who are interested in reaching across the aisle and finding common-sense solutions, and those people who want to do that apparently are being ignored in this process as well. They want to be able to steamroll any effort whatsoever to reach a responsible, bipartisan compromise on some of the most important challenges like health care and energy.

This conference report will let them do just that, to ignore the prospect of bipartisanship. The Federal budget may be a very complicated thing. We all know that. But the principles that should govern that budget are not. They are not complicated at all.

The budget should responsibly spend the taxpayers' money. Every program, Madam Speaker, should be held ac-

countable to cut out waste, fraud and abuse. The budget should assume responsibility for today's challenges rather than pushing the hard choices and mountains of debt off into the future to our children and grandchildren. The budget fails on all these counts.

The longer that the American public has time to examine the level of wasteful spending in this budget, the more deeply concerned they are. They wonder how we can afford this right now, how much debt will be left to our children and grandchildren, and will our taxes be raised to pay for this?

Just a few weeks ago The Hill, the newspaper here, ran a story on the emerging consensus among economists of all stripes that the numbers just don't add up and taxes are going to have to be raised dramatically to pay for all of this government spending. According to these independent analysts, as reported by The Hill, this will mean taxes on the middle class. On middle-income wage earners, these analysts are saying that taxes will be imposed.

Martin Sullivan, a contributing editor at Tax Analyst publications, is quoted as saying, "You just simply can't tax the rich enough to make this all up."

□ 1700

Another economist, Leonard Burman, director of the Tax Policy Center, said that, under the current tax structure, "there's no way we're going to be able to pay for government."

Now, Madam Speaker, these are not Republican operatives. These are independent economists, many of whom openly supported the President during the campaign, who were looking at the numbers and who are saying that this budget will make tax increases on middle-income working Americans, who are trying to make ends meet, inevitable.

This course of action is especially dangerous given our current economic crisis and its causes. Anyone with a little common sense can understand that reckless borrowing and lending led to our economic downturn. A little common sense is also all it takes to understand that raising taxes, including on middle-income wage earners, would be a disaster during tough economic times. Even Keynesian economists and economists of all stripes recognize that, Madam Speaker. Yet this budget continues that very reckless behavior and puts us on the path toward those middle class tax increases.

The most dangerous impact of this budget will come further down the road. This bill employs an arcane legislative trick that will allow the Democratic leadership to cram through massive health care legislation with little scrutiny and, as I said earlier, with zero bipartisanship. This provision we all know called "reconciliation" may be a very technical Beltway issue, but we can all understand its implications by simply considering that iconic

American image, Jimmy Stewart, as he played the role of Jefferson Smith, defiant on the floor of the other body on the other side of the Capitol in that movie "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington."

For many Americans, this is the classic image of public service at its principled best. However, had the Democratic leadership's budgetary gimmicks been in place, Mr. Smith would never have been able to make the stand that he did in that famous movie.

Instead, this budget ensures, Madam Speaker, that critical legislation can be rushed through without the hassle of principled debate. We've already seen what happens when 1,000-page legislation on very complicated issues gets crammed through the Congress. Look no further than to the hundreds of billions of dollars of bailout money that this majority has doled out, to the billions wasted, to the billions unaccounted for and with nothing to show for it.

The Democratic leadership's hasty and partisan approach has a very poor track record. Now they want to ensure that they will be able to approach health care reform in the exact same way, health care accounts for nearly one-fifth of our entire economy, and is one of the single, most important factors in an individual's and in a family's quality of life.

Will Americans be able to continue to choose what doctors they go to? Will they be able to consult their doctors on which treatments are best for them? Can we make health care more accessible and affordable without compromising quality and personal choice? These, Madam Speaker, are the incredibly critical questions that should be addressed in the health care reform debate.

You know, if the Democratic leadership has its way, there won't even be a debate. They want to be able to handle it like they've handled nearly every other important bill: written behind closed doors and crammed through without an open debate. Madam Speaker, this budget puts the rules in place that will allow them to do that. It will also allow them to attach dramatic new energy taxes on every household in America in order to pay for their health care proposals.

The Democratic leadership, when confronted with a question of a new cap-and-tax program, insisted that it is not contained in this budget. What they are hoping the American people will not find out until it's too late is that this budget will allow new energy taxes to be attached to the Democrats' health care legislation. Their energy tax proposal would mean hundreds and even thousands of new taxes each year on each and every single household in this country, and it's all made possible by this budget conference report that we're going to be voting on tomorrow.

The Democratic leadership likes to defend their procedural tricks by saying that Republicans used the same

tactics to enact welfare reform and tax rate reduction. I'm very proud of the fact that we were able to reduce the size and scope and reach of government; that we were able to make welfare programs more accountable; that we were able to let the taxpayers keep more of their own, hard-earned money; and that we were able to implement growth policies that gave us 55 months of job creation and sustained economic expansion. That was the right thing to do. The Democrats, on the other hand, would like to use this procedure to dramatically expand government bureaucracy and tax the American people during an economic recession. This is an absolutely disastrous budget under any circumstances, but it is equally and especially dangerous during challenging economic times.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject reckless, wasteful spending; to reject tax increases for the middle class; to reject a hasty and partisan process for crafting health care and energy legislation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying conference report.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just want to point out, Madam Speaker, that, notwithstanding the constant attacks on President Obama that have come from the other side of the aisle on this floor since he was elected, since he was sworn in as President of the United States, notwithstanding the constant attacks by the patron saint of the Republican Party, Rush Limbaugh, and notwithstanding the attacks by former Speaker Gingrich on every TV show that will allow him on, a poll done by CBS recently showed that, by a 56-32 percent margin, the American people believe that President Obama's budget sets the right priorities.

I believe in the American people. I believe in their instincts. I think they know what they want better than my friends on the other side of the aisle.

