United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 2009 No. 56

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

Rev. Bruce Frank, Biltmore Baptist Church, Arden, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Dear Heavenly Father, we call on You today as the sovereign, almighty, Holy God who can heal our land.

You have said that if wisdom is lacking, ask and You will give it. And so we're asking for wisdom this day. I pray for these congressional leaders. Pray You would fill them with wisdom on what to do. Pray You would give them the courage to do just that.

Pray You surround them with people who will speak truth into their ears and who will place principle above temporary favor. You have said, ''Blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord.''

Pray You give us a recognition of our inadequacy for the task at hand and a dependence to carry out that task, for You have said, God resists the proud, but You give grace to the humble, and we're asking for grace today.

You are a God who abhors dishonest scales. Grant a determination to do the people's business with the utmost of integrity and remind us daily of our accountability to You for the service that we give.

May the words that are written behind me ''In God We Trust'' be true this day, in the name of my God and my Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, I pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND BRUCE FRANK

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER) for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHULER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and brother in Christ, Pastor Bruce Frank, for opening the House of Representatives in prayer today.

Bruce Frank is the senior pastor at my church, Biltmore Baptist Church in Arden, North Carolina, where he provides spiritual guidance and inspiration for over 6,000 members.

Pastor Frank was born in Atlanta, Georgia, and grew up in Oklahoma and Texas. He and his wife, Lori, have two sons, Tyler and Conner. Before being called to our church, he served as pastor at Baptist churches both in Houston and Humble, Texas.

Pastor Frank has brought a renewed sense of spirit and purpose to my church and its congregants since he joined us in 2008. I am grateful that he was able to grace us with the same spirit and purpose as he led us in prayer this morning.

Pastor Frank, we love you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 10 additional 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY STUDIES ABROAD CONSORTIUM

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University Studies Abroad Consortium. USAC developed out of an informal exchange of students and professors between the Basque Studies Program at the University of Nevada, Reno, and the University of the Basque Country in San Sebastian, Spain. Under the excellent leadership of Dr. Carmelo Urza, USAC has evolved into one of the largest and most successful study abroad programs in the United States today. Currently, there are 33 U.S. member universities offering programs in 25 countries at 39 sites, with an annual enrollment of about 2,500 students.

USAC is presently holding its annual meeting at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. This brings together staff from the U.S. member universities and the resident directors of all USAC sites around the globe.

I salute them for their hard work and dedication, because we know that studying abroad provides students with a unique opportunity to develop the knowledge, skills, experience, and attitudes to succeed in the global society of the 21st century.

I offer this in memory of a key member of the USAC team and a dear personal friend, Dr. Felix Menchacatorre, who passed away last August.

Estas en el corazon—you are in our heart—Felix.

BUDGET DEBATE DEFINES CLEAR DIFFERENCES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the debate unfolding

Printed on recycled paper.

over the budget is really one that has always been a part of our Nation's dialogue. Do we want a big government and high taxes, which infringe on our individual freedom, or do we want a limited government that lets the American people keep more of the money that they earn, which expands freedom?

Democrats have a budget that says loud and clear: big government spending is going to be alive and well-fed by massive borrowing and increasing taxes by $1.2 trillion. They will raise taxes not to pay off debt but, rather, to simply spend more money, mortgaging the future of our students, such as those at Timmerman School of Columbia.

Republicans have offered a budget that does the opposite. We want to cut spending, reduce debt, address short-term and long-term challenges, and provide more relief for American families and small businesses. Our budget is a clear sign of the confidence we have in the American people, not big government, to create jobs and put our fiscal house in order.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th and the global war on terrorism.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, after doubling the national debt under the failed leadership of George Bush, the Republicans unveiled their budget alternative yesterday, very appropriately on April 1, April Fool's Day.

Now, there's a pretense that they're going to restore fiscal stability through budget gimmicks, the spending freeze, no matter how great the need, bridges falling down, veterans need services, to educate our kids, budget's frozen. Well, it's frozen, sort of. There is another part that's not. After the smoke and mirrors are put up, their real agenda comes through, which is more tax cuts for the wealthy.

Here's the amazing thing. They're going to eliminate all taxes on capital gains so people who invest for a living don't have to pay taxes. We have had that argument before. But think of it, it's so beautiful. The hedge fund managers, who averaged $260 million each a year last year creating toxic assets that are destroying our economy, claim that their income is carried interest, which is capital gains.

So the hedge fund managers who put our economy in the tank will contribute zero, zero dollars, under the Republican budget alternative to helping repair the damage in America.

Good work, guys. April fools.

BUDGET

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, unlike what the gentleman just said, this President's budget spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. This is the most fiscally irresponsible budget in the history of the United States.

The spending levels in the budget are just staggering. Under the President's budget, the government's spending will represent roughly 30 percent of our economy. That's not the American way.

The right way forward is the PAUL RYAN alternative budget which trims wasteful government spending and lets families and small businesses keep more of their hard-earned money.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the conservative budget proposal that rekindles prosperity, promotes financial security, invests in our future, and saves for our children's future.

Let's go, America. It's the right way to go forward.

□ 0915

A REPEATED FALSEHOOD

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We're going to hear more of our friends from the other side of the aisle talk about their budget proposal today. It's ironic that they're proposing things that they couldn't, wouldn't enact when they ran everything.

But one of the things I find most distressing is their repeated falsehood about some $3,100 increase in taxes on the American people based on research done by MIT. They talked about it four times again last night.

Talking to Professor John Reilly, who actually did the 2007 study, indicates that they are using an intentional misrepresentation of the study. In fact, when somebody from the Republicans ''called me on March 20 and asked about it, I explained why the estimate was incorrect and what they could do to correct it.''

The actual number is one-fortieth of what the Republicans are talking about. And the fact is that in the budget we have an opportunity for people who want to be legislators—not communicators—to help us allocate how those benefits will be utilized.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traverse the well while other Members are speaking.

CIGARETTE TAX

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, all in one week we've had April Fool's Day, the Democrats' budget, and the largest increase in cigarette taxes ever. But the American people aren't foolish and they aren't in the mood for gimmicks.

Yesterday, the Federal tax on a pack of cigarettes went up—way up. Was this tax raised to get people to stop smoking? Or was it raised to pay for a massive expansion in SCHIP? Well, both, actually. And that's a crazy way to run a railroad.

SCHIP needs more money under the Democrats' plan. So we're going to need more people to start smoking, not fewer. In fact, we're going to need about 22 million new people to start smoking.

But this tax increase is going to convince people to stop smoking, which means the SCHIP will be short of funds and the folks in charge in Congress are going to want to raise taxes again soon.

I'm all for health care for kids, and I'm all for getting people to quit smoking, but I'm against health care run by bureaucrats and health care programs funded by cigarette taxes.

The American people must wonder what Democrat leaders are smoking in Washington these days. And that is no laughing matter.

BUDGET FACT CHECK: NO COMPARISON

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, the Republicans, the ''Party of No,'' are now the ''Party of No New Ideas.'' The budget plan they released last week is a rerun of the same failed policies that got our country into this deep financial and economic crisis, including massive tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, huge subsidies to big oil and gas companies, and no plan to bring down the cost of health care. And their approach to the financial market is to ask for more deregulation. The plan will result in deep cuts to vital services like education and public safety.

It's basically the same old thing—the Republican ''Party of No.'' I ask my colleagues, vote for the Democratic budget and vote against the Republican alternative.

CHIEF STEVE WHEELER—TEXAS FIREMAN

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the small town of Cleveland, Texas, lost one of their finest citizens this week when Fire Chief Steve Wheeler was killed. Steve was more than a Fire Chief. He was a fireman's firefighter—dedicated to the people of his town.

Steve decided at 13 he wanted to be a fireman. He worked at the local barbershop and watched the firefighters next door at the station jump on fire trucks—and he got the urge to do the same.

After high school, he drove an ambulance and joined the volunteer fire department. He has held just about every position there ever since—most recently, head of the Cleveland Emergency Management Department. That's

the folks that take over during hurricane disasters.

Steve will be remembered most for the 30 years as Chief of the Cleveland Volunteer Fire Department, for that firefighter spirit that he had, and that unwavering devotion to his firemen.

Today, Chief Steve Wheeler answered his last call. Flags will be lowered; the final radio call will be made; and the final fire bell will be rung.

Our prayers go out to the Wheeler family, the Cleveland Fire Department, and the good people of that entire community.

Steve Wheeler—fireman, father, fine Texan.

And that's just the way it is.

RECKLESS SPENDING

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, the House will vote today on a Federal budget that borrows, taxes, and spends more than any other budget in history. Tax increases and deficit spending on big government programs won't help the economy. It will discourage job creation and burden families in the future for additional generations.

We can't spend our way back in terms of the recession and we can't borrow our way out of debt. The budget before us today would increase spending by $1.9 trillion over the next 10 years, raise taxes by $1.4 trillion, and add $3.3 trillion in new debt.

This is reckless spending masquerading as sound budgeting. What our country needs is a responsible budget that scales back spending and borrowing; a budget that will strengthen our economy and put Americans back to work; a budget that will leave our children and grandchildren with better opportunities than we had.

WE MUST WORK TOGETHER TO FIND SOLUTIONS

(Mr. REICHERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. REICHERT. Let's just talk about common sense. Budgets are about priorities. They're not just blueprints, but plans on how to achieve goals. Just as families sit down at the kitchen table to map out how to make ends meet to save for college education or their retirement, so too must the government put forward a responsible budget.

This budget identifies important priorities—economic recovery, health care, and energy independence—but I'm concerned. This budget spends too much, borrows too much, and taxes too much.

We must offer tax incentives to invest and create jobs, not raise taxes on job creators and small businesses. We must reduce wasteful spending, not increase the debt by $9 trillion.

We must work together to find solutions to the challenges before us, not halt progress with ''politics as usual.''

Despite calls to work together, this budget could permit a government-run health plan to be rammed through Congress without real consideration to protect seniors or the patient-doctor relationship. It's not about big government. It's about families, it's about small businesses, about entrepreneurism.

Let's oppose this budget and advance one that reflects the values found at kitchen tables across our country.

OPPOSITION TO THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

(Mr. MCCAUL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the budget resolution that the majority is forcing on this House and the American people. This budget is an irresponsible and unwise increase in Federal taxes with borrowing and spending that will double the national debt and place a $50,000 burden on each American.

The budget proposes to spend nearly $4 trillion over the next year that America simply doesn't have. It also lays the groundwork for radical changes that will further prolong this recession by increasing government control of health care and increasing taxes on small businesses and anyone who uses electricity or gasoline.

This budget maxes out America's credit card and buries future generations in a mountain of debt. This budget and its massive increase in borrowing and spending will lead to higher taxes and return us to big government.

Simply put, Republicans want more freedom for Americans. Democrats want more government control over our lives.

FREEDOM AND THE BUDGET

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, if one looks to the exceptionalism of America, one finds that at its base is freedom. We've always had an agenda for freedom—freedom with responsibility.

Today, we have a budget that's made up of numbers. People wonder how does that somehow have anything to do with freedom. Well, if you spend too much, if you tax too much, if you borrow too much, what it means is you give greater and greater power to the Federal Government, to elected representatives, to nonelected bureaucrats to make decisions for you and your life, not only today, but in the future.

For the young people that are listening, they ought to understand that the impact of this budget today will be far greater on them than it will be on me. Why? Because we are about to embark on a budget that will give us more debt than at any time in the history of America. And we and those of us who are here will not live long enough to pay it off.

The young people are the ones that are going to pay for it. They are in fact going to have less freedom rather than more freedom unless we come to our senses and vote for a budget that is consistent with the American agenda of freedom.

HONORING SECRETARY MIKE DIBERARDINIS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I come to the floor today to honor a man that exemplifies public service—a man that hails from the big city of Philadelphia, but who has had a profound impact on my rural district.

Secretary Mike DiBerardinis has served the Rendell administration and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with distinction for the past 6 years as the head of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, or DCNR.

While I have only had limited interaction with the Secretary personally, his work for the Pennsylvania Wilds Initiative—a nature tourism program that encompasses my district—speaks volumes about his character and his dedication to rural Pennsylvania.

Under the Secretary's leadership, DCNR has taken the PA Wilds from a concept to a budding program, highlighting the beautiful landscape and the many attractions of central and northwestern Pennsylvania. From hiking, to biking, to backpacking, and skiing, Pennsylvania Wilds has it all.

In fact, this past summer, the Secretary was in my hometown breaking ground on the State's first Nature Inn, in Bald Eagle State Park—adding yet another component to an already robust State park system.

So while tomorrow is the Secretary's last day at the helm, I want to say thank you. Thank you for your service to rural Pennsylvania. Your leadership and vision has made a lasting impression.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 85, 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 316 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 316

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for

further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 85) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 and 2011 through 2014. The concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. After adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 85 and receipt of a message from the Senate transmitting Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 and to consider the Senate concurrent resolution in the House. All points of order against consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the resolving clause of the Senate concurrent resolution and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 85 as adopted by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived. The Senate concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption. If the motion is adopted and the Senate concurrent resolution, as amended, is adopted, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate concurrent resolution and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 legislation days within which to revise and extend their remarks and 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.

□ 0930

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the resolution provides for further consideration of the budget under a structured rule. It makes in order four substitute amendments.

First, let me once again thank Chairman SPRATT and Ranking Member RYAN for all of their incredibly hard work. They obviously have very significant differences in philosophy, but they strive to make the Budget Committee a very fair and thoughtful place.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today will allow Members of this House to make a very clear choice: Do you believe we should pass a budget that invests in the American people? Or, do you believe we should pass a budget that makes the same old mistakes of the past?

My friend from California (Mr. DREIER) and I had a very good debate on the floor and in the Rules Committee yesterday, and I know that many of our colleagues will voice their opinions today during the debate. But I would like to take a bit of time to talk about the choice that Members will make today.

In addition to the Democratic and Republican budgets, this rule makes in order proposals from the Progressive Caucus, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Republican Study Group. So a wide range of options will be presented today.

I will vote proudly for the Democratic budget. Our budget reduces the deficit, it cuts taxes for middle-class families, and it makes critical investments in health care, education, and clean energy.

We will hear a lot today about the deficit, so let's remember one thing: The Obama administration inherited an economy in a deep recession, with a projected annual deficit of over $1 trillion. This deficit didn't simply appear out of thin air. It was the direct result of the policies of the Bush administration, along with their Republican allies in Congress, who inherited a large surplus and then proceeded to squander it.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle will say, ''Don't talk about the administration, they are gone,'' as though 3 months ago is somehow ancient history. But we must talk about how we got into this mess. Those who ignore bad mistakes of the past are doomed to repeat it.

We believe that the best way, indeed, the only way to effectively reduce the deficit is to grow the economy, to create good-paying jobs for middle-class Americans, to improve the health and education of the American people, to invest in the cutting-edge green energy economy of the future.

By contrast, the Republican budget proposes slashes in health care and in nutrition for the most vulnerable Americans. It ignores the educational needs of our people. And it relies on the same dirty fossil fuels that threaten our environment and increase our dependence on foreign oil.

Now, I would like to talk for a moment about a specific difference between the two budgets on hunger and nutrition. Mr. DREIER got very upset with me yesterday, I believe he used the word ''shrill,'' when I suggested that the Republican budget would cut food stamps and other nutrition programs. He argued that of course Republicans care about hunger, and that to argue otherwise would be class warfare.

Well, what do you know, when you actually look at the Republican budget they do in fact cut food stamps. They rescind the food stamp increases included in the stimulus bill; in other words, cutting the program below current law by more than $20 billion over 2 years. And if that weren't bad enough, the Republican budget instructs the Agriculture Committee to cut an additional $38 billion over 10 years.

Now, where would that $38 billion come from? It can only come from a couple places, agricultural subsidies or nutrition programs, because that is what the Agriculture Committee does. And Mr. RYAN said in the Rules Committee yesterday that they weren't proposing to reopen the farm bill.

So that means it won't come from the agricultural subsidies; that means that the additional $38 billion would most likely come from reducing nutrition programs for the most vulnerable Americans.

Now, here is what that means to the people at home. Because of the recovery package that we passed a few weeks ago, a family in Massachusetts will see an increase in their food stamp benefits by around $39 a month. But the Republican budget eliminates that increase, literally taking food out of the mouths of Americans already struggling to make ends meet.

This increase averages out to a little more than $1 a day. Now, many of my colleagues spend three or four times that amount on a latte. Maybe $39 a month isn't a big deal to those in this Chamber, but it is a lot of money for people who have been adversely impacted by this lousy economy.

I believe it is wrong to cut food and nutrition programs for vulnerable people in order to pay for capital gains tax cuts for Wall Street traders.

Madam Speaker, we all talk about how bad things are on Main Street, and our budget should be designed to help the people who live on Main Street and on the side streets as well, whether that is in California or Massachusetts or somewhere in between. But let me tell you how bad things are out there, and let me tell you why the Republican budget will make things worse.

School districts across this country are facing budget shortfalls. Families are having hard times making ends meet. Unfortunately, some families don't even have enough money to pay for the school meals, and the schools are taking drastic measures in response, according to a February 25 Associated Press article.

According to the article, many schools are literally taking kids out of the lunch line because their parents can't afford to pay the cost of a reduced lunch and they are giving them a cheese sandwich, or, in some cases, giving them nothing simply because their parents can't afford to pay for the reduced-price school lunch.

According to this article, the School Nutrition Association recently found that half of the school districts from 38 States surveyed have seen an increase in the number of students charging meals, while 79 percent saw an increase in the number of free lunches served over the last year. This means that more families are relying on the Federally funded school lunch program to help feed their kids; yet, the Republican budget would basically cut school lunch funding from the budget, once again making it harder for our children to get the proper food and nutrition they need.