I will also point out—and my friend admitted to this because, when it comes to reconciliation, they like to cherry-pick—that their budgets in 2001 and in 2003, which allowed for these massive Bush tax cuts and which nearly bankrupted us—the tax cuts that went to the wealthiest Americans—had reconciliation instructions. In 2005, with reconciliation instructions that allowed them to make deep cuts in Medicare, they increased the deficit by an aggregate of \$1.8 trillion. That's what they did to the economy. That's what they did to the American people. So we don't want the same old, same old.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for

yielding. I want to start by thanking Chairman SPRATT and his colleagues on the Budget Committee and the conferees for so quickly coming to an agreement on the conference report.

I rise to support the rule and the underlying conference report.

This budget resolution begins the long and painful process of digging out of the very deep hole that we have inherited. It makes good on President Obama's promise to cut in half the deficits he inherited in 5 years. In fact, it cuts the deficits by two-thirds, and it does so even while we are cutting taxes for 95 percent of Americans to the tune of \$1.7 trillion worth of tax cuts. We also invest in priorities that are absolutely vital to our future.

I'd like to be specific about one of those priorities, and that is the investment made in higher education and in education in general that is accommodated by the conference report. There are significant investments in higher ed and an increase in the Pell Grant maximum, which will make it easier for hard-pressed students and their families to achieve their slice of the American dream. The moving from the Federal Family Education Loan program, the so-called "FFEL program," to direct lending will save \$97 billion over 10 years, and it will put money in the hands of needy students as opposed to having that money added to the bottom line of banks and of other loan providers. It will restructure the Perkins Loan Program to make it more readily available to students. It will create a college access and completion fund that will enable colleges to emulate best practices across the country so that students really do succeed, and it will make permanent the American Opportunity Tax Credit. All of these are the kinds of investments we need to make if we are going to have the prosperous future that we all want.

With specific reference to education, Mr. DREIER made reference to the various alternatives that Republicans have offered to our budget resolution. The alternative that the Republicans offered made absolutely no mention of education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. There is no mention of education. There is no plan to invest in higher education. There is no plan to invest in job training. There is no plan to invest in any of the vital services that our children need to put them on a path to success.

Instead, that budget resolution made a series of very deep, unallocated cuts that could easily fall on education. We cannot have the bright future we need to have if we don't invest in our children's education. Our budget resolution does that.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I would like to simply say to my colleague who brought up this issue of

reconciliation that we were very proud of the fact that we were able to get people from welfare rolls to the working side of the economy in the mid-1990s, and we did use this procedure. I can time and time again remember instances of people who were saying they were so proud to be able to have a job. In the mid-1990s, the Republican Congress did bring about a bold reform of our welfare system, and it was a great, great accomplishment as it was in the early part of this decade when it was used to allow people to keep more of their own, hard-earned money in 2001 and in 2003.

At the same time, we were doing everything that we could to ensure that we had pro-growth economic policies because we were dealing with an economic recession then, of course with the aftermath of September 11 of 2001, with corporate scandals, and as I said, with an economic recession. We did put into place pro-growth policies, and yes, we used that procedure.

The really difficult thing for us to fathom is the fact that we're now seeing this process utilized to dramatically expand government to the point where this budget has, itself, got a deficit that is larger than what the entire Federal budget was just 10 years ago.

I would very much like to yield to my friend. I told the gentleman from Springfield I would.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Okay. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I just want the gentleman to know there are 40 million Americans without health insurance, and if we can get a health care reform package that covers them, I would be proud to cast a vote for that.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I totally agree on the issue of health care reform. That is a very high priority for us, and my friend knows that we have a solutions working group that is focusing on this issue, and it is a priority that does need to be addressed.

With that, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to my friend from Springfield, Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Here we are. We just had a same-day rule on a bill that was available 3 minutes till midnight last night. We're now on the rule on the budget, the supposed blueprint for the future, and we're going to hear in this debate and in the other debate that this is a budget that spends too much, that borrows too much and that taxes too much because it spends too much, it borrows too much, and it taxes too much.

I want to talk principally about health care for a few minutes. That has been a topic here of the discussion already. "Reconciliation," by definition, defines a partisan victory. I would just advance to my friends that health care is the worst possible place to achieve that victory if you can achieve something differently than that.

There is broad agreement on what we ought to do in health care. We're all working hard to make that agreement become a reality. We've talked about tax policy. We've talked about welfare policy. Frankly, we did use reconciliation, but it was always to restructure something that government was doing. I don't think there is an example of where we used reconciliation to restructure the overall private economy. Both health care and energy would restructure an economy that will never come back to where they were, and that is not something you should be doing without lots of thought and without lots of support in a bipartisan way.

I would advance to my friends that that is a huge mistake. Certainly, if you restructure energy for 5 or 10 years or you restructure health care for 5 or 10 years, we're never coming back to the competitive marketplace that needs to be improved but not tossed aside, and I'm fearful that that's what happened.

Here we are. We're at the end of April. If there is a Secretary of HHS, that's only because she will be confirmed this week. I don't think there is a Secretary there. Even if there is, the others in that Department who support the Secretary are not there. No Secretary. No bill. No plan to get this done within the calendar. The calendar makes it virtually impossible to get this done before that reconciliation instruction has to be used.

Frankly, for those who want to go to a single-payer, government-run system, having reconciliation out there is every reason in the world not to have a bipartisan compromise. This is an area where we need to have two-thirds of the Members of the House and two-thirds of the Members of the Senate going from that vote, saying we believe the country is headed in the right direction.

□ 1715

If we have a 51-49 sort of victory and we have a 5-year debate on whether we have health care rationing or government-run health care, that is a bad thing for America, Madam Speaker. We need a health care system that's affordable, that's accessible, that has better quality. I think we can all reach agreement on those issues. But not, I would advance, if we have this option out there of one party doing it one way.

This is a blueprint that doesn't work the way it should work. The budget doesn't. The taxes, the inflation, the interest rates that are absolutely in the country's future in the way of recovering the economy are part of the problem of the future. They will stand in the way of that recovery.

I urge that we vote against this rule and against this budget.

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

First of all, when people talk about partisanship, I recall my friends on the

other side of the aisle giving us the prescription drug bill, which was probably one of the most partisan health care votes I can recall ever having here. Our hope is not to have a partisan health care bill. President Obama has already had a summit at the White House where he invited not just Democratic leaders but Republican leaders to come and to provide their input to try to figure out how we can do this together.

But the deal is we are going to get health care reform this year. My friends on the other side of the aisle, they have had 8 years. If it's such a priority, why haven't they done it in 8 years? The number of people that have fallen into the ranks of the uninsured has increased dramatically while they were in control of the Congress and the White House. So no one's talking about trying to create a partisan vote.

What we're trying to do is get what the American people want accomplished. And, quite frankly, I think the onus is on the other side of the aisle to demonstrate that they are, in fact, sincere about working in a bipartisan way. I think this President has done everything humanly possible to reach out the hand of friendship and bipartisanship to try to work with the other side of the aisle.

I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I just wanted to follow up on the previous speaker.

It is absolutely clear, and hopefully we will pass this budget this week, but the budget sets out a process by which we can work and should work in a bipartisan way. It is simply not good enough for the other side of the aisle to say, "We would love to work with you on health care reform. We just can't guarantee that we can do it before October 15 and therefore we aren't sure we're going to do it at all." That is not what the American people are asking us to do. What they're asking us to do is get to work.

The fact is that we did more on health care in the first 8 weeks of this administration than we did for 8 years before. That's what the American people are asking us to do. That's what this budget does. It says we're going to get to work on health care. We're going to look to do it in a bipartisan way. It's going to be public-private partnership. That's what the President wants. That's what we're going to do. It is not going to be a wholly public system. They can keep saying so on the other side of the aisle, but that's not what's going to happen.

Let's get to work. This is a moment when the American people are saying one of the major challenges before us in this country is for economic competitive reasons and because every family is demanding it, is to do health care reform. Let's get it done. This budget puts us on a path to do it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

I rise, Madam Speaker, today in support of this rule and fully support the fiscal year 2010 budget as well.

President Obama has laid out an extremely ambitious budget this year that will resonate for decades to come. From health care to climate change to education, this budget will improve our Nation in significant ways, and I am proud to support it.

For health, this lays the groundwork for health care reform. Forty-seven million people living without any health insurance is a national disgrace. For energy, this goes towards the way of reducing our dependence on foreign oil. This budget would increase funding for renewables by nearly 20 percent over the '09 budget. And for education, Mr. BISHOP spoke about all the things. I agree with him. It builds upon the funding we provided for education in the recent stimulus package.

Now, as any large bill, it's not perfect, and it can be improved. And I just want to highlight a few areas that I hope we can improve on in the future.

One is foreign aid. I am disappointed at the level of the funding for international relations and foreign aid. As the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I've seen firsthand the benefits of foreign aid. This budget is a lot better. The conference report is a lot better than the initial budget. The Senate budget included the entire \$53.4 billion of the President's request. This compromise is \$51 billion, better than the original House \$48.5 billion, but I hope we can up it in the future.

I want to talk about the \$250,000 income threshold. The budget resolution uses this \$250,000 threshold as a way to raise revenue. I think it's too low and needs to be raised. If you come from a high-cost-of-living State as I do, this \$250,000 threshold is inappropriate. Raising taxes on these people, I believe, is not good at this time. But I think overall the budget is good.

Finally, I want to talk about the AMT, because in New York, you cannot deduct anything if you're caught in the AMT. I am happy this budget includes a 1-year AMT patch. Without this patch, 2.8 million middle-class families in New York alone would be swept into it. But every year, we're going to run into difficulty. We need a permanent AMT fix, and I hope we can do that.

But I do support the budget. It's a good budget. It calls for the change that President Obama spoke about, and I hope we vote for it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the un-

derlying budget conference report that we are considering today.

As a member of the Budget Committee and a budget conferee, I was proud to have worked with Chairman SPRATT and the other members of the committee on a 2010 budget resolution that reinvests in America and reinvests in hardworking middle-class families that make up the backbone of this country.

As we all know, the voters spoke this fall overwhelmingly, voting for change and a reorientation of our priorities so that, in fact, we are strengthening the middle class and making the critical investments needed to build a better tomorrow.

We began to bring that desired change with the economic recovery program, and we continue on that path by providing a blueprint in this budget that will bring tax relief to hardworking families across this Nation and make investments in health care, education, energy, and elsewhere that are needed to move this economy from recovery to long-term growth.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle will decry this budget claiming that it will burden future generations with crippling debt. But let's be clear. It was under their leadership that a \$5.6 trillion surplus turned into the historic budget deficit that President Obama and this Congress inherited, a deficit of well over \$1 trillion in 2009. If you listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they were missing in action over this last 8 years. It is hard to believe that they were in charge. It is a little bit like "see no evil, hear no evil, and speak no evil." They were gone from the playing field over these last 8 years.

We will also hear the other side rail against the instructions that are included in this resolution—to bring about what? Education and long-awaited health care reform, despite the fact that they used this same procedure to pass massive tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this Nation.

When it comes to health care reform, the American people have watched as Congress has failed since 1993 to make a serious attempt to fix our broken system. Health care reform, making health care coverage affordable, available to all, improving safety and quality, and providing Americans with a choice of health plans and physicians, including the choice of keeping their current health plan, is long, long overdue.

We will work to craft bipartisan legislation, but the American people are not interested in process. They are interested in results. We will not let a party of "no" stand in the way of a reformed health care system that the majority of Americans so desperately want.

Along with health care, this budget also invests in education by expanding access and increasing funds for early childhood education, creating a new tax credit to help cover college costs, and raising the Pell Grant award.