Now, my good friend from the other side of the aisle will probably say that this is class warfare, that the Democrats are demagoguing this issue. Well, let me tell my good friend from California that the Republican budget requires the Education and Labor Committee to cut almost $23 billion from programs in their jurisdiction. One of the biggest programs, if not the biggest program, is the school lunch program. And if the Republican Party isn't cutting school lunch, then I would like to hear where they are going to make these cuts. Student loans, special education, funding for basic education needs?

Let me be clear: A vote for the Republican budget is a vote to cut programs that are essential and that are helping Americans get through these tough times today, and it is a vote to ensure that people will not be able to improve their lives.

Madam Speaker, those of us in this Chamber earn a good salary. No matter what happens, we will all be fine; but there are a lot of people whom we represent who won't be, unless we provide some help. These are difficult times, and we need to rise to the occasion.

So again, Madam Speaker, Members will have the opportunity to make some very clear choices today. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Democratic budget, to believe in the potential of the American people, to restore the American dream, and to leave a better America for future generations.

NO FREE LUNCH: SCHOOLS GET TOUGH ON DEADBEATS

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M.—A cold cheese sandwich, fruit and a milk carton might not seem like much of a meal—but that's what's on the menu for students in New Mexico's largest school district without their lunch money.

Faced with mounting unpaid lunch charges in the economic downturn, Albuquerque Public Schools last month instituted a ''cheese sandwich policy,'' serving the alternative meals to children whose parents fail to pick up their lunch tab.

Such policies have become a necessity for schools seeking to keep budgets in the black while ensuring children don't go hungry. School districts including those in Chula Vista, Calif., Hillsborough County, Fla., and Lynnwood, Wash., have also taken to serving cheese sandwiches to lunch debtors.

Critics argue the cold meals are a form of punishment for children whose parents can't afford to pay.

''We've heard stories from moms coming in saying their child was pulled out of the lunch line and given a cheese sandwich,'' said Nancy Pope, director of the New Mexico Collaborative to End Hunger. ''One woman said her daughter never wants to go back to school.''

MIXED REVIEWS

Some Albuquerque parents have tearfully pleaded with school board members to stop singling out their children because they're poor, while others have flooded talk radio shows thanking the district for imposing a policy that commands parental responsibility.

Second-grader Danessa Vigil said she will never eat sliced cheese again. She had to eat cheese sandwiches because her mother couldn't afford to give her lunch money while her application for free lunch was being processed.

''Every time I eat it, it makes me feel like I want to throw up,'' the 7-year-old said.

Her mother, Darlene Vigil, said there are days she can't spare lunch money for her two daughters.

''Some parents don't have even $1 sometimes,'' the 27-year-old single mother said. ''If they do, it's for something else, like milk at home. There are some families that just don't have it and that's the reason they're not paying.''

The School Nutrition Association recently surveyed nutrition directors from 38 states and found more than half of school districts have seen an increase in the number of students charging meals, while 79 percent saw an increase in the number of free lunches served over the last year.

''FAMILIES STRUGGLING''

In New Mexico, nearly 204,000 low-income students—about three-fifths of public school students—received free or reduced-price lunches at the beginning of the school year, according to the state Public Education Department.

''What you are seeing is families struggling and having a really hard time, and school districts are struggling as well,'' said Crystal FitzSimons of the national Food Research and Action Center.

In Albuquerque, unpaid lunch charges hovered around $55,000 in 2006. That jumped to $130,000 at the end of the 2007–08 school year. It was $140,000 through the first five months of this school year.

Charges were on pace to reach $300,000 by the end of the year. Mary Swift, director of Albuquerque's food and nutrition services, said her department had no way to absorb that debt as it had in the past.

''We can't use any federal lunch program money to pay what they call bad debt. It has to come out of the general budget and of course that takes it from some other department,'' Swift said.

''DIGNITY AND RESPECT''

With the new policy, the school district has collected just over $50,000 from parents since the beginning of the year. It also identified 2,000 students eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches, and more children in the lunch program means more federal dollars for the district.

School officials said the policy was under consideration for some time and parents were notified last fall. Families with unpaid charges are reminded with an automated phone call each night and notes are sent home with children once a week.

Swift added that the cheese sandwiches—about 80 of the 46,000 meals the district serves daily—can be considered a ''courtesy meal,'' rather than an alternate meal.

Some districts, she noted, don't allow children without money to eat anything.

Albuquerque Public Schools ''has historically gone above and beyond as far as treating children with dignity and respect and trying to do what's best with for the child and I think this is just another example,'' Swift said.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to my very good friend and debating partner, as he has just outlined from Worcester, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. And I want to begin by saying that it was very obvious from the moment that he stood up, Madam Speaker, that we have been debating over the last couple of days, and I wish him well in his recovery as he seeks to get his voice back as our debate proceeds.

I also want to say that as I listened to his account of his concern, that we all share, for those who are on food stamps, for those who are suffering during these difficult economic times. I want to congratulate him for his lifelong commitment to dealing with those who are suffering, and to say that I stand here with him committed to doing everything that we possibly can to ensure that those who truly are in need, those who are on food stamps, do not see the rug pulled out from under them. That is a commitment that we are proud to make, standing with him on that. And I will say that I don't believe for 1 minute that our budget would in any way undermine those who are facing the serious economic challenges that we have.

But I have to say, Madam Speaker, it is interesting to note that the budget that was sent here to this Congress was, interestingly enough, entitled, ''The New Era of Responsibility,'' proving once again that, in Washington, spin seems to trump reality every single time.

Slapping the moniker of ''responsibility'' on a disastrous budget is far easier than actually crafting a responsible budget. But now is not the time to be taking the easy way out and abandoning our duties to wisely and effectively spend the taxpayers' money.

We, as we all know, are facing the gravest economic crisis that we have faced in nearly three decades. If there was ever a time for true leadership, it is now. And, regrettably, my colleague's side of the aisle has chosen this very critical moment to shirk the responsibility for the great task that is before us.

The Democratic budget imposes new taxes, new taxes on small businesses,

increasing that burden on job creators. So that will mean more lost jobs, fewer capital investments, and greater strain on our credit markets.

It also increases taxes on every single American household across this country with new energy taxes. In fact, families will see their taxes on energy go up by as much as $3,100 a year.

Now, these are not—these are not, Madam Speaker, as we all know, tax increases on the super rich, which we regularly hear decried around here. These are regressive taxes that will hit every single family in this country. And, Madam Speaker, it is important to note this energy tax will hit the poorest of families in this country, because they need to turn the light switch on and turn the microwave on as well.

This budget will have immediate and very, very painful consequences. But as painful as the short-term impact will be, the long-term consequences are even more troubling. This budget more than quadruples the deficit. My friend talked about how this budget reduces the deficit. All one needs to do is look at the numbers, Madam Speaker. This budget more than quadruples the deficit. It pushes our national debt to a level that threatens the solvency of this country for years to come, in fact, for generations to come.

Now, some Americans may be wondering why the deficit should matter while so many families are struggling. Well, let me clarify exactly what it is that we are talking about here.

Republicans are not advocating a complete eradication of the deficit in 2009. We have had deficits over the past several years. We all acknowledge that. And while we are committed to reining in wasteful spending, this time of serious economic challenges is not the time for sudden or extreme austerity.

Our concern with this budget is not that there is any deficit at all; our concern is that the deficit itself is so catastrophically huge. It takes the largest deficit in the last 8 years and expands it exponentially by 450 percent in this year alone, a 450 percent increase in the size of the deficit this year alone.

It is either amusing or tragic, depending on how seriously one takes this issue, to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle whine that they inherited deficits. They justify their enormously wasteful budget by saying Republicans ran deficits, too. Yes, there were budget deficits when Republicans controlled Congress. We all acknowledge that. We have been fighting two wars; and, yes, we did not go as far as we would have liked in trimming down wasteful spending. We acknowledge that.

But what twisted and contorted logic, Madam Speaker, is it to say: Republican deficits were bad, so we are responding by making them four times worse. Is this really the Democratic majority's justification for what it is that we are doing today? Do they really think anyone could be fooled by such preposterous reasoning? This argument is not just bizarre, it is downright dangerous. It fails to take seriously the impact of exponentially growing debt.

□ 0945

It also fails to take seriously the nature of our current economic crisis. Some debt is manageable, as any working family knows. Americans borrow money all the time to buy a new car or pay for college tuition. At reasonable levels, debt is manageable. But as we have learned very painfully, irresponsibly and dramatically increased debt can be catastrophic.

Our Nation's oldest, most prestigious financial institutions have collapsed under the weight of their irresponsible debts. And now the Democratic majority is careening down the path that led these institutions into ruin. Our current economic crisis has come as the result of irresponsible, unaccountable behavior. We all know that. We simply cannot begin our recovery unless and until we begin to learn from our mistakes. The Democratic budget simply repeats and expands on those mistakes.

But, Madam Speaker, we do have another choice. We, as Republicans, have put forth an alternative that heeds the lessons of our economic crisis and applies some common sense to our spending priorities. It also heeds the lessons of history and previous times of economic crisis. We have experienced great economic challenges before throughout our Nation's history. And what have those experiences taught us? Now if we go back to the recessions in the early 1980s and the early 1960s, we see very clearly a Democratic President and a Republican President. President Ronald Reagan and President John F. Kennedy quickly righted our economies with pro-growth policies that empowered America's job creators. Again, a Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, and a Republican President, Ronald Reagan, both put into place pro-growth policies that empowered the job creators here in the United States. John F. Kennedy, as I said, and Ronald Reagan after him, understood that all the government intervention in the world could never match the power of American entrepreneurship.

Madam Speaker, I am going to quote a Democratic President, President John F. Kennedy, who in 1962 said the following: ''To increase demand and lift the economy, the Federal Government's most useful role is not to rush into a program of excessive increases in public expenditures, but to expand the incentives and opportunities for private expenditures.'' Madam Speaker, I'm going to repeat the words of the great Democratic President, John F. Kennedy. In 1962, as we were dealing with economic challenges, he said, ''To increase demand and lift the economy, the Federal Government's most useful role is not to rush into a program of excessive increases in public expenditures, but to expand the incentives and opportunities for private expenditures.''

Madam Speaker, history proved John F. Kennedy right. His pro-growth reforms reversed the recession and put our economy back on the path to prosperity. We all know two decades later. My colleague, Mr. LUNGREN, and I were part of that ''Reagan Revolution.'' Reagan followed John F. Kennedy's lead and accomplished the same thing.

Now, Madam Speaker, today Republicans have proposed a budget built on the Kennedy-Reagan model, a budget that draws upon history's lessons and will allow our economy to grow once again. Our alternative also heeds the mistakes that led to our current crisis and rejects the Democratic majority's policy of massive, reckless new debt for the American people. This alternative will not eliminate the deficit immediately, but it responsibly funds our greatest needs while preventing the deficit from ballooning into an utterly unmanageable size.

It does not raise taxes on small businesses and working families, but, in fact, reduces the tax burden they face and empowers them to lead our economic recovery. It meets our needs as a Nation without condemning future generations to a mountain of crippling debt. It is the responsible solution that the American people are expecting. It is the only budget proposal before us today that will carry us through this economic crisis and begin the process of the recovery that I know we all seek in a bipartisan way.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from California for his concern for my voice. And I appreciate the fact that he admitted that the Bush deficits were a bad thing. That is the first important step toward a recovery. So I appreciate that. And he mentions the two wars we fought. I would remind him that they were always off budget. And the budget the Democrats present today is a more honest accounting of those expenditures.

At this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. ANDREWS.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I think someone who sells real estate or teaches school for a living must listen to this budget debate and be befuddled by what he or she is hearing. Thankfully, today there will be a chance for that citizen to hear a wide range of alternatives, a wide range of views as to how we should fix the country's economic problems. For that, I commend the Rules Committee under Ms. SLAUGHTER's and Mr. MCGOVERN's leadership, and I hope the minority will vote for the procedure that lets that wide range of views be heard.

But that person who teaches school or sells real estate has heard consistently from the minority that their household will get a $3,000-a-year tax increase. That isn't so. The fact of the matter is that the hypothetical, mythical energy tax that the minority continuously refers to is not in the budget. If there ever were to be such a tax, it would have to come to this floor for a separate vote, a separate debate and separate consideration. The minority habitually says that small businesses and families will have their taxes increase. The fact of the matter is there are instructions to pay for health care that would probably look to repeal the Bush tax cut for the wealthiest 5 percent of people in this country, a platform the President ran on and was elected on. It is absolutely untrue that the 95 percent below that figure have any sort of tax increase. They don't. In fact, there is a $1.7 trillion tax reduction for the bottom 95 percent of people in this country, for middle-class people. We hear that small businesses are going to have their taxes increase. That is not true. Ninety-eight percent of the small businesses in this country file tax returns lower than the adjusted gross income that would be affected by the provisions that would help pay for the health care bill.

We hear habitually about deficit and debt, and those on the minority side gnash their teeth and weep that the debt, according to them, will be doubled in 5 years. They know all about that, because that is exactly what they just did. They just doubled the national debt in the last 5 years under their watch.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. The fact of the matter is that this plan reduces the deficit by two-thirds over the next 5 years.

Now I do agree with my friend from California that this is about choice, this is about how to handle our economic distress. President Obama came to office and said he would do three things. He said he would pass a bill to stimulate the economy by helping people buy houses, buy cars, get construction workers back to work and keep people working and teaching in our schools. He did it. He then said his administration would lay out a plan to stabilize the collapsing banking system. Such a plan was laid out at the beginning of last week. And although it is far too early to measure its results, early signs are good. And then he said he would lay out a long-term plan for economic development, jobs and growth that would address the fundamental, underlying problems of this country. And that is what we are doing today. Stop living on borrowed money; he is cutting the deficit by two-thirds. Make us free from imported energy; he sets out a path to do so that Congress will either follow or not. Deal with health care reform; he sets out a path to do so that we will deal with through reconciliation instructions, whether you vote for it or not. And finally, he sets forth a path to broaden access to education and improve its quality.

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

Mr. DREIER. I would be happy to yield my friend additional time if he would yield to me.

Mr. ANDREWS. Just one moment. I just want to finish this point. I would love to hear from you.

The other side wants nostalgia. If we were to have a third George Bush term, their alternative is what it would look like; make permanent the tax breaks for the wealthiest, reduce what we spend on education, nutrition, environment, energy and health care, and hope for the best. This is a choice between the future of promise and the failure of the past. And if my friend would like to ask me about the failure of the past, he can certainly do that.

Mr. DREIER. Do I have any other option at all to discuss anything else? Is that all I can discuss is the failure of the past? If my friend would yield, and I'm happy to yield my friend 1 additional minute, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. Let me just say that if we talk about the failure of the past, clearly the ideological baggage of the past has been the tax, spend and borrow policy which is being proposed here. Let me say I'm somewhat confused. I know that the President talked about reducing the deficit by half. Now, of course, if we run multitrillion-dollar deficits and you cut it down by a $1 trillion or $2 trillion, yeah, you can maybe cut it in half. But my friend has just said he is going to cut the deficit by two-thirds. I don't know where that comes from.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, has the gentleman read the majority budget resolution? If the gentleman would read it, he would see that the deficit is two-thirds at the end of the 5-year cycle.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just say from what it is now, based on the projections with all the spending that is in here, that will create deficits that are so extraordinarily high. That is the challenge that we have got here. When you dramatically increase the size of the deficits—I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, if I may.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I will yield myself such time as I may consume. And I'm happy to further engage my friend. And I will say that we have proposed a 10-year budget. This is a 5-year budget that my friend has. And I know that if you have multitrillion-dollar deficits that are going to be run, the dramatic increase in debt servicing is going to increase the size of those deficits.

I also have to say that it is very interesting, Madam Speaker, my friend said that I was able to talk about the Bush years. And yes, I'm very proud of the fact that in 2001 and 2003, dealing with the aftermath of September 11, an economic recession that existed in the early part of this decade and corporate scandals, that we were able, for 55 months, to have sustained economic growth. And I think that that is something of which we can be proud. But my point is, my arguments here were bipartisan. And John F. Kennedy was one of our greatest Presidents. And I'm very proud to say that we are standing on the shoulders of John F. Kennedy, if that will make my colleagues feel better. Mr. LUNGREN and I regularly argue that we are standing on the shoulders of Ronald Reagan.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman can stand on whomever's shoulders he wants. I'm afraid that the economic collapse you have left us with is standing on the chest of the working American.

Mr. DREIER. If I can reclaim my time, we are standing on the shoulders of John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan to use policies that have historically been very, very successful and brought about economic recovery through difficult times in our Nation.

At this time, I would like to yield 4 minutes to my very good friend from Gold River, California, our former attorney general and my good friend, Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, John Kennedy's famous words were that a rising tide lifts all boats. I guess conversely then, a receding tide would lower all boats.

Isn't that what we are talking about here? How do we get out of this economic difficulty we are in? My friends on the other side have correctly pointed out that we spent too much and we borrowed too much in the last number of years. I have agreed. I have said that ever since I came back to Congress 4-plus years ago.

But to condemn the actions of the past and then say you're going to get out of it by repeating it but doubling down on it doesn't seem to make a whole lot of sense. Look, I was gone from this place for 16 years. My children are grown now. I now have grandchildren. When I first came here, I had very young children. And I have got to answer to them at some point in time as to what we did when this choice came this year. Did we say that it made us feel good to loft ad hominem arguments at one another, to say that if you are fiscally responsible, what you are going to do is literally take the food out of the mouths of children, as I heard the gentleman from the other side say? The gentleman from the

other side said that he has a number of school districts that can no longer give children lunch.

Why is that? They are having difficult economic times there. They are finding out they can't tax their people any more. Their receipts aren't enough at this time to do that. So the gentleman says that all we have to do is come to Washington, D.C., because, of course, our taxpayers are different than the taxpayers back home.