It invests in energy, builds a framework for developing and producing new energy and jobs, modernizing the electricity grid to make it more efficient, secure and reliable, increasing the efficiency of Federal buildings, and helping to make State and local governments more energy efficient.

This conference agreement invests in rebuilding America, including the establishment of a national infrastructure bank which would allow the government to objectively consider a wide range of infrastructure projects and leverage the private sector to fund those with the most significant economic, social and environmental benefits.

Finally, this budget plan reflects on the economic recovery program that we passed, including its provisions to provide tax relief to middle-income families. This includes room to expand the refundable child tax credit. By lowering the eligibility threshold to \$3,000 in the Recovery Act, we provided relief to the hardworking families of nearly 16 million children, including 5.5 million newly eligible children.

This budget builds on our efforts to create jobs and rebuild the economy through the economic recovery plan by providing a forward-looking economic blueprint that makes the strategic investments necessary to move from recovery to long-term economic growth while putting us back on a path to fiscal sustainability.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, to support the underlying resolution and do not let our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who had 8 years—and what did they do in those 8 years? They brought this Nation to its economic knees. It's time to look to the future. Support this resolution.

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

I say to my very good friend from Connecticut that it's fascinating that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to talk about nothing but the last 8 years. And I find it interesting because no one seems to be willing to talk about what it is that's before us: a budget that is dealing with the next 5 years. It's a \$17.8 trillion budget over the next 5 years. That's what we need to focus on. That's what this debate is all about.

With that, I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to our hardworking and very thoughtful chair of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Columbus, Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today in the midst of a debate and rise in opposition to the conference report on the Democratic budget.

I do so following after the quite typically forceful remarks of the gentlewoman from Connecticut, whom I respect as a colleague. She, as the gentleman from California just said, focused a

great deal on the last 8 years. As someone who in this body through the course of the last 8 years was, as my colleagues know, a harsh and public and consistent critic of runaway Federal spending under Republican control, allow me to stipulate that the gentlelady makes a point.

The truth is in the 8 years of the Bush administration's tenure, under Republican control 6 of those years, we did manage to double the national debt. And that was a disappointment to millions of Americans, me included. And I believe it was part and parcel why the American people in 2006 showed us the door because they know we can't borrow and spend our way to a healthy America. So I will stipulate to that point, Madam Speaker.

But it doesn't follow or stand to reason that coming to the floor as the gentlelady from Connecticut did and as others have today and complaining about overspending under Republican control of Congress, that the answer would be this budget which would—on top of what has already happened—double the national debt in 5 years and triple the national debt in 10.

□ 1730

It just simply doesn't make sense.

I would expect, Madam Speaker, that anyone that is looking in, that in the midst of these difficult times—a time when the American people are hurting, when every family and small business and family farmer across this country are sitting down around kitchen tables and metal desks and offices and figuring out how to make ends meet, they are making sacrifices, they are putting off until tomorrow what they don't have to spend today—here they see Democrat majorities in the House and the Senate bringing to the floor the most fiscally irresponsible budget in American history. And I say again, according to the numbers—and we can get lost in the numbers—outlays of \$3.5 trillion for fiscal year 2010, \$1.2 trillion in deficits in 2010. The deficits over this period never fall below \$500 billion. A number that was roundly criticized when the Bush administration and Republicans hit that number is now accepted to be the norm.

As I mentioned, public debt by the year 2014 will rise to more than two-thirds as a share of the economy. It is astonishing to point out that the European Union requires countries to keep their debt below 60 percent of their economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I yield my friend an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. If this administration and the Democrat majority have their way, the United States of America, by 2014, wouldn't even qualify under the criteria of the European Union—not that I would ever want to join. It just gives a perspective here, Madam Speaker, that what we have before us today is a budget that is out of step

with the American people. It is a budget that does not embrace the sacrifice and the resilience and the demonstrated virtue that millions of American families and millions of small businesses are practicing today.

The truth is, we can do better. The truth is, the American people know that this Congress has the capacity, even during these difficult times, to do the right thing, to take our jackets off, to roll our sleeves up, to do the hard work.

I look across the aisle and I see a gentleman with whom I serve that I personally and deeply respect. And I have to believe there are many colleagues on the other side of the aisle that also know this we ought not to do. After a so-called stimulus bill that spent \$1 trillion, an omnibus bill that increased spending by 8 percent for last year's business, and now the most fiscally irresponsible budget in American history, enough is enough.

The American people want this Congress to begin to practice fiscal discipline and reform. We ought to do so by rejecting this conference report, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

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

Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana, whom I respect, I agree with half of what he said. I agree that his party did mess up and leave us with a terrible economy at this particular juncture. But I think here's where we may disagree philosophically. The question is, how do you dig yourself out of this ditch? Is it more cuts? Is it throwing more people off the health care rolls? Is it creating more joblessness? Is it cutting back on educational programs? Is it cutting back on infrastructure programs? I mean, is that how we get out of this? Or, as I think we are suggesting, is it that maybe in the short term there needs to be some investment upfront to try to stimulate and resuscitate this economy, to create more jobs, to create more revenue, to try to get this economy back on the right track?

We are in deep trouble. We have inherited the worst economy since the Great Depression. Now, the gentleman and others have spoken as if we are not concerned about the deficit or the debt. First of all, we have joined with the gentleman from Indiana over the last 8 years complaining about the size of the debt. And we were told repeatedly by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle that the deficits don't matter, the debt doesn't matter; well, now all of a sudden it does.

The fact of the matter is, in the budget that we are proposing, we cut the deficit by nearly two-thirds in 4 years. That is our promise. That is our pledge in this budget.

I will briefly yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Mr. McGOVERN went through this litany of options and the

challenges that we have faced and things that should be done. He never mentioned that the solution that is being put before us is to dramatically increase the size and scope and reach of government, to impose taxes that will—as these independent economists about whom I referred earlier have said—will impose this tax burden on middle-income wage earners.