Madam Speaker, the fact of the matter is, they are the same people. They are the same people that are going to suffer if we put them on a road to economic calamity that is going to last for decades.

So we have a responsibility here to look beyond the easy personal shots and to judge these budgets to see whether or not one of them is more responsible than the other. I could point out the $1 billion placeholder that is in the Democratic budget. What is it for? Nobody knows. It is a hedge against whatever they want to spend it on. I could point out that my Democratic friends are saying that cap and trade, which really translates into cap and tax, is a magical, mystical ride that we are going to take. It is going to cost nobody anything. And so they criticize us when we say, ''do you know that there is a tax inherent in this budget?'' Well, tell me how are we going to do this cap and trade that is based on an auction? An auction means somebody has to put a price in order to get the ability to spend. But it is going to come out of nowhere? And my friend from Massachusetts says, ''and the Republican budget is going to allow dirty fossil fuels to be used.'' Once again we are blaming America.

□ 1000

I know that the fact of the matter is that we have fossil fuels in abundance here in the United States, coal for instance; and somehow, instead of working towards clean coal technology so that we can utilize our abundant resources, our friends on the other side say somehow that's evil.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. And Madam Speaker, I would simply say in response to the cap-and-tax issue about which my friend has just spoken, that we do share a concern about the poor.

And as I mentioned in my remarks earlier, there is a tax of up to $3,100 for every American family. That includes the working poor, it includes those who are impoverished who are still in their homes. And so the notion that we somehow are doing everything——

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield my friend an additional minute. If the gentleman would further yield, the fact of the matter is, with this proposal that our colleagues have, they regularly point the finger of blame at us, that we somehow are trying to hurt the poor by cutting food stamps and nutrition programs, which is just plain wrong. But they fail to recognize that the tax burden, with this energy tax imposed on any family that turns the light switch on, is going to be overwhelmingly strong.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Well, the gentleman's statement is only true if you believe that when you buy a carbon credit and pay for it, that actually amounts to money. If somehow, magically it doesn't cost anybody anything, even though it's being auctioned on the market, and then that cost is going to be passed on to the consumer, which is, in the nature of a tax.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would further yield, I would simply say maybe it is perverse that we somehow believe that if a burden is imposed on a business, that it is something that is going to have to be passed on to the consumer. I mean, is that—maybe there's something wrong with that interpretation.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. What we have here is an argument that if you can't pay for it back home, you can pay for it here because somehow we have an unlimited amount of money, and it has no impact on anybody whatsoever. As if inflation has no impact.

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

I'm not sure how pointing out that the Republican budget cuts nutrition is a personal attack. But I guess the truth stings a little bit.

The fact of the matter is that their substitute rescinds $20 billion in food stamp funding right off the top. I mean, that's just a fact.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I was just handed a piece here which states that the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, our colleague, Mr. PETERSON, the gentleman from Minnesota, has made it clear that he is not going to allow for a single cut in agricultural subsidies, a story that has just come out here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So that means it's only food stamps. And the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, said that the farm bill was off the table. So there's a bipartisan, you know, I guess agreement that the farm bill is going to stand. But your budget——

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would further yield, under your budget how do you propose to have the cuts in agriculture if you're going to maintain the food stamp and nutrition program and not bring about cuts in subsidies?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time. Under our budget we do not rescind the $20 billion in food stamp funding. Beyond that, the Republican budget freezes all discretionary spending. That potentially cuts off nutrition assistance to between 500,000 and 1 million pregnant women, nursing mothers, infants and small children, including monies for the WIC program.

So, we can sit here and talk about abstractions all we want. The bottom line is that these programs that we're talking about, these cuts that are being proposed by the Republican budget, have a direct impact on real people. And maybe those aren't the people that come to Washington to lobby, but I'll tell you, the number of people who have fallen into poverty, the number of people who are still struggling just to hold on to the middle class, they're dwindling. And so your budget makes it much worse.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. And, Madam Speaker, I would simply say to my friend, how does he justify the $3,100 tax that is imposed on struggling families who are impoverished with the so-called tax?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Will the gentleman yield on this point?

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I really appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak to this, because I endured this through the Budget Committee. I didn't say anything in the Budget Committee. I've listened to it on the floor.

Does the gentleman know where the $3,100 figure comes from? Does the gentleman know?

I yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. There are several different studies which show——

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Does the gentleman know where the $3,100 figure comes from, that your leadership——

Mr. DREIER. There are several different studies.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time.

Mr. DREIER. There are studies that show there's an increase. The highest I've seen is $3,100.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California to tell me what page in our budget that figure comes from.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. It's not a page in the budget. It's the fact that there is, in fact, a tax increase that several studies have shown ranged from $1,600 to $3,100 for a working family in this country.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I reclaim my time.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Okay. This $3,100 figure that has been cited by Republican leadership, MITCH MCCONNELL, JOHN BOEHNER, and referenced, I

thought the gentleman from California would talk about it coming from MIT. That's where it came from, and his colleagues have referenced it repeatedly on the floor. This is from research by MIT professor John Reilly, done in 2007.

Republican staffers at one point, since they were citing it, called him and he said, and I quote, ''called me March 20 and asked about this. I had to explain why the estimate they had was incorrect, and what they should do to correct it. But I think this wrong number was already floating around by that time.'' He pointed out that it actually was one-tenth of that figure, it was a net welfare that was going to be $300 per person, that the Republicans are intentionally misrepresenting the research from MIT.

Now, I would suggest that it's further flawed because we have, in the budget, left this element to be worked on by people who want a legend. But this canard ought to be rejected.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. We are really tight on time, Mr. DREIER.

Mr. DREIER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, his leadership, and my colleagues for correcting this number.

Madam Speaker, as we consider the budget proposal for the coming year, we are facing one of the most important votes in recent history. We can choose to honor the pledge we made to the American people in the last election and begin the process of health care reform, make investments that will lead to energy independence, and invest the needed funds to reinvigorate our educational system, or we can follow the same failed policies of the past that brought us to the crisis we find ourselves in today.

Our budget builds on the integrated approach to lifting us out of the recession, and returns us to fiscal discipline by cutting the deficit by two-thirds by 2013.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this rule and on the leadership's budget blueprint, H. Con. Res. 85.

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

I know that the time was limited on the other side, so I'd like to respond to my good friend from Oregon and say that there are a number of studies which have indicated what this cost will be. The highest that I saw was this $3,100 figure.

Now, my friend has just said, this will be worked out later. And in saying this will be worked out later, that creates a degree of uncertainty as to exactly what the tax will be on working families.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Okay. I want it to be clear. I didn't say it would be worked out. I said that the study that you and Republicans have repeatedly cited——

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I wanted to say that there are several studies. That is one study. And I don't have the other studies in front of me, Madam Speaker, but I would like to say that it stands to reason that if this structure is going to be put into place, the so-called cap-and-trade, talking about exchange of carbon taxes and the taxes that are out there, they are going to be passed on to consumers. And a number of studies, other than the MIT study, have indicated that this will increase the cost burden on working families throughout the United States of America, regardless of their economic standing.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course, I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I would like to clarify that the professor who's being referenced by your leadership said that it would be one-fortieth of that amount.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, the fact is, Madam Speaker, there are several other studies which have talked about that tax burden which is going to be involved, not that single study. They range from roughly $1,600 to this $3,100 figure that we had in the past.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. What do you think, assuming that it is one-fortieth or larger, what do you think happens to that money?

Mr. DREIER. What do I think happens to that money? I will tell you. Whatever the tax burden is, it is imposed on the families in this country who are on food stamps, who are on nutrition programs and who are struggling to make ends meet but still have to pay their energy bills.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. My friend from California continually references this energy tax increase. He's very astute on the rules, Madam Speaker, and he knows that the way you can set the predicate to raise revenue in a budget resolution is by a reconciliation instruction.

Would the gentleman care to tell us where the reconciliation instruction is to raise money for this cap-and-tax that he keeps talking about?

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would yield, the fact of the matter is it has not been put into place, and it's very, very clear that there is a $1 billion place holder there, which is what they're planning to utilize.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his statement. It is not in place. Therefore, there's no tax in this budget.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. ETHERIDGE.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Speaker, you know, a budget's more than just a document. It really is a statement of our Nation's priorities and values. And the underlying bill that we're talking about builds on the work this Congress has done to put our economy back on track and provide jobs for our people and invest in the current economic crisis of building for future needs.

The bill lays out a plan to cut the deficit by nearly two-thirds, creates jobs and investments, reforms health care, and provides for clean energy and education.

As a former school chief in my home State, I'm particularly pleased that the budget prioritizes education and innovation, a critical foundation piece for building a future.

In recent months, we have seen the economy start to recover as we put things in place. We'll see that in the months to come.

But let me just share a personal story. Just this past week I was at a middle school, Meadow Middle School in Johnson County, met with a bunch of students who will be the first in their family to go to college. That's what this is all about. We're building for the future. These youngsters start in middle school making a decision where they're going. Never has a member of their family been to college. That's what we're about here today.

Certainly we can argue the details, but, you know, let's keep our focus on what it's about. It's about the people of America, those who've lost their jobs, some who've lost hope. But we can give hope to the next generation. We can provide a foundation for building jobs, and we can get our economy moving again. But we have to do it together.

This budget resolution is a step in that direction of building a strong future for America and making a difference—for the leadership position in the world.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to our very thoughtful new colleague from Buffalo, New York (Mr. LEE).

□ 1015

Mr. LEE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule and, more importantly, the budget resolution. Having run a business, I know that, to put together a responsible budget in the middle of a difficult economic climate, you have to prepare for things to get worse, not assume they will get

better. The majority's budget fails to meet the commonsense standard by spending taxpayer dollars freely, without the same ''do more with less'' approach that many of my constituents live by.

For proof of that, look no further than the fact that independent estimates suggest, roughly, 250,000 new Federal bureaucrats may be needed to spend all the money in the President's budget. We should be looking at paring our employment roles, not expanding the already bloated Federal Government. Moreover, by continuing to borrow money we don't have, taxpayers will be on the hook for as much as $1 trillion in interest payments on this debt. This is only a preview of the massive burden that will be forced on our children and grandchildren by Washington's refusal to make tough choices now.

My constituents didn't send me here to evaluate how their hard-earned money is spent in the abstract. This is about dollars and cents. By that measure, this budget is reckless spending, and it fails to protect working families, family farms and small businesses who are struggling right now. This budget simply spends too much; it borrows too much, and it taxes too much.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. SCHRADER.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I would like to speak to the rule. I appreciate this opportunity.

I'm not going to bore the rest of the body or the American people with more discussion about the inherited deficit we've got and about the necessary recovery plan that has been enacted to put Americans back to work after the Bush administration destroyed our economy, morally bankrupted us, as well as financially.

It also is amazing to me that, in the Republican budget I have here, there is nothing that addresses the long-term cost drivers that the budget of change has that has been put forward by the President of the United States and the Democratic Congress. We're dealing with the long-term cost drivers of health care, with the need for a 21st century education, and with the fact that we can no longer have our economy being at the mercy of people in the Middle East.

What is amazing is what is not in this budget. In this budget, the most explicit piece is about how we get wasteful spending under control. We just heard the Republican floor leader talk about the fact that, yes, we did not go after wasteful spending in the last 8 years. Well, this budget doesn't do it. It is in our budget. We talk about program integrity. We talk about making sure that seniors are taken care of with their Social Security, and we talk about preventing fraud and abuse. That fraud and abuse gives us an $11 return for every dollar we've invested.

Tax compliance: Instead of letting the wealthy get away with huge tax breaks that hardworking Americans don't get, we actually have a tax compliance feature in this budget that actually makes sure we get $5 for every dollar invested.

Medicare-Medicaid: The fraud and abuse that's going on in there with wealthy people trying to game the system at the mercy of hardworking individuals and seniors who are destitute is abominable. For getting after that fraud and abuse in our budget, we actually talk about the fact that there's a $1.60 return for every dollar invested. Most importantly, I think we recognize that the States are the incubators of a lot of innovation. There is a partnership fund established where we can do some creative work.

A lot of this work has been done in my home State of Oregon. It yielded tremendous benefits when I was in charge of the appropriations process back there.

The last comment I'd make, Madam Speaker, as to what is not in the Republican budget that is in the Democrat budget is: We talk about performance management. We actually make sure that agencies are held accountable for every single tax dollar that's being spent, and I'm sorry to say that that's nowhere in the Republican budget.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply say to our new colleague from Oregon, who has just joined us, that it seems that this budget is dealing with what is little more than a 5-year fantasy land. We're dealing with a 10-year proposal here, and the notion of saying, ''within a 5-year period of time,'' these projections are not taking into reality the huge debt that is going to be existing beyond that 5 years.

I've asked my friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) to return, and I've been doing a little research. Our staff has looked into this, and we've found that the professor about whom my friend was speaking from MIT did, in fact, say that there would be this one hundred fortieth level, but it was based on the fact that we would see rebates to those families provided, and yet there is nothing in this budget that provides for those rebates.

In light of that——

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Let me just finish my thought, and then I will yield to my friend.

The fact is, if you look at that $3,100 figure, it does stand because the budget does not have a penny for those rebates.

I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The budget doesn't have anything for the rebates because the program isn't in the budget. The budget allows——

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, let me just——

Mr. BLUMENAUER. No. Give me the courtesy——

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlemen will suspend. Both the gentlemen will suspend.

The gentlemen must remember to respect the gavel and not talk over each other, and yield and reclaim time in an orderly way to have the debate recorded.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, who controls the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At that time, the Chair couldn't tell who had the time. The gentleman controls his time.

Mr. DREIER. I think that I control all the time on our side, Madam Speaker, and I think that I've been yielded to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. While the gentleman is talking over the Member to whom he has yielded time, it is difficult to understand who actually has the time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I may, what I said was I'm reclaiming my time. Did the Chair not hear me say that I was reclaiming my time from the gentleman?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At the time that the gentleman was speaking, the gentleman from Oregon was using the time that had been yielded to him.

Mr. DREIER. Well, there was no amount of time yielded to him, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I may——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Members will respect the gavel. They will yield and reclaim time in an orderly manner and attempt not to talk over each other so that their comments can be recorded properly.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I be recognized?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. DREIER. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

I would simply like to state to the Chair that the gentleman said that there was nothing in this budget that specifically referred to that. When he made his point in response to my question, I asked you to allow me to reclaim my time. I said it three times loudly and with enthusiasm, so I don't believe that I was talking over the gentleman. I was asking to reclaim my time.

Am I wrong?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman needs to respect the gavel, and the gentleman needs to understand that all comments need to be recorded, and when comments in the nature of rebuttal are being made without a clear yielding or reclaiming of time, it is difficult for the official reporters to make sure that they have all of the comments.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me state very clearly again for the recording clerk: What I was saying was ''reclaiming my time.'' That was the statement that I was making as the gentleman was speaking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. DREIER. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

I would say to my friend that, as we look at this issue, there is nothing in this budget, but there is this $1 billion set-aside there. I would like to ask my friend if he could guarantee that that $1 billion will not be used for the so-called cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax plan, or that it will not be in the budget conference report that we have returning to us.

I'm happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. In attempting not to be a potted plant but to respond, there is no detail in terms of a cap-and-trade proposal. There is an——

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, may I reclaim my time?

I reclaim my time to ask again as I just did of my friend: Can the gentleman provide a guarantee that that $1 billion will not be used for this so-called ''cap-and-trade program'' and that it will not be included in a conference report that comes back to the House?

I'm happy to further yield to my friend to respond.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The purpose of a budget resolution is to provide a framework, and if the House and the Senate provide a framework that involves a fee on carbon pollution, then we will have the chance to work our will. There is, in this bill, a framework to move forward.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, I will say that the gentleman has made his point, and so he is not providing a guarantee that it is not going to be there, and I appreciate his recognizing that fact.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must ask Members to bear in mind the principle that proper courtesy in the process of yielding and reclaiming time in debate, and especially in asking another to yield, helps to foster the spirit of mutual comity that elevates our deliberations above mere argument.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I'd like to yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, nobody can make guarantees, but the framework is to allow the body to work its will. There's no tax. There's an opportunity for us to have a framework to fight carbon pollution.

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

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

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, after 8 years of failed policies under the last administration, we have inherited a massive, unprecedented budget deficit projected to be well over $1 trillion before the current President took office. While growing our economy is a major component of the budget, reducing the deficit is a top priority for everyone.

The budget before us today will cut the deficit by two-thirds by the end of 2013 with a combination of spending cuts. Now, I'd like to correct the excesses overnight, but like steering a sailboat, it takes some time to turn us around while still not capsizing.

Some say we should chop everything except defense in the interest of leaving less debt to our children, but the fiscal deficit is not the only thing the policies of the last 8 years has left us with:

We have a huge education deficit, Madam Speaker, where children in urban and rural areas in my district don't have decent schools available to them. We have a health care deficit where people even with insurance cannot get the preventative care they need to avoid bigger problems. We have an infrastructure deficit, as demonstrated by leaky sewers and crumbling roads and bridges in my district.

If we reduce the deficit a little more, it will still be substantial thanks to the policies of the past, but it will leave our children with poor education, inadequate health care and crumbling infrastructure. Are we really serving their best interests by doing this?

We must invest in the economy to get rid of the structural deficit that we inherited. Just as someone might take a second mortgage to fix the structural integrity of their family house, we must do this as well. We may have a somewhat bigger mortgage, but we will have a strong house to pass on to our kids. That's what this Obama budget does. Otherwise, we will leave our children with a somewhat smaller mortgage but with no house, with no education, with poor health, and with Third World infrastructure.