Mr. McGOVERN. I reclaim my time. First of all, there is not a single tax increase in the budget. The budget that we propose cuts taxes for middle-income families by more than \$1.7 trillion over 10 years. And again, our budget cuts the deficit by nearly two-thirds in 4 years.

I am proud to defend our budget. I have talked about how it is going to create jobs. I have talked about how it is going to cut taxes. I have talked about how it is cutting nondefense discretionary spending. I have talked about how it is going to invest in affordable health care and college affordability and clean energy. I am out here very proudly defending this budget that we have.

So all I am simply saying is that what the other side has proposed, quite frankly, in our opinion, is unacceptable. It will hurt more middle-income families. It will cause more people to fall into the ranks of poverty, more people without health care. It will cut back on education, on investments in our infrastructure. Those were the proposals that were presented. I think that is the wrong way to go.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI).

Mr. BOCCIERI. "Johnny, what have you done?" I remember my mom asking me that as a young boy, "What have you done?" Well, she asked me this weekend, "Johnny, what have you done to help middle class families? What are you doing in Congress to put the middle class first for a change?" And I said, Mom, some great things are happening in Washington, D.C. Can you imagine this? The Democratic Party is about to enact the largest tax reduction in our country's history for middle class families. Imagine that. Can you imagine that Democrats are going to cut the budget in half, by two-thirds by 2013? And can you believe that we are finally going to have an honest accounting for all the mess that we have inherited over the last decade, the mess that includes bailing out banks, bailing out Freddie and Fannie, and also dishonest war funding, money that should be included in the budget but yet we were not strong enough to put that in the President's budget? Can you believe that the Bush tax reduction was for the wealthiest Americans, and that our tax reduction is going to be for middle class families?

Madam Speaker, this House is in order. And we are investing in America. We are investing in our country and in our jobs. Do you remember in 2004, when President Bush's Secretary

of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, flew to Iraq with one of many billion dollar checks in hand to make sure that every man, woman, and child in Iraq had universal health care coverage? And all we hear now from our opponents on the other side is that Americans don't deserve health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BOCCIERI. But all we hear from those detractors is that Americans are not worthy of having health care that works for every family and for every child.

I say enough is enough. We need to invest in our country, in our people, in our future. And that is exactly what this budget does; it invests in education, in green energy jobs, and cuts the budget deficit.

Are we going to be leaders or are we going to be blockers? Are we going to say "yes," or are we going to say "no?" Are we going to invest in American families or Iraqis?

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this juncture I am happy to yield 3 minutes to our hardworking friend from Savannah, Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I must say that if I had just arrived here from out of town, I would think I was in a college literature class listening to Orwellian doublespeak at its best and examples thereof.

When they talk about investments, this new big government order, that really means tax increases and increases in spending. When they talk about bold, swift action, that means more "big government" power grabs. When they talk about probusiness regulation and modernization of energy, that is just more government dictating to the private sector. When they talk about rebuilding America and new modern job creation, those jobs are coming from the government. Those are government jobs. They talk about health care reform. That is just plain old socialized medicine.

And then they talk about cutting the deficit, but they don't tell you it is their own deficit. If the gentleman from Massachusetts can tell me what the deficit is today, as I sit here and listen, then all I have to do is divide that by half. But that is not true at all. What you are doing is increasing spending and then, based on some phony "we're going to grow the government next year by 4 percent, then we're going to cut the deficit," come on, guys, that doesn't sell and you know it.

And we hear over and over again this is George Bush, Dick Cheney, Halliburton, Blackwater, and everybody else's fault but the Democrat Party. But who has been in charge for 2 years? It was you guys, that under your watch, \$29 billion spent on AIG; \$200 billion last year on Fannie Mae and

Freddie Mac; \$168 billion for a stimulus bill last year, a year ago; \$85 billion going up to \$140 billion for AIG in September; \$700 billion in October for Wall Street; and then, just in January, \$790 billion for a stimulus bill followed by a \$410 billion omnibus bill which had over 9,000 earmarks—which the new President was going to cut every earmark out and not accept any.

At what point are Democrats going to go ahead and admit, you own the House, you own the Senate and the White House? This stuff all happened under your watch. Get over George Bush. You are now in charge.

And I want to say this, as an Appropriations Committee member during the period of time when George Bush was President and we were in the majority—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield my friend 1 additional minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. We never had one appropriation bill that spent enough money for you guys. And you know it. And the records show it in the appropriations debate over and over again; it didn't spend enough money.

So now we are hearing that your fiscal discipline—I just think it is laughable to think about this—your budget spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. We will be borrowing more money from the Chinese. Indeed, the new Secretary of State's first trip was over to China to say, please continue to lend us money. The deficits that go on will never fall below \$500 billion. But I understand you are going to jack up spending so you can say you have cut it in half, and that's the way you want to do business.

Tax increases; \$1.5 trillion in tax increases. And a lot of it will fall on the backs of farmers and small businesses, the very people you have the nerve to say that you are trying to help. And the total spending outlay of \$3.5 trillion in the year 2010.

This budget should be rejected. It spends too much, borrows too much, and taxes too much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, you have had your chance. We did it your way for 8 years, and we have the worst economy since the Great Depression. We have more people in poverty, we have the worst job creation since the Great Depression, we have more people who are hungry in America, we have more people without health insurance. I mean, give me a break.

The bottom line is we have tried it your way for 8 years, and you have failed. And the American people sent my friends a message loud and clear on Election Day that enough is enough.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. Who took over the Congress in 2006?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time. Yes, the Democrats did, but unfortunately with a President who vetoed every decent piece of legislation that we tried to pass, vetoing children's health care, and a whole bunch of other things that would have helped the economy.

Right now we have a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President, and we are going to pass a budget that reflects what the American people want, the values of the American people. We are going to get this economy back on the right track. Enough. Eight years of failed policies is enough. The same old, same old doesn't work anymore.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my friend from Savannah.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from California.

I was going to ask my friend from Massachusetts, is it not true that the President vetoed Democrat spending, and did come to compromise on things like children's health care, but the first go-round you guys spent too much money, and that is why he was vetoing it? I mean, I can see, blame it on the President and Republicans for 6 years, fair and square. But you guys have been in charge for 2 years now, and the only vetoing that he did was when you were spending too much money.

I just think it is time to go ahead and say, you know, we are in charge, we are going to take responsibility. And, if anything, we need to start talking checks and balances in this town because I don't think we have any with all this runaway spending.

Again, I think this budget spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. And I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4½ minutes. The gentleman from California has 3½ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. That is all I need to respond, just very briefly, to my good friend from Savannah/Brunswick when he asked and says that too much money was what the previous President vetoed.

□ 1745

I wonder how much, Madam Speaker, is too much money to care for sick children in America or to ensure that children do not get sick in America?

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute

to our colleague from Mesa, Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, a lot has been said about the last 8 years. And just to make it known, there were a lot of us who weren't happy with the level of spending that went on during that time. We were headed for a fiscal cliff. We knew that. A lot of us knew that, and a lot of us weren't shy in saying it. A lot of us voted against a lot of appropriations bills because they spent too much money.

But when you're headed toward a fiscal cliff, you don't step on the accelerator. And that's what this budget does. We all know or we should know, or we'll claim we knew it when it happens, that the next crisis will be when we try to auction off some Treasury bills that nobody buys. What do we do then? What do we do when nobody wants to lend us money? And we're going to get there, we know we are, because this budget puts us on the track to get there a lot sooner than we would have been otherwise.

That's why this budget needs to be rejected. It's simply too big. I think people know that. And as we go through the appropriations process, I think that will become even clearer.

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

Madam Speaker, this is an interesting debate that has preceded, and I have to say that I believe that there is great bipartisan concern about where this country is headed. Democrats and Republicans alike both want to get our economy back on track.

As I look at small businesses in Southern California, it's not a Democratic or Republican issue. Small businesses are closing down and people are suffering. As I look at homeowners who are losing their homes, it's not a Democratic or Republican issue. They very much want to be able to enjoy the American dream of owning their home. As I look at people who have lost their jobs, it's not a Democratic or Republican issue. So I believe that Democrats and Republicans alike want us to make sure we get this economy growing again. The question is how do we do it?

It's fascinating as I listen to my friends on the other side of the aisle decry deficit spending under President Bush and then argue that we should dramatically increase the size and scope and reach of government. And very sincerely that is what they've done. As I listened to my friend from Ft. Lauderdale, that is what he has just advocated. I congratulate him for being consistent in making that argument. But there are others who say that the policies of the past 8 years have created the problem that we have right now.

I also want to clarify the record on issues that were raised. I have argued that we could have done better during the time that we were in the majority.

But, Madam Speaker, I think it's important to note that with the exception of the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, and veterans, there were real dollar spending cuts that took place in appropriations bills over the last few years when we were in the majority. I think that the record needs to show that. We did work to try to reduce spending. We could have done better than we did. I will acknowledge that.

But, again, here we are looking at a proposal which dramatically increases the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government.

And I know that President Obama is popular. I like President Obama. I've been enjoying working with him on things in the past. But I'm very troubled in seeing the implementation of what he calls the "transformation," the "transformation of government." I don't believe that it's what the American people want. What they want to do is they want to see us implement policies that will create jobs, that will allow them to keep their homes, that will keep small businesses thriving. That's what they want to see happen. The best way to do that is to use the model that was put forth by John F. Kennedy when, in 1961, he said, you can't encourage economic growth by increasing public expenditures; you can only do it by increasing private investment.

Reject this rule and reject the underlying conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, President Kennedy also said if a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich. And that's been the problem over the last 8 years is that the emphasis has been on the rich. The tax cuts, the extravagant tax cuts, for the wealthiest individuals that have contributed to our deficit; spending on the war that they wouldn't even pay for that was covered up under emergency spending procedures so it would mask the size of our growing debt. Yes, they made cuts in programs that helped kids and veterans and our elderly and investments in job creation and things that would help stimulate this economy. I don't think that's a record to be proud of.

So we're turning the page. We're actually going to a new chapter here. We have a budget before us that I am proud to defend. This is a budget that creates jobs with targeted investments in affordable health care, clean energy, education. It cuts taxes for middle-income families by more than \$1.7 trillion over 10 years. It cuts the deficit by nearly two-thirds in 4 years, and it paves the way for an affordable health care plan.

Forty million of our fellow citizens are without health care. That's a national scandal. And you know what? That reality is one of the reasons why health care costs are soaring. We need to get that under control. We need to

deal with the issue of college affordability so we have the best trained, best educated workforce in the entire world. We need to invest in clean energy so we can actually make this transition to clean, renewable sources of energy so we're not dependent on foreign oil, we're not dependent on the same old, same old kind of energy that we have here, that we have relied on for so many years in this country.

So we can either do what my friends on the other side of the aisle have done for 8 years or we can go in a very different direction. And I urge my colleagues that it's time to move in a different direction.

Madam Speaker, I will be offering an amendment to the rule. The amendment provides for timeout authority in this rule which will allow the debate on this conference report to take place over 2 days, giving Members adequate time to read this important report before voting. I hope Members will vote "yes" on the amendment and on the previous question and on the rule.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. McGOVERN

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment to the rule at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Insert at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The Chair may postpone further consideration of the conference report to such time as may be designated by the Speaker."