That's not why the people of the 25th District of New York elected me. That's not why people elected the 44th President of the United States. The President's budget makes these tough decisions that the people sent us here to make. We must support it and we must support the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I'd like to yield a minute and a half to our hardworking colleague from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I have to confess that it's a little tough to be here on the floor and be accused of wanting to keep money from the hardworking Americans, as Republicans, when I have had a bill I have been begging to be allowed to come to the floor that gives a tax holiday to every hardworking American in the country—to everybody. Even those who don't make enough to pay income tax would get a FICA holiday.

So, to be lectured about our not wanting hardworking Americans to have a break, give me a break. The bill is there. Let it come to the floor. I'm told by people all over the Hill and all over America: Please, see if you can't get the Democratic leadership to give us this holiday.

Then we have a marriage penalty that is exacerbated in this budget, made even worse. Then who do you think is going to pay for this extra energy tax? It'll be passed on, and the people who earn the least will get hurt the most.

The real secret about this budget, Madam Speaker, should not be lost in this one act. Secretary of State Clinton was sent to beg the Chinese to keep loaning us money. What does that say for our future? We're quickly approaching the irreversible in this spending. It has to stop.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, there is nothing in the underlying budget resolution that adversely affects the marriage penalty situation for any middle-class person. Again, 95 percent of families in this country get a tax cut, not a tax increase. It's just not so.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, the vice chair of the Budget Committee, Ms. SCHWARTZ.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, let me first say that, I think, this is a very important debate.

Last night, it was suggested that we have not debated this budget when, in fact, we had 14 hours of markup, of conversation about the debate in the Budget Committee, and of course, we had hours last night and hours this morning. This budget resolution is a statement of our priorities, of our values and of our goals, and it gives direction to the Congress this next year and for years ahead.

The fact is that the President's budget, embraced by the Democratic Congress and modified slightly by us, as is our responsibility, is a change in the direction to this Nation. It is honest. It is fiscally responsible after years of not being so, and it is extremely difficult, and it recognizes the difficulty that we have inherited: the economy, which is, of course, in great difficulty, and the fiscal situation for our Nation, reflected by the $1.3 trillion deficit that

President Obama and this Democratic Congress have inherited from President Bush and the Republican Congress.

□ 1030

It reflects and understands that we have a large debt in this country, and it restores fiscal discipline by commitment to cut that deficit in half in 5 years and to restore fiscal responsibility and fiscal policies that will rebuild this economy and rebuild our Nation.

It is clear that the Republicans want to go back to those failed policies that led us to this moment, and we simply cannot let that happen.

The President and the Democratic budget does, in fact, provide relief for our families and our businesses. It restores fiscal discipline and a commitment to cut that deficit in half in 5 years. And very importantly, it makes clear that we have to make investments in our people, in our businesses, and in our Nation if we're going to grow economically and restore fiscal discipline.

So it sets the opportunity for the debate on three critical issues: on energy independence, on education, and on health care reform. That is the way we are going to rebuild this economy, and we are going to make those investments, and that's what this budget does. And I hope it will be embraced by this Congress and this Nation.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of my friend if he has any further speakers.

Mr. McGOVERN. We have no further speakers.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend from Worcester is prepared to close, I will yield myself the balance of our time.

Madam Speaker, we all know this has been an interesting debate, a fascinating one, and I think there is going to be a very clear choice that is before us.

The American people are hurting. The people whom I represent in California and people all across this country are suffering because of the economic downturn that we face today. It is a very serious and a challenging one, and I believe that every Democrat and every Republican wants to do what they believe is best to get our economy back on track.

I will tell you that I think that it's important for us to look at history. We need to look at the history of spending and what it has created, and we need to look at the history of what it is that gets our economy growing. Dramatically increasing spending, as study after study has shown, does nothing to get our economy back on track, to get it growing.

I believe that those words that were offered by President Kennedy, that I quoted earlier, in 1962 as he was dealing with a difficult economic time, when he said, ''to increase demand and lift the economy, the Federal Government's most useful role is not to rush into a program of excessive increases and public expenditures but to expand the incentives and opportunities for private expenditures.''

Now, Madam Speaker, the reason that I point to John F. Kennedy is that at the beginning of this administration's term and at the beginning of this Congress, we heard Democrats talk about the need for us to work in a bipartisan way. So what we're using, Madam Speaker, is the model of a great Democrat, John F. Kennedy, who recognized that dramatically increasing spending is not the cure that we need to deal with this challenge. And history proved John F. Kennedy right.

We know that tax cuts create jobs and jobs create revenues. It's true that we have a debt and a deficit that need to be addressed. The way to do that is to grow our economy. Tax increases do not increase jobs. And so it is absolutely imperative that we put a pro-growth policy into place, and that's what we do. We grow the economy, we recognize that there are serious societal needs out there, whether it is nutrition, whether it is food stamps. We need to address those. And we do provide for that in our budget. And at the same time, we focus on future generations by saying we are going to responsibly take the debt that exists and we are going to take it on a downward slope.

Now, my colleagues continue to talk about the next 5 years. Our budget focus is on 10 years. Why? Because we know that the 5-year plan that they have where they talk about reducing the multitrillion-dollar deficits that we're going to have, that they skyrocket after that 5-year period of time based on the spending that they plan to have in their budget.

So, Madam Speaker, we're going to continue with this rigorous debate that's taken place over the past hour-plus. We will see it happen throughout the day, and then we're going to have a chance to determine whether or not we are going to put into place policies that stand on the shoulders of John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan to grow our economy, reducing the tax burden on working Americans so that they can create jobs and increase the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury, or are we going to have a policy which taxes too much, spends too much, and borrows too much.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, this has been an interesting debate, but the fact is that Members will have a clear choice. And it's a choice of whether or not you want to stick to the same old-same old, or whether you want to go in a dramatically different direction.

If you have loved the last 8 years, then you should vote for the Republican budget because it's a continuation of the same thing.

If you want a different direction, a direction in which we invest in our economy, invest in our health care, invest in clean energy, invest in education and reduce our deficits, then you need to vote for the Democratic budget.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, the Republican budget, among other things, repeals most of the economic stimulus package that we passed, a stimulus package that is already helping our economy. In my district, a health IT company has already announced they are going to hire 500 more people because of the money for health IT in the economic stimulus package.

And what I find ironic is that so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who voted against the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, you know, and who now will vote against it again by voting for the Republican budget, are going back to their districts and will be taking credit for all of this Federal money going to help the people in their communities.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have taken so many bows, they are humpbacked.

The fact of the matter is we have a problem not just 5 years from now and not just 10 years from now; we have a problem today. There are people in my district today who can't put food on the table. There are people in my district today who are losing their jobs who can't afford a college education for their kids.

We need to approve the Democratic budget because we need to understand if we're going to reduce our debt, we need to have our economy grow, and the only way to grow is by providing smart, sound, good investments. That's the choice.

And so I urge my colleagues to vote for the Democratic budget. I am proud to stand here in support of it. I have two kids, a 10-year-old son and a 7-year-old daughter. I am voting for this budget because of them. I want to give them a better future. And that's what this debate is about.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 93

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, April 2, 2009, through Saturday, April 4, 2009, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 21, 2009, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, April 2, 2009, through Sunday, April 5, 2009, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, April 20, 2009, or such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of H. Con. Res. 93 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adoption of H. Res. 316.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 177, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—244

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
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
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—177

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Arcuri
Austria
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maffei
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Blunt
Griffith
Hinojosa
Klein (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore (WI)
Pascrell
Richardson
Westmoreland

□ 1104

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 85, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 316, 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 resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 182, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—242

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
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)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
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
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
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
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
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)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—182

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

NOT VOTING—7

Baird
Hinojosa
Miller, Gary
Moore (WI)
Pascrell
Shuler
Westmoreland

□ 1114

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.

FAMILY SMOKING PREVENTION AND TOBACCO CONTROL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). The unfinished business is consideration of the bill (H.R. 1256) to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When further proceedings were postponed on the bill, all time for debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) had expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 307, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Indiana.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 142, noes 284, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

AYES—142

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Etheridge
Fleming
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Hill
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kissell
Kline (MN)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Posey
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—284

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lummis
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta

Sarbanes	Snyder	Velázquez
Schakowsky	Space	Visclosky
Schauer	Speier	Walden
Schiff	Stark	Walz
Schrader	Stupak	Wasserman Schultz
Schwartz	Sutton	Waters
Scott (GA)	Tauscher	Watson
Scott (VA)	Taylor	Watt
Serrano	Teague	Waxman
Sestak	Thompson (CA)	Weiner
Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Sherman	Thompson (PA)	Wexler
Simpson	Tierney	Wilson (OH)
Sires	Titus	Wolf
Skelton	Tonko	Woolsey
Slaughter	Towns	Wu
Smith (NJ)	Tsongas	Yarmuth
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	

NOT VOTING—5

Blunt	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Hinojosa	Pascrell	

□ 1132

Messrs. GRIFFITH and LATTA and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. In its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rogers of Michigan moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 1256) to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 919(c)(2) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 101(b)(3) of the bill, amend subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF OTHER FUNDS.—Fees collected under subsection (a) are the only funds authorized to be made available for the purpose described in subparagraph (A).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes to support his motion.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends for bringing up and working on an issue that we all know is troublesome, smoking in America. We certainly don't want our kids to do it. We wouldn't wish it on any family. And sometimes we disagree on the smallest things and the paths to get there. And I think this is one of those occasions. But some of those differences have huge consequences. We even offered an amendment to say to the FDA if you're going to give them this authority, you ought to be able to get nicotine out of cigarettes. And the majority said ''no.''

So what we are going to do is we're going to have them create this whole new government structure to approve or authorize or regulate a drug that, if used as directed, will kill you—for the first time in the history of the FDA. It is a problem. But as long as we get to this place of eliminating smoking, maybe we are moving forward.

But here is a huge problem, and I hope my colleagues listen well. Because for several years during the course of this bill, we have been told and told again and told again that this will not impact the general fund of the FDA. It will not. But, in fact, it will. There is a dangerous loophole in this bill, and we together today can close it. I will tell you why this is important. Because it does allow in the bill specifically for money to come from the general fund of the FDA to get this thing going for as long as 6 months. Six months doesn't seem like a long time. But let me tell you, the FDA is strapped for resources and failing in many of its core missions.

Many of us here agree with that. We have often said it is not meeting its mission requirements. We need to give them more, more resources. This bill today takes away precious resources from some of the most dangerous diseases and cures that may be on their way at the time they don't need it. Do you realize last year the FDA inspected roughly 6,000 of 189,000 food facilities under its jurisdiction? Three percent. Americans eat food imported from 150 countries where they are processed in 189,000 plants, scattered from China to Fiji. But in 2007, the FDA inspected just 96 of those plants.

You pose to the new FDA Commissioner a very dangerous set of policy decisions. Do I not inspect food plants to get this new regulation going today or for the next 6 months? The last salmonella outbreak had 550 illnesses and eight deaths. You will make, today, the FDA Commissioner choose between one more inspection and catching one more bad outbreak of salmonella or stepping up and starting to regulate, in this new way, tobacco at the FDA. The salmonella outbreak cost the industry about $100 million just for tomatoes last year alone. People are dying because we are not meeting our obligations for food safety. This bill jeopardizes the Commissioner from meeting that core and important element in food safety in the United States.

But that is not all. Chronic pain. We are very close. They have new technology that is getting close to being approved by the FDA. You will make that Commissioner stand up and say, ''I'm sorry that you have arthritis and have waited and prayed every day of your life for that cure, that new medicine that is going to alleviate your pain and give you a quality of life. I'm sorry, we have to wait 6 months for that cure.'' Six months does mean a lot.

Pediatric cancer, we are very close to some great treatments, some great treatments. If it is your son or your daughter in your family, are you willing to say, let's wait 6 months for that cure, for that medicine, for that very treatment that may save your life? You make the FDA Commissioner choose when you pass this bill today if we don't close this loophole. It is not done.

Biologic drugs, we all know how important they are, what kind of cures they can bring, the innovation. They are already hurting economically. You're telling them, ''wait 6 months for that new cure for whatever disease ails you because we want to get this bureaucracy started at the FDA and take some of those resources.'' What scientist are we going to ask that Commissioner to remove from the bench to do that study for 6 months to find that cure? That is what we are doing today if we don't close this loophole.

Alzheimer's, we have some great cures. But they keep telling us they need additional resources to meet the demands on the new medicines that are coming forward to either alleviate pain or alleviate the disease or slow it or even cure it, God help us all if we can do that soon. But you make the Commissioner decide, today, to stop that research, to stop that process, to slow down the clinical trial so we can institute this new bureaucracy on cigarettes at the FDA.

Some pretty exciting stuff on HPV, cervical cancer is in the works.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I will end with this because I can go on and on about all the diseases that mean so much to all of us, a very simple thing, close this dangerous loophole, vote for this motion to recommit, protect the families, stand with them as they pray each night for a cure for their diseases.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair. All Members are reminded not to traffic the well while other Members are under recognition.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, this bill will not divert resources away from other important functions at the Food and Drug Administration. It is fully funded by a user fee from the tobacco industry. And that user fee will fund this effort, and none of the funds to deal with tobacco will come out of other activities at FDA. But there is an exception. In the beginning, until the user fees are collected and disbursed, we want FDA to get going. So we allow the FDA to borrow money, no more than for two quarters, from the general revenue. But they have to pay it back. That is the only use of general revenues that

would be borrowed under this motion to recommit.

Now, the American Cancer Society is supporting our legislation. Would they support our legislation if it diverted the FDA from review of drugs that cancer patients rely on to save their lives? The same is true of all the other health groups that support our bill. They believe this bill accomplishes effective tobacco regulation without diverting the FDA from lifesaving activities that the FDA must undertake.

The bill is supported by 1,000 public health and other groups, including the Heart Association, the Lung Association, the Cancer Society and the American Public Health Association. They would not support this bill if it did what the gentleman from Michigan claims it does, because his claim is inaccurate. And these groups know that. And that is why they are supporting the Waxman-Platts legislation.

Simply put, the Waxman-Platts bill makes absolutely clear that the tobacco program will not detract from FDA's other activities, and we shouldn't delay the regulation of tobacco, which is really the impact of this motion to recommit should it be adopted. We shouldn't delay this long overdue measure based on a misplaced concern about FDA's other resource challenges.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to recommit and to vote for the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 256, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

AYES—169

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ellsworth
Emerson
Etheridge
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walden
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—256

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
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
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Blunt
Hinojosa
Kaptur
Miller, Gary
Pascrell
Westmoreland

□ 1200

Mr. TEAGUE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. WALDEN of Oregon, RADANOVICH and WHITFIELD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. 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 298, noes 112, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

AYES—298

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Camp
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr

Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—112

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Bright
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell
Carter
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Pence
Perriello
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—21

Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blunt
Broun (GA)
Cardoza
Carney
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Larson (CT)
Levin
Luján
Miller, Gary
Napolitano
Pascrell
Roybal-Allard
Salazar
Velázquez
Westmoreland
Wu

□ 1207

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House that I missed rollcall No. 187. If I had been present I would have voted "aye" on the final passage of H.R. 1256. Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 2, 2009, I was delayed in a Congressional Hispanic Caucus meeting and was not able to vote on rollcall No. 187. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on passage of H.R. 1256—Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 187, I inadvertently pressed the "no" button. I meant to vote "aye" on passage of H.R. 1256.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 187 on H.R. 1256, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, today the House voted on final passage of H.R. 1256, The Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. I was unavoidably detained and was unable to be here for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on the bill.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was detained in an elevator in the Capitol building due to a mechanical malfunction earlier today. As a result, I missed rollcall vote 187 on passage of H.R. 1256, Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. If present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 187 I was held up in a meeting and unable to vote due to delayed elevators. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 187, due to delayed elevators. I was unable to get to the Chamber in time to note. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 187, the elevator was delayed, and I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 187 I was held up in a meeting and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 187 I was held up in a meeting and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, on April 2, 2009, I missed one vote regarding H.R. 1256, the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on final passage (rollcall vote 187).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on April 1 during rollcall votes 175 through 182. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 175 to table H. Res. 312; "yea" on rollcall vote 176 on agreeing to H. Res. 305; "yea" on rollcall vote 177 on agreeing to H. Res. 306; "yea" on rollcall vote 178 on passage of H. R. 1575; "yea" on rollcall vote 179 on agreeing to H. Res. 290; "nay" on rollcall vote 180 on agreeing to the Bean amendment to H. R. 1664; and "yea" on rollcall vote 182 on passage of H. R. 1664.

On April 2, I was absent for rollcall 187, final passage of H.R. 1256. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 305 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. 85.

□ 1208

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. 85), with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier, 60 minutes of debate remained on the concurrent resolution.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 30 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has 30 minutes remaining.

Who yields time?

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, we resume this morning. When we'd broken off last night, we'd had a lively but civil and spirited debate. There were some things said last night that were just so wildly off the mark that they bear just a minute of consideration to correct the RECORD.

It was said repeatedly that this resolution was about the biggest tax increase in history. In fact, don't take it from me. Look at the CBO. After examining the President's budget, they said it will work out to be a net tax reduction of $1.7 trillion over a 10-year period of time.

The size of the budget was mentioned several times in the debate. It's enormous, no question about it, but it's partly swollen by virtue of what has happened over the past year in the financial services industry, beginning

with the failure of Lehman Brothers, of other firms on Wall Street, and due to our intervention, which has cost us substantially and is factored into the budget that we are dealing with today.

Our friends were blaming that crisis on us. In truth, we all share some responsibility for it, but it's one of the reasons we have a swollen number.

Before we begin the debate proper, I would like to recognize for 1 minute the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) because he was an active participant in the debate last night. This is just to connect it to where we left off.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Chair, I think there are a couple of points that the RECORD should accurately reflect.

Number 1: There is no energy tax in this budget. It's a statement that has been claimed again and again and again. It's not correct.

Number 2: This budget reduces taxes for middle class Americans by a net $1.7 billion over time.