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 371, if ordered; and motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1595, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 179, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—240

Abercrombie	Berkley	Braley (IA)
Ackerman	Berman	Bright
Adler (NJ)	Berry	Butterfield
Altmire	Bishop (GA)	Capps
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Capuano
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Cardoza
Baca	Boccheri	Carnahan
Baird	Boren	Carney
Baldwin	Boswell	Carson (IN)
Barrow	Boucher	Castor (FL)
Bean	Boyd	Chandler
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Childers

Clarke

Cleaver

Clyburn

Cohen

Connolly (VA)

Conyers

Cooper

Costa

Costello

Courtney

Crowley

Cuellar

Cummings

Dahlkemper

Davis (AL)

Davis (CA)

Davis (IL)

Davis (TN)

DeFazio

DeGette

Delahunt

DeLauro

Dicks

Dingell

Doggett

Donnelly (IN)

Doyle

DrieHaus

Edwards (MD)

Ellison

Ellsworth

Engel

Eshoo

Etheridge

Farr

Fattah

Flner

Foster

Frank (MA)

Fudge

Giffords

Gonzalez

Gordon (TN)

Grayson

Green, Al

Green, Gene

Griffith

Grijalva

Gutierrez

Hall (NY)

Halvorson

Hare

Harman

Hastings (FL)

Heinrich

Herseth Sandlin

Higgins

Hill

Himes

HincheY

Hinojosa

Hirono

Hodes

Holden

Holt

Honda

Hoyer

Inslee

Israel

Jackson-Lee (TX)

Johnson (GA)

Johnson, E. B.

Kagen

Kanjorski

Kaptur

Kennedy

Kildee

Kilpatrick (MI)

Kilroy

Kind

Kirkpatrick (AZ)

Kissell

Klein (FL)

Kosmas

Kucinich

Langevin

Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)

Lee (CA)

Levin

Lewis (GA)

Lipinski

LoebSack

Lofgren, Zoe

Lowey

Lujan

Lynch

Maffei

Maloney

Markey (CO)

Markey (MA)

Matheson

Matsui

McCarthy (NY)

McCollum

McDermott

McGovern

McIntyre

McMahon

McNerney

Meek (FL)

Melancon

Miller (NC)

Miller, George

Mitchell

Mollohan

Moore (KS)

Moore (WI)

Moran (VA)

Murphy (CT)

Murphy, Patrick

Murtha

Nadler (NY)

Napolitano

Neal (MA)

Oberstar

Obey

Olver

Ortiz

Pallone

Pascrell

Pastor (AZ)

Payne

Perlmutter

Perriello

Peters

Peterson

Pingree (ME)

Polis (CO)

Pomeroy

Price (NC)

Quigley

Rahall

Rangel

Reyes

Richardson

Rodriguez

Ross

Pingree (ME)

Polis (CO)

Pomeroy

Price (NC)

Quigley

Rahall

Rangel

Reyes

Richardson

Rodriguez

Ross

Rothman (NJ)

Roybal-Allard

Ruppersberger

Rush

Ryan (OH)

Salazar

Sánchez, Linda T.

Sanchez, Loretta

Sarbanes

Schakowsky

Schauer

Schiff

Schrader

Schwartz

Scott (GA)

Serrano

Sestak

Shea-Porter

Sherman

Shuler

Sires

Skelton

Slaughter

Smith (WA)

Snyder

Space

Speier

Spratt

Stupak

Sutton

Tanner

Tauscher

Teague

Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)

Tierney

Titus

Tonko

Towns

Tsongas

Van Hollen

Velázquez

Visclosky

Walz

Wasserman

Schultz

Waters

Watson

Waxman

Weiner

Welch

Wexler

Wilson (OH)

Woolsey

Yarmuth

</

Miller, Gary	Roe (TN)	Smith (TX)
Minnick	Rogers (AL)	Souder
Moran (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Stearns
Murphy, Tim	Rogers (MI)	Sullivan
Myrick	Rohrabacher	Taylor
Neugebauer	Rooney	Terry
Nunes	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Nye	Roskam	Thornberry
Olson	Royce	Tiahrt
Paul	Ryan (WI)	Tiberi
Paulsen	Scalise	Turner
Pence	Schmidt	Upton
Petri	Schock	Walden
Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Platts	Sessions	Westmoreland
Poe (TX)	Shadegg	Whitfield
Posey	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Price (GA)	Shuler	Wittman
Putnam	Shuster	Wolf
Radanovich	Simpson	Young (AK)
Rehberg	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)
Reichert	Smith (NJ)	

NOT VOTING—13

Brown, Corrine	Jackson (IL)	Stark
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Watt
Clay	Massa	Wu
Edwards (TX)	McKeon	
Granger	Melancon	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1828

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIAN K. SCHRAMM POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1595.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1595.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

AYES—420

Abercrombie	Barrow	Blunt
Ackerman	Bartlett	Bocchieri
Aderholt	Barton (TX)	Boehner
Adler (NJ)	Bean	Bonner
Akin	Becerra	Bono Mack
Alexander	Berkley	Boozman
Altmire	Berman	Boren
Andrews	Berry	Boswell
Arcuri	Biggart	Boucher
Austria	Bilbray	Boustany
Baca	Bilirakis	Boyd
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Bachus	Bishop (NY)	Brady (TX)
Baird	Bishop (UT)	Braley (IA)
Baldwin	Blackburn	Bright
Barrett (SC)	Blumenauer	Brown (GA)