Number 3: The budget resolution assumes that the Pomeroy estate tax plan will be adopted, meaning that individuals will get a $3.5 million exemption and that couples will get a $7 million exemption from the estate tax.

Then the final point that, I think, can't be stated enough is: When our friends on the other side worry about doubling the national debt in 5 years, it's a subject for which they speak with great authority, because that's exactly what they just did. Their plan doubled that debt over 5 years. So they do know what they're talking about when that happens.

Mr. SPRATT. We now would like to return to the broad issue of fiscal responsibility. For the purposes of leading that debate, I would like to yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman SPRATT. He and his staff have provided great leadership over the last month or so on the development of this budget resolution, and he has had many difficult positions to reconcile. He has worked closely with myself and with my Blue Dog colleagues, since the new President came into office, to put this budget resolution in place.

In March, Madam Chair, for the first time in 8 years, Congress had a President who sent us a budget blueprint that was honest and that laid out for the American people all of the expenditures and all of the projected revenues, projected expenditures, in an honest way so that the American people could see it.

What do I mean by that?

What I mean is, for the last 7 or 8 years and prior to the new administration coming in, when the President's budget came to Capitol Hill, it neglected to include massive spending obligations such as war-cost funding, Alternative Minimum Tax fixes, the Medicare physician payment fixes—these are all items that the American people and the Congress knew that we would do—disaster relief, middle-class tax cuts, and other tax provisions like the estate tax, which needed to be fixed because of the convoluted mess that was put in place in 2001 under the Bush tax plan.

□ 1215

Therefore, the budget President Obama sent us is honest. But honestly, it left a lot of us with sticker shock when we saw it because I don't think many of us and many of the American people realized how bad the situation had gotten over the last 7 or 8 years. I think we as a group—and I speak for the group that I work with, the Blue Dogs—we had two options: We could say ''no'' or we could work constructively to place this country back on the right track to fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility. We chose the latter path, and that is to work with Chairman SPRATT to see if we couldn't get this country back on track.

We inherited a mess. The numbers are bad. But we, working together, we can get back on the right track to start with an honest document, an honest budget, and this certainly provides that.

Madam Chairman, I have several Members that would like to speak, and at this moment I am going to yield 2 minutes to a fellow Blue Dog from Louisiana, one of the leaders of the Blue Dogs, Representative MELANCON.

The CHAIR. The gentleman having the time may yield but not a specific block of time.

Mr. MELANCON. Thank you for the allotment of time, Mr. BOYD.

Let me start by saying that a budget resolution is not a binding document. It is a guideline, it is a principle, it is to give guidance to the Congress and to the administration. It has no taxes that are included in it. There are, in fact, spending cuts included in it.

Working with Chairman SPRATT, who has been diligent in trying to put together a good spending package, a good budget package, we, as the Blue Dogs, have consistently asked for help in trying to bring control over the spending that has occurred in this country over the last 8 years that has given us the deficit we have.

If you go and take a look at the last budget that President Bush put forward, add into that the offline budgets, the offline spending that he had, if you put them together then you'll find President Obama's budget in roughly the same numbers.

We are not fooling the American public anymore. We are trying to say to the American public, This is what your government has been spending and you deserve to know that. And as a Blue Dog, what we're saying is we're here to work with people to try to make this government work for the American public and the taxpayers of this country.

We have gone for too long with deceit and trying to trick the American public by thinking that they are not watching what was spent in the war, by not paying attention that the alternative minimum tax was funded out of budget, that we were just borrowing and spending, borrowing and spending. And if we keep this up, there will come a day when China will tell us when we can borrow and when we can spend, and I think I would rather have the dictate come from the American public rather than the country of China that holds our debt.

Mr. BOYD. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his work, and obviously, he has laid out what the problems are that exist before us. And one of the things that we wanted to do in this budget is make sure that we reincorporated the tools, the fiscal responsibility tools that were put in place in the 1990s by then-President Clinton, a Democratic-controlled White House, and a Republican-controlled House and Senate working together to put in place tools that would discipline the Congress in the way it collected and spent this money. Those tools were the PAYGO principle. Pay as you go. If you are going to create a new program or a new spending program or new tax cut, you had to figure out where the money was going to come from to pay for it so it would be budget deficit neutral.

Discretionary spending caps, a very important tool that I am sure that some on the other side of the aisle, Mr. RYAN and I, would certainly agree upon.

So those tools were put in place in the 1990s but then allowed to expire in 2002 shortly after the Bush administration came into power in January of 2001.

After those tools were allowed to expire, then you begin to see spending run out of control. And we had increases in all kinds of spending: defense spending, nondefense discretionary spending, mandatory—there were new mandatory programs created like the Medicare Prescription Drug Program without any accommodation for where that money would come from to pay for that.

So that's the kind of lack of discipline, lack of enforcement tools and lack of fiscal management that existed in the first 8 years of this decade. No more.

We have to discipline ourselves, and the Blue Dogs said we want PAYGO back in the statute. We want the tools that are needed to get us back on the fiscal track to get back to balance. We want them back in law. And Chairman SPRATT has accommodated us, and he put statutory PAYGO into this budget resolution, assumes that it will be passed by the House and the Senate and signed into law; and President Obama has committed to work with us on that.

So this has been a top priority for the Blue Dogs for years. We want to see programs like the Medicare Doctor Fix and tax relief and AMT and disaster relief, we want to see those benefit the American people. We want to also say to the American people, This is what your government is doing for you, and this is what it's going to cost you. I think it's time that we had that kind of straight talk for the American people, and this budget presumes that kind of straight talk.

So, Madam Chairman, I am extremely proud of what Chairman SPRATT has done to accommodate these provisions that the Blue Dogs have asked for.

On a more specific note, some of the things that we wanted done is we wanted these new initiatives of the President, we wanted them to be deficit neutral. Health care reform is going to be a major undertaking of this United States Congress and the new President, but we think it's something that's important for us to do for the benefit of the American people. And Chairman SPRATT has put in this budget resolution that we can do but it needs to be budget-deficit neutral. We don't have to go out and borrow the money some place to pay for that new program.

Climate change, another provision, energy, the whole climate change energy debate that we're going to have this year, and some things have to be done there. We want those provisions to be budget-deficit neutral. And they will be per this budget resolution.

There is always a debate about the amount of nondefense discretionary spending. Nondefense discretionary, you take the discretionary spending, you remove defense from it and then you have your other domestic discretionary nondefense spending and how much do you increase that or do you try to. Our objective was to try to get it as close to inflation with literally no increases until we get back on a good footing financially. And Chairman SPRATT has accommodated that request. I mean, the number—the increase in that number is 1.9 percent above inflation. That is a very, very small number. And we know that the American people are going to have to sacrifice, and we are willing to get into that sacrifice with them.

I see that we've just been joined, Madam Chairman, by the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. MOORE, and if Mr. MOORE would approach the microphone, I would love to yield him some time.

Representative MOORE from Kansas has been a leader in the Blue Dogs for a number of years now, and I would yield to him.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Thank you.

After years of irresponsible fiscal and economic policies, we're faced with a financial crisis that's affecting the lives of Americans all across our country. This administration in Congress and our Nation inherited from the previous administration a $5.8 trillion national debt which increased that much over the last 8 years. We're now in the worst recession since the Great Depression.

But Congress and the administration are working to develop a realistic plan to put our country back on a fiscally responsible path while making targeted investments and health care and energy research that will reduce future costs and lay the foundation for future economic growth. This budget is not perfect, but it does take several steps, in my mind, that are critical for us to return to the sustainable fiscal path.

The budget resolution for the first time makes a good-faith effort to provide us with a true accounting of our Nation's fiscal position and accounts for items that have been left out of the budget for years.

Second, the budget goes further than the President's budget in cutting the deficit by two-thirds over the next 4 years. These deficits are still too high, and there is no question that difficult choices need to be made. But we're back on a sustainable fiscal recovery.

And third, this budget gives us the best opportunity for reinstituting statutory PAYGO. This budget resolution makes sensible investments in several areas that are key to the long-term health of our Nation, including education, renewable energy technologies, and health care reform.

I thank Chairman SPRATT for his work on this budget resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Chairman, I would like to remind the American people that there are some—and my friends on the other side of the aisle—there are some one-time costs accommodated for in this budget. And some may not think they are important, but I think they are certainly government responsibilities.

And one of these is the one-time cost of the census, the 10-year census. That's coming up soon, and we have to accommodate that census in the spending bill. So I would remind the American people that that is being done and that is a nondefense discretionary spending item.

There is also an item in here that relates to Farmers Home Administration defaults. Obviously, we are in a very unique time in this Nation's history in terms of home mortgage failures and foreclosures, and there are some extraordinary costs that are happening in the Farmers Home Administration as a result of these very difficult economic times we're in. So I would like to remind the American people that we have put some additional money in this budget to accommodate the associated costs with those foreclosures.

Madam Chair, the average level of nondefense discretionary spending between 1969 and 2008 was 3.8 percent. This budget projects a better path on spending than there was under the previous President. I and my Blue Dog colleagues support controls on nondefense discretionary numbers as a way to get our country back on track, and we have made tremendous progress in this budget to control government spending and growth.

Madam Chairman, to close out the few moments that I have left, I would like to call on my friend from Louisiana again, Mr. MELANCON.

Mr. MELANCON. Thank you, Representative BOYD.

A budget is only as strong as those who are here to enforce it. The Blue Dogs have been committed to fiscal responsibility and accountability for over 15 years, and we will be here to make sure that the House follows this blueprint for putting our government and the economy on a fiscally sustainable path. We are here to work with all in this Congress for a budget, for a country, for a government that works for the people again.

Mr. BOYD. I thank my friend, Mr. MELANCON.

And I would say as we close, Madam Chair, to the American people and to my chairman, Mr. SPRATT, I want to thank him for the great work he's done, and to the ranking member on the Republican side, Mr. RYAN. He's a wonderfully smart man, and we reach out a hand to work with him as we bring the country out of these very difficult economic times that we have.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I will yield myself 5 minutes at this time.

Madam Chair, I just heard one of my colleagues say the cap-and-trade proposal is not in this budget. Let me show you the stalking horse that's in this budget. Page 30 on the chairman's mark, it says in their reserve fund on increasing energy independence, we can have legislation that provides for and limits reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

Now, we just heard Mr. BLUMENAUER out on the floor a little while ago saying, ''Cap-and-trade. That's what cap-and-trade is. Our proposal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is cap-and-trade.''

□ 1230

Now, it might not say cap-and-trade here, but you're saying we're going to achieve what cap-and-trade is.

One more point. You reconcile the Energy and Commerce Committee. What does that mean for people who don't know what reconciliation means? It means they're telling the Energy and Commerce Committee you can do whatever you want within your jurisdiction, $1 billion of savings. So you can have a $1.3 trillion cap-and-trade tax increase, and then have a $1.2999 trillion spending program out of it, and you satisfy your reconciliation instructions.

I heard somebody say, you know, the debt goes up under all these budgets. That is true. I've got news for everybody. The national debt is going to increase. It's going to go up under anybody's budget, under any conceivable scenario. You know why? The baby

boomers are retiring. We've got 40 million people who are going from paying taxes into the programs who are going to retire and collect money from these benefits. So the debt's going up, no two ways about that.

The question is, what are we doing about it? Do we have a really bad fiscal situation right now? Have we inherited a mess? Yes. The question is, what are we doing to clean up this mess? Are we making it better or are we making it worse?

I would suggest that the budget that is here before the floor makes it so much worse. We have a plan that we will talk about later that gets our debt and our borrowing under control. This is a budget that sends our budget deficit and debt out of control, doubling it in 5½ years, tripling it in a little over 10. More money going out the door in borrowing, raising the national debt under this Presidency than under all prior presidencies combined.

So let's see if we're really being fiscally conservative here. Let's review the budget of our Federal agencies.

The annual average increases in government agencies over the last 8 years, under a Republican President, Democrat and Republican Congress: legislative branch got an annual increase of 6.1 percent; the judiciary, an annual increase of 5.9 percent; education, an annual increase of 10.2 percent; Health and Human Services, annual increase of 7.7 percent; Justice, annual increase of 7.0 percent; Labor, annual increase of 9.1 percent; State Department, an annual increase of 11.9 percent; Transportation Department, annual increase of 6.5 percent. Let's go to the executive office of the President. We had some problems there with Katrina, 87.3 percent annual increase. Total outlays of our government, from our government agencies over the last 8 years: an annual increase of 6.4 percent.

So what's Congress doing this session? Are we being fiscally conservative? Are we being frugal? Are we watching taxpayer dollars? Look at the family budget. Do you think the family budget is going up an average of 6.4 percent a year? Inflation's not even 1 percent. Do you think State and local governments are going up that fast?

Let's look at what we just passed a month ago. An increase in this year's budget from the stimulus, the Education Department, get this, an increase of 196 percent, and this budget says let's throw on top of that a 13 percent increase.

HUD, an increase of 34 percent this year. What's going on top of that in this budget? Another 18 percent increase in their budget.

Labor Department, an increase this year, 38 percent in their budget. What does this do? Another 5 percent on top.

State Department, $600 million increase in stimulus. What are they saying in this budget? Let's increase the State Department by 41 percent.

The Environmental Protection Agency, good agency, they do smart, important things. In the stimulus bill this year, they got a 92 percent increase in their budget. What does this budget bill propose? Let's give them another 35 percent increase this year in their budget.

Madam Chair, this is reckless. This is reckless spending. Name me a family in Janesville, Wisconsin, that's going to get a 92 percent increase in their family budget. Name me a local government in your communities that's going to get a 196 percent increase in their budget this year.

We are spending like drunken sailors—wait, I apologize to the drunken sailors of America for that comment. This is reckless. This is why this budget doubles our national debt in five-and-a-half years and triples it in 10 years.

Madam Chair, at this moment, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for the time.

You know, in the confusion and the smoke and mirrors of what frequently passes for floor debate, the budget every year actually offers us very clear contrasts between priorities and the vision and the direction for the Nation.

America is at a historic crossroads. We have severe recession, record foreclosures, lack of credit, growing deficits, and high unemployment.

This year alone, Congress has spent $787 billion on an economic stimulus and another $480 billion on what's called an omnibus. This does not take into account the TARP spending, the Federal reserve lending programs that currently expose over $5 trillion in government capital to financial institutions and companies.

We are in the midst of an all-out economic downturn not experienced in generations, and yet, while families are cutting back from their own spending and reprioritizing their budgets, the Federal budget just keeps spending. Families and small businesses, and even local and State governments, have to make tough decisions, quite frankly decisions this Congress has been unwilling to make.

This isn't a budget. It's an invoice. It's at best a $3.5 trillion IOU deliverable to every hardworking family across the country, courtesy of Washington, DC. You earn it; we'll spend it.

The administration and the Congress had an opportunity to produce a responsible budget that would do more than throw borrowed money at old problems. Instead, we're debating a budget that proposes more spending, more taxing, more borrowing and no reforms.

If the majority's budget is supposed to represent a new era of responsibility, I'd hate to see what this Congress considers to be irresponsible. Washington continues to ask hardworking families to make tough decisions on their own, but the doublespeak coming out of our Nation's capital is quite the opposite.

The Democratic budget we are reconsidering today will not end Washington's spending spree but further saddle future generations with irresponsible spending priorities of this Congress and this administration. It assumes a peak deficit using terms and numbers that are inconceivable.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the gentleman.

It is important that we adopt the Republican budget that offers no new taxes, lower spending, and lower deficits, and a lesser burden on future generations, who are going to be expected to carry America into the 21st century as a strong capitalistic and free society and not the Venezuelan model that we are creeping ever closer to each day.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Chair, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

Mr. MCCOTTER. Madam Chairman, from the G–20 summit in England to factories in France to the streets of our Nation, the economic crisis is causing and exacerbating societal chaos.

Now, the Democrats' $3.6 trillion budget, that spends too much, borrows too much, and taxes too much, will wreak the chaos of the financial institutions within our political institutions and, thereby, further the economic disorder within our midst.

Thus, let us remember what working Americans already know: Big Government does not stop chaos. Big Government is chaos. And we cannot build a stable economy on government spending.

I urge rejection of the Democrats' $3.6 trillion budget that spends too much, borrows too much, and taxes too much.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this moment, Madam Chair, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the House Republican Conference chairman.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The budget brought to the floor by the Democratic majority today spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much, and the American people know it.

This Democrat budget will double the national debt in 5 years, triple it in 10; 2010 spending alone is $3 trillion, 25 percent of GDP. More than $1 trillion in tax increases in the majority's budget. The 2010 deficit estimated at $1 trillion, and independent estimates suggest a deficit of nearly $1 trillion a year for the next 10 years.

The numbers tell the tale. The Democratic majority is proposing the most fiscally irresponsible budget in American history. But this isn't just about the numbers. It's not about dollars and cents alone.

It's about who we are as a country. It's about the American dream, and it's about our kids. It's about those small business owners and working families and family farmers that are dreading the idea of paying higher taxes during these hard times, higher marginal rates, higher national energy tax on every American household. And it's about our kids who may not even know or understand what they have to fear in the mountain range of debt that we are piling on.

It reminds me of a time a few years back I went to the CVS, forgot my wallet. I was with my 10-year-old daughter, and I reached down and I grabbed her purse, and I took out her little kid's debit card to pay for my Coke. I felt so guilty about it. I still feel bad about it today. Truth is, that's exactly what we're doing here.

Let's not do this to our kids. Let's not borrow from the next generation of Americans things that we ought to be dealing with in sacrifices and hard decisions today. Every American family, every American business is answering these challenging times by sitting down around tables, sitting down around desks, and with sacrifice and frugality, they're finding their way through these challenging days. Congress should do no different.

Let's reject this Democrat budget. Let's reject runaway Federal spending of those who believe we can borrow and spend and bail our way back to a growing economy, and embrace fiscal discipline and reform and tax relief in the Republican alternative that will truly put our fiscal house in order and get this economy growing again.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership on our alternative budget because, indeed, it is important that we bring forward a budget that is fiscally responsible because the Democrat budget does spend too much, tax too much, borrow too much, and it compromises hope and opportunity for future generations, and that is of such concern to me.

It is something that should not be lost in this debate, that after 232 years in this great Nation and 43 Presidents and the debt that was accrued there and for many of us, like me, that's too much. This budget is going to more than double that, and it is reckless.

I do think it is irresponsible that my grandchildren, one who is 10½ months old, one that will arrive in June, are going to be burdened with a $70,000 price tag because of the actions of this House. Indeed, I do see that as irresponsible, and it is something that angers me.

It also angers me that section 303 of this bill, it does have an energy tax in there. You can call it anything you want to, but according to MIT, not according to MARSHA, but according to MIT, $3,128 per household. Now, that $8 a week tax rebate that you're going to see in your check certainly goes away when compared with $3,128.

And Madam Chairman, a previous speaker said we've inherited a mess, the numbers are bad, these deficits are going to continue. You know what, they must have liked the deficits so much that they're going to double and triple them, because that is exactly what they're doing with these actions. Those deficits and that debt should be coming down, but these actions are going to see it double. They're going to triple it. So you must have liked it an awful lot because you're certainly dishing out more of it in the actions you're taking.

Someone else said this budget is just a guideline. You know what, Madam Chairman, isn't it interesting, if you don't spend everything that's in that guideline, all of the sudden the bureaucracy yells, well, look what, they cut us. Let's act responsibly.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, for a rejoinder, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Chair, I want to ask my friend from Tennessee who just spoke, if she's still here, that when she makes reference to MIT analysis about the so-called cap-and-trade, first of all, as my friend from Wisconsin knows very well, the way that we raise revenue in a budget resolution is to direct reconciliation instructions. And I frankly think his interpretation of the Energy and Commerce instruction is incorrect. It's for health care.

But I want to go back to what our friend from Tennessee just said about the MIT study, and I will ask unanimous consent at the appropriate time to enter this letter into the RECORD, a letter dated April 1 from Professor John Reilly, I believe is his name, who is the author of that study. I will read what he says.

□ 1245

He said, ''It has come to my attention that an analysis we conducted examining proposals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions has been misrepresented in recent press releases distributed by the National Republican Congressional Committee.

''The press release claims our report estimates an average cost per family of a carbon cap-and-trade program that would meet targets now being discussed in Congress to be over $3,000. But that is nearly 10 times the correct estimate, which is approximately $340.''

Is the gentlelady still on the floor? I would yield to my friend, the ranking member, to explain—is that the study on which you're relying?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I can't speak for her. Let me ask the gentleman this. It's my understanding that that MIT study comes up with these calculations based on the fact that people are getting rebates to offset the higher energy costs. I think that's right.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, I believe that's true. But I would like you to answer the fundamental question: Is that the study on which you're relying?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I can't answer the question because the gentlelady said it. But here's the interesting point. Since you just acknowledged that that study rests upon the fact of having rebates go back to taxpayers, then why is it that this budget you're bringing to the floor repeals the rebates? This budget says the Making Work Pay tax credit goes away.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. If I can just ask for 30 more seconds.

Mr. SPRATT. I'm glad to yield 30 seconds. Maybe Mr. RYAN would yield some more time as well.

Mr. ANDREWS. The budget doesn't repeal any rebate whatsoever. What it does is set up a process where, if the Congress wants to deal with cap-and-trade, it will evaluate all the different ways the money could be a raised, the ways rebates could be paid, and whatnot.

I'm just very troubled that the minority continues to rely, apparently, on a study that the author claims is just being blatantly misrepresented.

Mr. SPRATT. Does the gentleman desire further time to rejoin?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will simply say: Let's put the MIT study aside for a moment and look at the Congressional Budget Office. The Congressional Budget Office is saying it's going to hit families an average of $1,600 a year. That's still a lot. It's more than the Making Work Pay tax credit.

But I think it's also fairly revealing that since the chairman's mark takes away the Making Work Pay tax credit, the only way to get it back is impose a cap-and-trade regime to get those revenues. Even the Congressional Budget Office says the tax increase on families buying energy will far exceed the amount of the Make Work Pay tax credit.

No matter how you slice it, no matter how you dice it, people are going to get an energy tax increase if you pass that bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, this argument we've heard ad nauseam here that there's $3,100 per home rests on two arguments. The first is that there is an instruction to raise the revenue in the budget. Mr. DREIER admitted on the floor earlier that's not the case. Then, the $3,100 rests upon this MIT study—and the author of the study has now told us that's a misrepresentation.

I think a lot of the other claims that the minority makes about the budget are equally invalid.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Might I ask for a unanimous consent agreement

then, just to make sure we're sure about this—to play it doubly safe—I would like to ask unanimous consent to remove the Commerce Committee reconciliation instructions out of this bill to make sure that that doesn't occur.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would object to that.

The CHAIR. The Chair cannot entertain that request in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of our caucus, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina, Madam Chair, and commend him for the outstanding job that he has done and, most notably, as we heard from the President the other day, the civility in which you and Mr. RYAN conducted the hearings.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are honorable people. They put forward proposals in an honorable fashion. They have done so for several years. This President and this administration inherited a deep and cavernous hole—from which it will take great effort, but we will make a steady ascent out of—not without having to face the largest deficits in the history of this country that were thrust upon this new President and this new Congress.

Yes, it was tried in the past to send more money, tax dollars back to the Nation's wealthiest 1 percent. Yes, they were lax in terms of oversight and review in what transpired on Wall Street that has brought this Nation the great difficulty that it is working through now.

The answer isn't the way it's been done in the past. The answer is in the hope that this administration and, under the tireless work of Mr. SPRATT, that we provide the American people—not the Nation's wealthiest 1 percent, not the barons on Wall Street—but the American people with an opportunity to invest in their health care, to invest in their energy systems.

The other ''do nothing approach'' of wanting to continue to export $200 billion abroad annually to pay taxes to Russia and the OPEC nations and Venezuela is counterproductive.

It doesn't help grow our economy here, it doesn't invest in the American people, it doesn't give them what they need in terms of health care and in education. And they are inextricably tied and linked to our future.

In a knowledge-based society, what we need is the budget that has been put before us today—that brings values back and educates our people, puts them back to work and gives them energy that will allow us to be independent from our foreign competitors.

Mr. SPRATT. Could I inquire of the Chair how much time is left on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I will yield myself 2 minutes. The only thing that's on the ascent in this budget is the national debt, the budgets of our government agencies, the tax burden on the American people, the deficits. Because after you lower the deficit a little bit, it goes right back up.

You know what is ascending in this budget is the fact that the national debt goes to double of what it is today in 5½, triples in 10½ years. That's what's on the ascent.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman who just spoke. We're good friends. And he is an honorable man. We just have honorable disagreements. The chairman and I have a lot of respect for one another. We're friends. We have honest disagreements. I wish we would have more debate about this because we are really, truly debating the fiscal future of this Nation right here.

I asked for this unanimous consent to have what we call ''reconciliation'' taken out of the bill. What that means is they are setting up a procedural device so that they can bring through nationalizing our health care system, a brand new energy tax on top of all our energy, the largest tax increase in American history, the biggest debt increase ever.

They can bring this thing through here in just a few hours of debate in the people's House, no more than 20 hours of debate in the other Chamber, with no amendments. They can get this agenda passed so fast with this procedural stunt that the American people won't know what hit them.

I just have to ask a question. You know, should we be giving any government agency a 200 percent increase in their budget this year? The Education Department is great. It's education. Six cents on the dollar on education spending which, by the way, comes from the Federal Government. All the rest is State and local government.

Name me a family in America that just got a 196 percent increase in their family budget. We just gave that to the Department of Education. This budget says: Let's give them another 13 percent increase.

In February, we passed a bill giving the Environmental Protection Agency a 92 percent increase in their budget this year. This bill says that wasn't enough.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

This bill says that wasn't enough. Let's give them another 35 percent. The problem is this: We're chasing ever-higher spending with ever-higher taxes, and the taxes never catch up with the spending. So the debt we're increasing is the highest we've ever seen. It is just so reckless, so irresponsible.

Madam Chair, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. Before ever serving in elected office, I spent nearly 20 years practicing public accounting—helping individuals and businesses balance their budgets. Balancing budgets is my business, and I'm certain of one thing—this budget spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much.

I recently asked my constituents in Kansas how this budget will impact them. I heard stories from small business owners who are afraid that higher taxes will force them to close their doors and lay off employees, as well as from middle-class families scrimping to pay their bills and just save a little each month.

One family wrote this: ''We are not asking for money from the government—just that they carefully take care of the taxes we pay. We consider paying taxes our responsibility as American citizens. But we also need to be able to have enough to live on.''

Gimmicks don't hide the fact that this budget will triple the Federal debt in 10 years, bringing it to $17.3 trillion by 2019, and will increase the tax burden on working families across the Nation to allow for massive new spending plans to grow government.

My constituents in Kansas sent me to Washington to protect their hard-earned paychecks. It's very disappointing that this budget falls so short of the fiscal discipline rhetoric that we have heard so much about lately.

The House should reject this budget resolution and adopt a responsible plan to curb spending, create jobs, and control debt. Our children's future depend on it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the vice ranking member of the House Budget Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. As I listened closely to my friends on the other side of the aisle, there's a couple of themes that continue to reoccur. One theme is: It's not our fault. This mess was inherited. We sympathize with President Obama. He inherited a mess.

Well, Madam Chairman, he did inherit a mess—but he inherited a mess from a Democratic-controlled Congress.

In 2007 the deficit stood at $161 billion. Now, this year, for 2009, it's going to be $1.8 trillion—a tenfold increase under the Democratic watch in just 2 years. They inherited their own mess.

In December of 2006, unemployment stood at 4.4 percent. Now, 8.1 percent. Up 84 percent. On January 3, 2007, the Dow stood at 12,400. Most recently, it is now down 40 percent. The economic calamity happened on their watch.

Now, Madam Chair, I don't blame them for everything, but I don't understand how they accept responsibility for nothing. Absolutely nothing.

Madam Chair, what is so ironic, and it would be laughable if it wasn't so sad, is we have had Democratic leaders

come to the floor on previous budgets to decry the size of the national debt, to decry the size of the deficit.

When the deficit was less than $400 billion, and falling—still too great a number—the majority leader of the House, then minority leader, Mr. HOYER, the gentleman from Maryland, said this was equivalent to fiscal child abuse. Fiscal child abuse. And now we have a deficit of four and five times that—and stone-cold silence from the other side.

Madam Chair, reckless doesn't do justice to this budget. This is a radical budget. Radical. Never in the history of America have so few voted so fast to put so many in debt. More debt will be run up on this Democratic budget—this radical budget—in 10 years than has been run up in the entire history of our Republic. A sea of red ink for generations to come.

□ 1300

Now, part of that generation to come is my 7-year-old daughter and my 5-year-old son. I know the people on the other side of the aisle, they love their children, they love their grandchildren. But it is clear they don't love my children; because if they did, this radical budget would not be coming to the floor to put this level of debt which will bankrupt our Nation and crush the next generation, it wouldn't be on the floor. It would not be on the floor.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I give the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HENSARLING. And one other point I would like to make. I don't see the gentleman from New Jersey on the floor now. But in speaking about the national energy tax, it reminds me of that old joke, which I will not and cannot repeat on the floor but whose punch line is: Now we know what you are, now we are just haggling over price.

The Congressional Budget Office says the national energy tax is going to cost the average American family at least $1,600. We know what you are: You are a national energy tax. Now we are just haggling over the cost that will be imposed on struggling, hard-working families in America imposed by the Democrats.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. NUNES.

Mr. NUNES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I had to come back down here because I heard folks on the other side of the aisle saying that there was no energy tax in here, and last night out here on the floor late in the evening we talked about cap-and-trade.

A lot of Americans don't know what cap-and-trade means, but cap-and-trade is an energy tax. It is not a baseball cap, it has nothing to do with international trade. It is an energy tax. It is a tax on everything that you use.

So I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to please explain to me where this $2 trillion comes from if it is not a tax. Does it come out of the sky? Do we print it at the Federal Reserve? Do we borrow it from the United Nations? But there is $2 trillion in this bill that has got to come from somewhere. So it is disguised as cap-and-trade, but it is a flat-out energy tax, unless someone can explain to me what it may be.

So what do we know about this budget? We know that it has a cap-and-tax, energy tax, $2 trillion. We know that we are going to have the largest tax increase in American history. We know that at the end of President Obama's first term that he will have amassed more debt than every single President that this country has ever had. More debt. Those are the things that we know.

So unless the majority can tell us what is going to happen, where this money is going to come from, I don't know what they are smoking but somebody's hallucinating, and we need to figure that out, Madam Chair.

So I would urge a ''no'' vote on this budget. Let's go back, let's determine where these taxes are coming from, because this is absolutely reckless.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

Mr. BUYER. I want to thank the gentleman for his hard work, and I thank you and your staff also for creating this alternative budget. It is a budget I believe that you can be very proud of.

Madam Chair, this alternative budget for fiscal year 2010 would provide $106.4 billion for veterans health care and programs. This budget is $540 million above the administration's request.

The Republican alternative also reduces spending, it brings our national debt under control, and creates 2.1 million jobs, actually, more than the Democrat plan, all while not raising taxes.

This alternative budget also reflects the priorities of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, the Republican views and estimates for FY 2010, which included ensuring a seamless transition from DOD to VA. It also provides for the innovative programs to help veterans gain job skills and good-paying jobs, and making sure the VA provides world-class health care to veterans; and, ensuring that veterans disability compensation claims are adjudicated quickly and accurately. I believe all of these are issues for which both Republicans and Democrats would equally embrace.

Madam Chair, while I am supportive of the increase that the President's budget proposed for veterans, the overall budget request, for which we are having to vote on here, is nothing more than the same old shell game that we have come to know here in Washington, D.C.

President Obama had promised this open and transparent budget; however, this budget contains many of the same tax hikes and gimmicks that hide the real truth from the American people about the real fiscal situation.

Earlier this year, it was rumored and later confirmed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Eric Shinseki, that the administration was planning a proposal to bill veterans' health insurance to pay for VA treatment of their service-connected injuries. I, like many of my fellow veterans, was outraged by this proposal. We strongly believe that the same military values help guide us in our military service, and define the principles and allow us to say unto the administration that you should not be billing veterans to pay for their disabilities. It is one of the solemn obligations of government.

The budget views and estimates of the Republicans on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee took a very strong stand, while the Democrats' position was very muted. It wasn't until the veterans service organizations met with President Obama at the White House did this proposal then get out unto the American people. Only then did some of my Democrat leaders here in the House then, in order to get in front of that parade, said, ''Oh, yes, I am just as outraged.''

I look at it like this: Character is defined at the moment of calling. What do you do at the moment of call? Are you muted, or do you stand up and take charge and take control? It didn't happen, and I was greatly disappointed.

Thank you, for the time Mr. RYAN and I thank you and your staff for your hard work on this alternative budget. It is a budget of which we can be proud.

Madam Chair, the Republican Alternative for Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Resolution would provide $106.4 billion for Veterans healthcare and programs. This budget is $540 million above the Administration's request.

The Republican Alternative also reduces spending, brings our national debt under control, creates more than 2.1 million more jobs than the Democrat plan all while not raising taxes.

The Republican budget alternative reflects the priorities of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs Republican Views and Estimates for FY 2010 which include:

ensuring a seamless transition from DoD to VA;

providing innovative programs to help veterans gain job skills and good paying jobs;

making sure VA provides world class health care to veterans; and

ensuring the veterans disability compensation claims are adjudicated quickly and accurately.

Madam Chair, while I am supportive of the increase that the President's budget proposes for veterans, the overall budget request is really nothing more than more of the same old Washington shell game. Instead of proposing an open and transparent budget, as President Obama and the Democrats promised, this budget contains many of the same tax hikes and gimmicks that hide the truth from the American people about our real fiscal situation.

Earlier this year it was rumored, and later confirmed by Secretary of Veterans Affairs Eric Shineski, that the Administration was planning a proposal to bill veterans' health insurance to pay for VA treatment of their service connected injuries.

I, like many of my fellow veterans, was outraged by this proposal and I strongly believe that the same military values that guided me and my fellow servicemembers should define how our government provides benefits and assistance to them now as veterans.

The prospect of VA collecting from third-party insurers for care provided for service-connected conditions is contrary to these military values and our obligation as a grateful Nation.

This proposal was soundly rejected by the Republican Members in our FY 2010 Views and Estimates and in the March 18th letter to the President by all members of the Republican House leadership and all of the Republican members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

It was only after the voice of reason was heard from Republicans and numerous veteran service organizations that President Obama dropped his proposal.

However, by dropping his proposal the President left a $540 million hole in the VA budget. And, I am proud to say that the Republican Alternative budget includes $540 million to fill the gap.

While I am happy that this crisis was averted and this outrageous proposal was rejected, the fact that President Obama would even consider such a proposal is worrisome to me and other veterans advocates.

Madam Chair, the overall Democratic budget is not good for Americans, including veterans. The Democratic budget contains a $1.5 trillion tax hike. This includes tax hikes on veterans and their families, and veterans who own small businesses.

It is unfortunate that Democrats continue to try to pass the largest tax hike in American history. This is the wrong message to send to our veterans and their families when our country is in a recession.

Madam Chair, we are a nation at war, and we will win these wars. The best way to maintain morale of our servicemembers is to make tough decisions here that will engender their confidence in our capacity to preserve the vitality of this nation while they fight for its freedom.