Brown (SC)	Grayson	McCarthy (CA)	Sarbanes	Smith (TX)	Turner
Brown-Waite,	Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	Scalise	Smith (WA)	Upton
Ginny	Green, Gene	McCaul	Schakowsky	Snyder	Van Hollen
Buchanan	Griffith	McClintock	Schauer	Souder	Velázquez
Burton (IN)	Grijalva	McCollum	Schiff	Space	Visclosky
Butterfield	Guthrie	McCotter	Schmidt	Speier	Walden
Buyer	Gutiérrez	McDermott	Schock	Spratt	Walz
Calvert	Hall (NY)	McGovern	Schrader	Stearns	Wamp
Camp	Hall (TX)	McHenry	Schwartz	Stupak	Wasserman
Campbell	Halvorson	McHugh	Scott (GA)	Sullivan	Schultz
Cantor	Hare	McIntyre	Scott (VA)	Sutton	Waters
Cao	Harman	McMahon	Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Watson
Capito	Harper	McMorris	Serrano	Tauscher	Watt
Capps	Hastings (FL)	Rodgers	Sessions	Taylor	Waxman
Capuano	Hastings (WA)	McNerney	Sestak	Teague	Weiner
Cardoza	Heller	Meek (FL)	Shadegg	Terry	Welch
Carnahan	Heller	Meeks (NY)	Shea-Porter	Thompson (CA)	Westmoreland
Carney	Hensarling	Melancon	Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Carson (IN)	Herger	Mica	Shimkus	Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Carter	Hereth Sandlin	Michaud	Shuler	Thornberry	Wilson (OH)
Cassidy	Higgins	Miller (FL)	Shuster	Tiahrt	Wilson (SC)
Castle	Hill	Miller (MI)	Simpson	Tiberi	Wittman
Castor (FL)	Himes	Miller (NC)	Sires	Tierney	Wolf
Chaffetz	Hinchee	Miller, Gary	Skelton	Titus	Woolsey
Chandler	Hinojosa	Miller, George	Slaughter	Tonko	Yarmuth
Childers	Hirono	Minnick	Smith (NE)	Towns	Young (AK)
Clarke	Hodes	Mitchell	Smith (NJ)	Tsongas	Young (FL)
Cleaver	Hoekstra	Mollohan			
Clyburn	Holden	Moore (KS)			
Coble	Holt	Moore (WI)			
Coffman (CO)	Honda	Moran (KS)			
Cohen	Hoyer	Moran (VA)			
Cole	Hunter	Murphy (CT)			
Conaway	Inglis	Murphy, Patrick			
Connolly (VA)	Inslee	Murphy, Tim			
Conyers	Israel	Murtha			
Cooper	Issa	Myrick			
Costa	Jackson-Lee	Nadler (NY)			
Costello	(TX)	Napolitano			
Courtney	Jenkins	Neal (MA)			
Crenshaw	Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer			
Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Nunes			
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Nye			
Culberson	Jones	Oberstar			
Cummings	Jordan (OH)	Obey			
Dahlkemper	Kagen	Olson			
Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Oliver			
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Ortiz			
Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Pallone			
Davis (KY)	Kildee	Pascarell			
Davis (TN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pastor (AZ)			
Deal (GA)	Kilroy	Paul			
DeFazio	Kind	Paulsen			
DeGette	King (IA)	Payne			
Delahunt	King (NY)	Pence			
DeLauro	Kingston	Perlmutter			
Dent	Kirk	Perriello			
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peters			
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kissell	Peterson			
Dicks	Klein (FL)	Petri			
Dingell	Kline (MN)	Pingree (ME)			
Doggett	Kosmas	Pitts			
Donnelly (IN)	Kratovil	Platts			
Doyle	Kucinich	Poe (TX)			
Dreier	Lamborn	Polis (CO)			
Driehaus	Lance	Pomeroy			
Duncan	Langevin	Posey			
Edwards (MD)	Larsen (WA)	Price (GA)			
Ehlers	Larson (CT)	Price (NC)			
Ellison	Latham	Putnam			
Ellsworth	LaTourette	Quigley			
Emerson	Latta	Radanovich			
Engel	Lee (CA)	Rahall			
Eshoo	Lee (NY)	Rangel			
Etheridge	Levin	Rehberg			
Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Reichert			
Farr	Lewis (GA)	Reyes			
Fattah	Linder	Richardson			
Filner	Lipinski	Rodriguez			
Flake	LoBiondo	Roe (TN)			
Fleming	Loeb sack	Rogers (AL)			
Forbes	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (KY)			
Fortenberry	Lowe	Rogers (MI)			
Foster	Lucas	Rohrabacher			
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Rooney			
Frank (MA)	Luján	Ros-Lehtinen			
Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Roskam			
Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel	Ross			
Fudge	E.	Rothman (NJ)			
Galleghy	Lynch	Roybal-Allard			
Garrett (NJ)	Mack	Royce			
Gerlach	Maffei	Ruppersberger			
Giffords	Maloney	Rush			
Gingrey (GA)	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)			
Gohmert	Markey (CO)	Ryan (WI)			
Gonzalez	Markey (MA)	Salazar			
Goodlatte	Marshall	Sánchez, Linda			
Gordon (TN)	Matheson	T.			
Graves	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta			

Smith (TX)	Turner
Smith (WA)	Upton
Snyder	Van Hollen
Souder	Velázquez
Space	Visclosky
Speier	Walden
Spratt	Walz
Stearns	Wamp
Stupak	Wasserman
Sullivan	Schultz
Sutton	Waters
Tanner	Watson
Tauscher	Watt
Taylor	Waxman
Teague	Weiner
Terry	Welch
Thompson (CA)	Westmoreland
Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Thornberry	Wilson (OH)
Tiahrt	Wilson (SC)
Tiberi	Wittman
Tierney	Wolf
Titus	Woolsey
Tonko	Yarmuth
Towns	Young (AK)
Tsongas	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Brown, Corrine	Granger	Massa
Burgess	Jackson (IL)	McKeon
Clay	Johnson, Sam	Stark
Edwards (TX)	Marchant	Wu

□ 1835

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, on yesterday, Monday, April 27, 2009, I was unavoidably detained by airline flight problems and missed the following votes:

Rollcall vote 207, H. Res. 329, recognizing the anniversary of the tragic accident of the steamboat ship SS Sultana, I would have voted “aye”;

Rollcall vote 208, H.R. 1746, Pre-Disaster Mitigation Act of 2009, I would have voted “aye”;

Rollcall vote 209, H. Res. 335, supporting the goals and ideals of National Volunteer Week, I would have voted “aye.”

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 13, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the conference report to accompany the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 27, 2009, at page H4774.)