I believe that the Republican alternative helps do exactly that, while honoring the promises we have made our veterans and their families.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, a Vietnam veteran, a colonel in the Border Guard, SILVESTRE REYES.

Mr. REYES. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership of the committee and for the inclusive process that he has utilized to come up with this budget resolution.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 85, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this budget because, at a time when Americans are looking for leadership, at a time when they are looking for this new administration to keep our country safe, this budget resolution provides the tools to do just that. It provides increased support for our national security, it increases the funding for the Department of Defense and for the veterans budget. It also funds above the administration's defense request.

These additions help this country meet its military goals, it supports the efforts to reform the acquisition program, it supports the efforts to improve facilities, it supports and sets out important steps to help our country care for our wounded, our ill, and our injured servicemembers.

The resolution matches the President's request for overseas operations. Having his separate request is important. It provides the transparency that has been missing in describing the real cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This funding is important as we sustain our efforts in Iraq with an eye towards responsibly reducing troop levels throughout the coming 2 years. This funding is also important because it supports the administration's new Afghanistan strategy, and the intelligence community stands committed to supporting the new strategy using every means possible to attain success in Afghanistan.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. REYES. Our intelligence professionals stand ready to not only continue their support to the war fighter, but also to continue their support to the policymakers that are working on issues that affect not just our country but the entire world.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution. Americans are smart. They know who got us in this mess. They know what administration inherited a surplus and what administration inherited a mess. The record is clear. The dog they have sent out isn't hunting.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I assume the gentleman from South Carolina has the right to close. Is that correct, Madam Chair?

The CHAIR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman from South Carolina have any other speakers?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I come from the middle class. I was a military spouse, and my husband is now a veteran; my children and my husband all have a chronic disease, asthma; my mother is elderly; and, I pay college tuition for kids.

I looked at this budget from this prism: Does it help the middle class, the military and military families and vets, and those families with medical problems, the elderly, and families with kids in school? The answer is a resounding ''yes.'' And that is why I support this budget that supports the middle class.

Ninety-five percent of Americans will get a tax cut. This budget helps our military become better prepared and it supports military families. It increases VA funding by more that 11 percent in 2010. It will help reduce health care costs and help Americans get insurance coverage.

Budgets are moral documents stating our Nation's priorities. We are finally investing in America and in our middle class, and I am delighted to support this budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I take it the chairman has no other speakers?

Mr. SPRATT. I have one other speaker in addition possibly to myself. How much time is left?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 4½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I take it the gentleman is waiting for the Speaker to come.

Madam Chair, there is a virtual conga line forming around the Capitol right now to come and get money. We are spending so much money these days. We have got to get this spending under control. It is out of control. And because the spending is out of control, the debt is going out of control.

But I want to talk about something else in the closing minutes of the general debate here, and that is about the biggest problem in America today: Jobs. We don't have enough of them. In my hometown of Janesville, Wisconsin, they closed down the General Motors plant. It is about three-quarters of a mile from my house. Two of my neighbors had their jobs there. Gone. High unemployment everywhere.

So the real question is, what are we doing to get jobs back in this economy, to get out of this deep recession, this the longest recession since 1945?

I would say that it is important to focus on one fact. Small businesses are the engine of economic growth in this economy. Seventy percent of our jobs come from small businesses. That is who got us our prosperity, that is who is going to get us our prosperity back.

And so what does this budget do for small businesses? Do you know what it says to small businesses? We are going to raise your taxes.

You have got to remember, Madam Chair, that the people who pay those rates that are being increased, those tax rates that are being increased in this budget are small businesses. They file their income taxes as individuals.

So we hear speaker after speaker after speaker saying, we are not doing these irresponsible tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent, the rich.

Look, Madam Chair, preying on people's emotions of fear and envy may be

a good political slogan, but it doesn't create jobs. Tapping into the legitimate anger and anxiety in America today is not leadership. Because what this does with these tax increases on small businesses is it demonizes those successful small businesses that are getting us our jobs, and it demoralizes those small business men and women in America who are trying to become successful. It tells them, you know what? If you work hard, if you achieve, if you take a risk, if you innovate, if you become an entrepreneur in this country, we are going to tax you, we are going to demonize you. You are one of the evil people.

□ 1315

That is not America. That is not what this country is all about. We believe we ought to help people become successful. We want to reward work. We want that entrepreneurial, innovative spirit in America to come alive again.

The problem with this budget at the end of the day is it shuts off the wealth machine, the job creation machine of America. It makes it harder for those small business men and women to survive. The big reason why I voted against that stimulus package is because only 1 percent of it was actually dedicated toward encouraging small businesses to keep and create jobs. The rest of it was spending or tax rebates. There is a big difference here, a huge difference.

The American people finally have a very clear choice. Do you want bloated government? Do you want spending where every government agency gets double and triple-digit increases in their budget? Do you want record deficits, record tax increases and record debt increases? Or do you want to get this stuff under control? Do you want to get spending under control? Do you want to get borrowing under control? Do you want to get our deficits under control? Do you want to get taxes low so we can create more jobs?

At the end of the day, it is all about freedom. The budget they are bringing to the floor gives us less of it. The budget we are going to bring gives us more of it. That is what America is all about. America is the land of opportunity. We help people when they are down on their luck. We help people who cannot help themselves. But we create an entrepreneur activity. We create a country that rewards freedom, risk taking, advancement and success. Those are good things. This budget squelches that. This budget extinguishes those great aspects of America, the American ideal we have come to know and love. I say we keep it and reject this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Could the Chair inform me how much time is now remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield myself 3 minutes.

It has been difficult to sit here and listen to the cascade of unfounded facts. It is hard to respond to everything that has been said. But a few things need to be said clearly as we move forward with this debate. First of all, last night in particular, but again today, Member after Member got up and talked about the biggest tax increase in history. It is not here. It is not in this particular budget resolution. If you read CBO's analysis of the President's budget, you will see that CBO, not me, CBO finds that there is a net reduction of $1.7 trillion due to tax cuts that are incorporated in this budget resolution. For example, we have been saying for years that we would renew the middle-income tax cuts when it came time to, those that were middle-income tax cuts adopted between 2001 and 2003. Well, the date for their expiration is approaching, and we are coming forward with what we have said consistently for the last several years, we are renewing those tax cuts, the marital tax relief, child's tax credit, the 10 percent bracket, the Pomeroy substitute for estate taxes. We provide in this budget resolution for the renewal and the extension of those tax cuts. And as a result we have a net tax cut of $1.7 trillion.

Then there has been a lot of limiting of the size of the deficit for this year and next year. And as the Lord knows, I share the concerns. I pride myself on having been a budget hawk, on having brought together the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and for the first time in 30 years actually, actually balanced the budget of the Federal Government. We did it.

Well, what has happened this year with the swollen budget that we have seen before us is that we have had a catastrophe in the financial markets. And much of the cost of that, the TARP, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, AIG, FDIC, the list goes on and on, and the costs that have come out of the Treasury are reflected in the swollen spending level of today. It isn't acknowledged, but spending is projected in the President's book here to come down from $3.9 trillion to $3.5 trillion, $400 billion per his recommendations here. You wouldn't have known that to listen to the cascade of facts coming forth.

Finally, as to spending levels, NDD, nondefense discretionary, often looked upon as an index as to whether or not Congress is exercising restraint in spending, the increase in NDD is about 4, 4½ percent. Defense, national defense, we want a strong national defense. We have always stood for that as Democrats and still do. We think we should restrain, however, the defense spending level. And it is restrained by the President to a 4 percent increase. Some would say that is a modest increase, but it is a big sum of money. We will be spending over $660 billion on national defense at that level.

For all of these reasons, the resolution before us should be ready and up for debate on the House floor.

I would now like to yield the balance of my time, 1 minute, to the Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his extraordinary mastery of the budget and for presenting us with the opportunity to vote for a statement of our national values here today.

Madam Chair, President Thomas Jefferson wisely stated that ''Every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle.'' That is so. But some are. The difference of opinion over this budget is a difference of principle, in fact, more than one principle. This budget is a statement of our national values and upholds the American principles of opportunity, security, responsibility and fairness.

It upholds the principle of fairness with tax cuts for the middle class, for 95 percent of the American people. It upholds the principle of fairness with health care for all Americans as a right, not a privilege. The budget will not only create a healthier America, but by lowering health care costs, health care reform is entitlement reform. By curtailing the rising costs of Medicare and Medicaid, health care reform will significantly reduce the deficit.

This budget upholds the principle of opportunity by advancing the President's investments in education from early childhood through post-secondary education and training. It supports the President's goal of improving education and training a workforce that is prepared to compete and succeed in the global economy.

This budget upholds the principle of security. The first responsibility we have as elected officials is to keep the American people safe. I am proud that in doing so, this budget gives the biggest increase ever to our veterans, the first time a President has submitted a budget which exceeds the veterans' independent budget. I hasten to add that in the last Congress, the new direction Congress exceeded the veterans' benefits under the leadership of CHET EDWARDS and Mr. SPRATT as well. On the battlefield, the military promises to leave no soldier behind. And when they come home, we promise to leave no veteran behind.

This budget upholds the principle of responsibility. The budget resolution begins the process of turning around the Republican budget legacy of deep deficits, mounting debt and economic decline due to the Bush administration's reckless fiscal policy. It takes steps to put the budget back on a fiscally sustainable path by restoring fiscal responsibility and cutting the deficit by more than one-half by 2013.

It upholds the principle of responsibility for our planet by investing in science, technology and renewable energy resources to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. That is a national security issue, an economic issue, an environmental health issue and a moral issue, if you believe as I do that

this planet is God's creation and we have a moral responsibility to preserve it. It is God's beautiful gift to us, and it is our responsibility to convey it to the next generation intact.

Mr. SPRATT, thank you again for this budget which will create economic growth, make America healthier and honor our veterans.

Decisions are liberating. By deciding to support this budget, Members are freeing themselves from past mistakes and stale assumptions. They are unleashing the possibilities of the future. This budget is the logical progression of the bold initiatives already taken in the first 3 months of this year. By providing health care for 11 million American children in the SCHIP Act and the recovery bill and the omnibus bill's investments in NIH cancer research and in health IT, this Congress has done more for health care in America than has been done in decades.

In terms of education, with the investments we made in the Recovery Act, the omnibus, the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, and now this budget, we have done more for education than has been done in any one other period of time in our history.

On energy proposals, we plow new ground. As President Obama said, ''We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories.'' We have made the investments that will spur new growth of energy that we can produce here in America, creating new green collar jobs for American workers. This budget also allows for fiscally responsible legislation that will promote energy independence over the long term.

In terms of science, we have made bold and new investments in the area of science in both the Recovery Act and the omnibus. We also just passed a landmark public lands bill that will protect 2 million acres of natural heritage, the most sweeping conservation legislation in decades. So in terms of energy and the environment, we have made historic progress.

This budget is in stark contrast to the Republican budget's hollow shell. We must always strive to find common ground here in the Congress. However, when the American people voted for change in November, they did not vote to send us here to split the difference. They sent us here to make a difference. Sadly, that difference of opinion on this budget is a difference of principle.

Mr. SPRATT, again, I thank you and members of the committee for giving us the privilege of upholding America's principles of fairness, opportunity, security and responsibility today by voting ''aye.''

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, last fall the American people voted for change and today we are seeing its vision implemented. As such, I rise in strong support of the Democratic budget.

For too long America has been distracted with misplaced priorities such as unnecessary wars, tax cuts for the ultra wealthy, and spending on unnecessary weapons systems. At the same time, our leaders were often negligent when it came to honouring our solemn commitment to the hard working men and women of America. It will take time to reverse failed Republican policies, but I believe the Democratic budget will lead America in a new direction by providing urgently needed health care reform, bringing back our tradition of progressive taxation, improving our education, and confronting global warming.

Everyday, we hear more bad news about companies laying off their workers—a sad occurrence that has increased the already alarming levels of Americans who lack access to health insurance. Madam Chair, access to health care is a human right and enacting today's legislation will bring us one step closer to desperately needed reform. This bill will do so by improving quality, expanding coverage, addressing the rising costs that create so much budget heartache for hardworking citizens. This bill will also add an important provision into the Budget Reconciliation which will allow for expedited consideration for health reform later this year. I enthusiastically support the inclusion of this provision as a means to move this critical legislation to the President's desk this year.

At the State of the Union, President Obama made it clear he wanted to cut the budget deficit in half; this budget fulfils that promise. Today's legislation takes the record deficit that President Obama and the 111th Congress inherited in 2009, and cuts it to $586 billion in 2013.

Madam Chair, for too long the broken ideology of trickle down economics has promoted tax cuts for the very rich as the solution to our nation's economic woes. After years of economic decline and stagnation it is evident this ideology is not viable. The Democratic budget will instead provide over $1.5 trillion in tax cuts to nearly 9 out of 10 Americans. This is done by giving Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) relief, eliminating the estate tax, giving hard working a fair shot at higher education with tax relief in higher education. The Democratic budget funds these tax cuts by closing corporate loopholes and the ''tax gap.''

In this era of global competition, it is imperative that we give our students the world class education without staggering amounts of debts. The bill will continue to increase Pell grant funding, expand early childhood education programs, and expand federal school meals initiatives.

While some may see that this budget is too ambitious, I say that the state of our economy demand nothing less. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chair, today I rise in support of the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution. Today's vote on the budget is a critical one, not only because it finally invests resources in domestic priorities, but because it also takes into consideration the needs of our families.

Our economy is suffering, financial markets are in turmoil, and back home in Michigan we are facing an unemployment rate of 12 percent. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle suggest cutting our spending, while also providing huge tax cuts for their fat cat friends and more subsidies for oil and gas companies. These are not the folks that need government tax breaks and subsidies.

If it is not the government who will pump money into our economy, provide tax cuts to our families and make health care and education more affordable, then who will? We know that our banks are not lending, families are living paycheck to paycheck, and our small businesses and companies are struggling to maintain their payroll. The status quo is not an option.

For the first time in eight long years we have a President who proposed a budget that takes into consideration the long-term stability of our country and provides a strong economic plan to guide us out of this recession. To that end, Congress proposes cutting the deficit by nearly two-thirds by 2013, reducing discretionary spending to its lowest level ever, and including initiatives to cut waste, fraud and abuse, saving taxpayers nearly $50 billion. And for the first time, Congress and the administration are including the costs of the Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in the budget, no longer hiding the costs in supplemental legislation.

Yes, Congress and this administration is tackling a lot at once, not only because the last administration left a platter of problems at our feet, but also because we can no longer afford to put off health care reform, or climate change, or quality education. Our country and our economy need a long-term solution.

Through this budget we will begin to tackle the rising costs of healthcare by reducing high administrative costs and rooting out inefficiencies. We will ensure that Medicare physician payments provide clear incentives for better quality care and ensure that primary care physicians are compensated for the hard work that they do. All of these steps will set the stage for health care reform and provide a down payment for legislation this summer.

This budget also continues our investment in education by raising the maximum Pell grant award, including additional assistance to help more low-income students complete college. This is critical to ensuring that our current and future employers continue to have a highly educated workforce. We need to keep our workforce competitive with our neighbors abroad and I strongly believe that ensuring access to education for all is one way to do that.

Finally, we will look towards laying the foundation for climate change legislation this summer by ensuring that funding and tax incentives in the stimulus bill receive significant funding—producing new sources of energy and creating green jobs across the country. Further, it will set aside funding to be used to pay for climate change legislation that the House and Senate are working on as we speak. This will ensure that the final product that makes it to the President's desk is paid for, allowing for responsible legislation that will cut greenhouse gas emissions, promote energy independence, and create new jobs in the energy sector.

I want to commend the leadership of the Obama administration and Chairman SPRATT for all of their hard work to put together this budget proposal. I know that producing a budget that will address the problems of the last eight years, while also investing in the priorities of our families, was not an easy task. However, it is high time that the budget helps all Americans, not just the wealthy. Let this budget be a message that Congress has heard our families loud and clear—we want to ensure your families are healthy, your children receive quality education, and your paychecks stretch a bit further than they used to. This is

particularly true for the people of the 15th District—you can rest assured that I am working tirelessly to help you through this tough time. Together we can, and we will, turn our country's economy around.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I want to say a few words in support of the Fiscal Year 2010 House Budget Resolution. This important legislation builds on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to create jobs and strengthen the American economy for the long-term. It also restores honesty and transparency to the congressional budget process and puts our nation on a clear path to recovery.

I want to especially commend House Budget Committee Chairman JOHN SPRATT, Office of Management and Budget Director Peter Orszag, and the leadership of the Blue Dog Coalition for their outstanding work in crafting this budget. As a Blue Dog, I am pleased that the budget incorporates many of the Coalition's principles—namely, commitments to statutory Pay-As-You-Go budget discipline, deficit neutral health care reform, eliminating $50 billion in waste and abuse in government spending, and cutting the deficit in half by Fiscal Year 2013.

Concerning the deficit, it is important to recall that America's fiscal house was in order when the Bush Administration took office eight years ago. There was a projected ten-year budget surplus of $5.6 trillion. The nation would have had the resources then to pay down the national debt, protect Social Security for future generations, and accommodate tax relief for hardworking American families.

In a few short years, the surplus disappeared and the national debt mushroomed. Rather than a $5.6 trillion surplus, Congress is now confronting a record $1 trillion deficit in 2009 alone. In fact, the nation is facing deficits in 2009 and 2010 that would be greater as a share of the economy than in any year since World War II.

According to the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, the current recession ''is compounding the underlying long-term fiscal pressures resulting from rapidly rising health care costs, the aging of the population, past tax cuts, and war costs. If we continue current policies . . . the nation is on a path to amass $10 trillion in cumulative deficits over the next decade, during which time the deficit will not fall below 5 percent of GDP.'' Both as a member of the Blue Dog Coalition and, more importantly, as an American citizen, it was troubling to see that our nation's commitment to fiscal discipline was being so recklessly squandered during these eight years.

This budget resolution finally puts America's budget house in order. In addition to ensuring budget discipline, it makes vital investments in a number of areas. The House Budget Resolution strengthens education by providing additional funding for new initiatives in early childhood education and raising the Pell Grant award. It includes provisions to reduce health care costs while improving access to quality medical care.

The House Budget Resolution also supports veterans by increasing Veterans' Affairs funding by 11%. Finally, it increases our investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency by 18% in 2010 to promote clean energy technologies, industries, and jobs.

The House budget makes many of these investments at a lower level of nondefense discretionary funding than President Obama's original request. I also am pleased that it includes tax relief for middle-income taxpayers and small businesses, as well as an accurate accounting of the costs of our military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This budget is good for Georgia and good for America. I am pleased to support it and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of its adoption.

Mr. PETERS. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the budget resolution. Like the President, I came to Washington this year at a time when we are both inheriting record budget deficits, and battling the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. I am a strong believer in fiscal discipline, and I understand that the current budget deficits are unsustainable. However, I also know that it is next to impossible to bring our nation out of a deep recession and balance our budget at the same time. This budget is a blueprint for generating economic expansion. As our economy begins to grow again, deficits will be reduced over time.

This budget makes a great deal of progress on deficit spending, cutting the record budget deficit inherited from the last administration in half over the next five years. The budget also reaffirms the commitment of this Congress to the PAYGO rules, which require that new spending and tax cuts be offset by cuts in spending or new revenue so new measures do not increase our deficit and our national debt. The budget also ends the use of accounting tricks to hide costs of certain spending. For example, for the first time the budget includes both a full-year estimate for the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan for the budget year as well as estimates for future costs.

The quickest way to restore balanced budgets is to increase growth, and at a time when our economy is simply not functioning this plan has the investments and incentives to make that growth happen. This budget includes substantial middle class tax cuts, and makes critical investments in education, health care reform, and energy independence that are necessary to revive the economy and ensure that our nation leads the globe in next generation technologies.

In Michigan and Oakland County, this means investments in programs like MEP, which helps small manufacturers retool and retrain as they implement the next generation of manufacturing practices and green technologies. It also means investments in new advanced vehicle technologies, which will help ensure that the next generation of green vehicles are designed and built in Michigan, not overseas.

Madam Chair, I was elected to office along with President Obama because voters were demanding change. This budget delivers on the promises we made to voters last fall, by restoring fiscal discipline, delivering middle class tax cuts, making critical investments in our future, and laying the groundwork for future reforms. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this blueprint for job creation and robust economic growth in America.

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 85 Democrat budget resolution. Our economy is in chaos, every day more Americans lose jobs, and our retirement savings are dwindling. The only response Democrat leadership and this White House seems to have is to spend more. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have forgotten that a successful economy comes from the ground up, not from the government down.

Do I have to remind the Speaker that ''money doesn't grow on trees?'' This money comes from the American people, directly from their wallets which are growing thinner and thinner by the day. What they need from us isn't a larger government, but a government that tightens its belt as they are forced to do. A government that helps the private sector get back on its feet and prosper. A government that creates a level playing field for American employers on the world market.

The past few months we have all become economics majors as we try to interpret and make decisions on complex financial markets. There is no question in my mind that everyone in this body wants to return to our country's historic economic success. I think there's considerable disagreement on how we get there, but I think at least we can start with the statement that we all want to end up in the same place. A place where our children can start a business or find a high quality, high paying job. Today's discussion—and indeed the focus of the entire Congress—should be on how to renew the American Dream.

I do not subscribe to Keynesian economics. Every thin dime this Congress spends—or more appropriately borrows—is the functional equivalent of a thick quarter the children of Kansas and the rest of America have to pay back later, and I have yet to see a government job that pays for itself. I don't believe that massive deficit spending as we see in this budget proposal is going to create private sector jobs in the short-term or revive our economy. In the short time he has been in office, we have already amassed $3 trillion in debt for a total of $8.7 trillion. $8.7 trillion is a lot of money, money we don't have and money that our children and grandchildren will be forced to pay back.

One of the very worst things that we, the Congress, can do is follow economic policies that result in raising taxes on American citizens and employers. We have enjoyed economic success in the past in large part because of our relatively low tax rates. To raise taxes will, in my view, not only hurt American wallets immediately, but also stifle the prospect of economic prosperity in the near future. Sadly this is where the administration is headed.

The president has made a big deal recently about Republicans being the ''party of no.'' I am ready to say ''yes.'' To say yes to policies that will help rebuild a sound economy for today and the future. We need to pursue common sense economic policies that work—while reducing the size and scope of a government that has strangled growth. We need to move toward competitive business tax rates to compete with the rest of the world. Ireland, though it too has been caught up in the worldwide downturn, is well poised to recover as it welcomes companies and fosters growth. We desperately need a common sense approach to regulation, with cost-based justification of the rules our bureaucrats impose on those who create jobs. We need to be energy independent. It's well past time that we adopt a ''loser pays'' approach to litigation as the United Kingdom follows. Finally, I hope we discuss the rising cost of health care (in addition to ensuring health care access), which is

one of the biggest burdens on our economy. I believe a consumer-based approach to health care delivery will benefit patients and our economy.

These ideas build the fundamental strength of our economy. That is how we can and will renew the dream and renew opportunity for ourselves and our children.

I'll close by saying that, although we are struggling today, I am confident and optimistic that the American people will overcome this downturn, as we always have. My concern is that borrowing and spending will prolong the pain instead of fixing the problem.

I look forward to our discussion today.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, a budget is a moral document that demonstrates our values and priorities. I want to congratulate Chairman SPRATT for again bringing forth a budget that represents values of which we can be proud. This budget would make real investments in education, hometown security, veterans' programs, healthcare, and research and development while halving the budget deficit in four years.

I am pleased that this Fiscal Year 2010 budget continues to follow the pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) principle that the House restored at the start of the 110th Congress in January 2007. This ensures that every new dollar of spending is offset and will not worsen the deficit. Although the budget resolution does not set tax or spending levels, it does lay out the plan for the coming years to spend money and to raise revenues.

This budget validates the President's Inaugural declaration that we will ''restore science to its rightful place.'' This resolution restores science to its rightful place in terms of our national innovation investment by providing $31 billion for the science and research programs. In these troubled economic times, it is important to understand that while research lays the foundation for our long-term prosperity, research also creates jobs now. A report by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation estimated that each additional $1 billion investment in research would create approximately 20,000 American jobs a year. This investment would provide jobs not just to scientists but also to research students, electricians who wire the labs, lab technicians who run the instrumentation, construction workers who will renovate the buildings, and many more. This job creation is comparable to or better than job creation for other spending, even in the short term, and over the long term, nothing produces jobs tomorrow like research today.

This budget would make a significant investment in our nation's energy future by building on the significant funding and tax incentives for renewable energy and energy efficiency that were contained in the recovery bill. The budget increases investments in energy programs by 18.4 percent to create new sources of renewable energy, to improve energy efficiency, and to expand research and technological development. The budget is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and ensures that Congress has the flexibility to consider legislation for increasing our nation's energy independence.

Madam Chair, this budget honors our commitment to our nation's children by investing in education. The budget follows on the bold investments made by the economic recovery bill and provides further support for early childhood education. The budget supports education at a young age through a range of approaches, including strengthening and expanding early childhood education programs, home visiting programs, and child nutrition programs such as school meals. I am pleased that the budget also would help make college more affordable and accessible for students in New Jersey and throughout the country by increasing funding for Pell grants and providing additional assistance for low-income high school graduates. The budget further would expand our scientific workforce by tripling the number of graduate fellowships in science.

I am pleased that the budget addresses the fact that 46 million Americans are uninsured, with more than 8 out of 10 of those uninsured living in working families. Specifically, data from The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation show that 16 percent of New Jersey's residents were uninsured in 2007. This is despite the fact that health care spending has grown to about $7,026 per person as of 2007. According to a report from the Institute of Medicine, working-age Americans without health insurance are more likely to receive too little medical care too late and to receive poorer medical treatment throughout their lives. As a result, they are sick more often and die at a younger age. This budget resolution supports the President's goal for health care reform and provides opportunities for the relevant committees to work this year to draft reform legislation that will help more Americans get health insurance, reduce health care costs, and improve patient safety.

I strongly support the provisions in the budget that would invest $53.3 billion for veterans' programs, an increase of 11.5 percent over the 2009 level. I am pleased that the budget reverses the policies of the previous administration and restores health care eligibility for non-disabled veterans with modest incomes. This funding is more important than ever to treat the 908,690 Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans, many of whom suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injuries, or blast-related injuries.

I also am voting for the two alternatives offered by Mr. SCOTT and Ms. LEE because, although each is imperfect, each in different ways, they would advance the principles of equality and justice in our society and the peaceful resolution of international problems. I expect that neither of those alternatives will prevail over the well-crafted compromise of Mr. SPRATT, yet they are worthy of support.

Madam Chair, the budget produced by the Budget Committee, under the leadership of Representative SPRATT, reflects values of which we can be proud. It supports healthcare, science and engineering research, education, veterans, and national security programs while maintaining our commitment to fiscal responsibility. By adopting this budget and supporting the designated funding levels throughout the appropriations process, we would be investing in priorities important to our future.

Mr. STARK. Madam Chair, I rise today in measured support of H. Con. Res. 85, the FY 2010 Budget Resolution.

A budget is a moral document that should reflect our priorities as a nation and act as a blueprint for the investments our nation needs to be healthy and prosperous. By this measure, the budget resolution before us is not a perfect document. It does, however, provide for vital investments in health care, jobs, education, and the environment that will spur both short-term and long-term economic growth and make our country healthier and more humane.

This budget unfortunately continues to provide far too much money for defense—51 percent of discretionary spending. The $532.6 billion for defense includes billions for out-dated or just plain bad weapons systems and ideas, such as missile defense, space-based weapons, and the V–22 Osprey. Cutting these and other wasteful defense programs would save nearly $69 billion. These savings could be invested in reforming our education system, ending hunger, and rebuilding our infrastructure. The Congressional Progressive Caucus alternative budget would allow for those important investments and I am proud to support it.

While the budget before us is not perfect, it does steer us—after eight years headed the wrong way—in the right direction. It sets the stage for long overdue comprehensive health reform, while providing latitude for us to make improvements to Medicare. Within these budget parameters, we will be able to address structural problems with physician payment policies to increase access to primary care, provide incentives for coordinated patient-centered care, manage chronic diseases, and improve quality. We will build on what works in our existing system by creating a public health insurance plan available to everyone and preserving our existing employer-based system. This budget will allow us to make investments in our people and our future, yielding long-term benefits in both tangible cost savings and improved quality of life by finally achieving quality, affordable health care for all.

This budget provides a framework for economic prosperity and builds on the investments made by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in education and energy. Under this budget, education from early childhood through college is given top priority. It allows for the expansion of early childhood education programs and creation of a nurse visitation program that will assist new mothers raise healthy children. The bill also creates a framework to permanently reform the Pell Grant program and ensure that it provides yearly increases for students most in need of assistance.

Creating a clean energy economy will not only allow us to avoid the catastrophic consequences of global warming, it will also create jobs and spur innovation. This budget includes a roadmap for a comprehensive response to global warming and provides for investments in energy efficiency and technology that will lead to good paying jobs across the country. Already, the energy funds in the recovery bill are creating jobs in my district through the financing of a new solar panel manufacturing facility. These types of projects will become more common with the passage of this budget.

This budget clearly distinguishes the priorities of the new Congress and President Obama—jobs, universal health care, and a first rate education system—from the misplaced priorities of past Republican budgets—tax cuts for the wealthy, war, and an eviscerated safety net. I urge all of my colleagues to embrace priorities that put the health and wellbeing of people ahead of the narrow interests of the well connected and support this budget.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Chair, I am deeply disappointed that the FY 2010 budget resolution considering today represents another missed opportunity for both sides of the aisle to come together for the future of our country. Frankly, it continues down a very dangerous path that has been business as usual in the House for far too long. For our children and grandchildren we must come to grips with the financial crisis looming on the horizon.

We all know that we face enormous fiscal challenges in terms of the deficit, the debt, and solvency of entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Addressing these issues in a meaningful and bipartisan way will take strong bipartisan commitment—the kind of commitment that is sorely lacking in the budget resolution that will be voted on in the House.

The statistics accompanying the nation's long-term fiscal health are astounding. The national debt has topped $11 trillion for the first time in history. While the White House claims that the president's budget proposal would increase the deficit by $6.9 trillion over ten years, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office projects that this figure will be closer to $9.3 trillion, more than a third higher than the administration's projection. By 2019 the government could be paying over $800 billion annually just in interest on this amount. China is one of our biggest bankers and now holds the paper on about one out of every 10 American dollars. Standard and Poor's Investment Service predicts loss of our triple-A bond rating as early as 2012. Moody's predicts 2018.

The American people are hurting. The U.S. unemployment rate hit 8.1 percent in February, the highest in more than 25 years. If that isn't troubling enough, leading economists are predicting the jobless rate could hit double digits by year's end.

Many of those lost jobs are coming from the U.S. manufacturing base, or what's left of it. The decay in U.S. manufacturing is real. Drive across the cast iron bridge linking Trenton, New Jersey, with Morrisville, Pennsylvania, and read the outdated sign: ''Trenton Makes, the World Takes.'' There was a time when Trenton made the steel used for the world's longest suspension bridges, its cars, and farm tools. The sign today could be: ''The World Makes and America Takes.''

This Congress must face the reality of America's long-term financial future and start a process that will reverse the downward slide we're facing. I've said it before and I'll say it again: Congress acting alone will not make the hard choices necessary to right our ship of state. The partisan divisions are too deep. We need a process outside of Congress to come to grips with the burden of debt we are piling on our children and grandchildren.

The American people—our constituents—understand that we are in serious trouble and that regular order in the House offers no way forward. The American people have no confidence in this Congress's ability to think outside of the box and come up with bipartisan solutions to the country's most pressing issues. A recent Peter Hart/Public Opinion Strategies survey confirmed that 56 percent of registered voters say a bipartisan commission rather than the regular congressional process is the best means to begin tackling our growing budget deficit and national debt.

There is a plan on the table right now that this House could act on to set up such a national commission. JIM COOPER and I—a Democrat and a Republican—have been working together on legislation—the SAFE Commission Act—that would establish a bipartisan commission to address entitlement spending, other spending and tax policy. When we reintroduced the bill last month, there were exactly 26 Republicans and 26 Democrats joining the effort as original cosponsors. Everything is on the table, because to reverse the current financial path, we must look at the big picture. And when the commission makes its legislative recommendations to Congress after extensive public hearings around the country, Congress is required to vote up or down, like the base-closing process, on the plan.

The Cooper-Wolf SAFE Commission Act has garnered support from the Heritage Foundation, Brookings Institution, Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, Concord Coalition, National Federation of Independent Business, Business Roundtable, The Peterson Foundation and former U.S. Comptroller General David Walker. Newspapers across the country, including the Washington Times, Richmond Times-Dispatch, Winchester Star, Dallas Morning News and the Tennessean, have editorialized about SAFE being the only way forward. National syndicated columnists, including David Broder, Robert Samuelson and David Brooks have all written favorably about this proposal.

I submit for the record David Broder's piece ''Hiding a Mountain of Debt'' from last Sunday's Washington Post which speaks to the inability of Congress to tackle entitlement reform through regular order and suggests the Cooper-Wolf SAFE Commission as a bipartisan process that could help lawmakers face reality.

If there are other ideas about how to come to grips with the mountains of debt under which we are burying our children and grandchildren—that can pass—I implore our colleagues to offer them. We just can't continue with the same old tired process, drawing lines in the sand while the tsunami of debt comes crashing toward America's shore.

That process is on full display today with the business as usual tone on this year's budget resolution. The current process is broken. The SAFE Commission offers an opportunity to make a difference for the country's future, rather than just continuing to score political points as we see in the debate today.

The SAFE Commission process could be the foundation for a renaissance in America. It can renew Americans' confidence in the ability of our elected leaders to act and provide the opportunity to order priorities, create jobs and provide a quality of life unsurpassed in America. It can ensure that we have the funding for education, cutting edge technology, medical research, infrastructure improvements and other programs critical to providing a bright future for the next generation of Americans.

Why is every budget plan today from both sides of the aisle missing this critical component? For our country's future, this Congress and this administration must come together and work to set up a bipartisan panel to deal with America's long-term financial future to give hope to our children and grandchildren. The time bomb of debt is ticking and it's on our watch to act before the explosion buries our country.

[From the Washington Post, March 29, 2009]

HIDING A MOUNTAIN OF DEBT

(By David S. Broder)

With a bit of bookkeeping legerdemain borrowed from the Bush administration, the Democratic Congress is about to perform a cover-up on the most serious threat to America's economic future.

That threat is not the severe recession, tough as that is for the families and businesses struggling to make ends meet. In time, the recession will end, and last week's stock market performance hinted that we may not have to wait years for the recovery to begin.

The real threat is the monstrous debt resulting from the slump in revenue and the staggering sums being committed by Washington to rescuing embattled banks and homeowners—and the absence of any serious-strategy for paying it all back.

The Congressional Budget Office sketched the dimensions of the problem on March 20, and Congress reacted with shock. The CBO said that over the next 10 years, current policies would add a staggering $93 trillion to the national debt—one-third more than President Obama had estimated by using much more optimistic assumptions about future economic growth.

As far as the eye could see, the CBO said, the debt would continue to grow by about $1 trillion a year because of a structural deficit between the spending rate, averaging 23 percent of gross domestic product, and federal revenue at 19 percent.

The ever-growing national debt will require ever-larger annual interest payments, with much of that money going overseas to China, Japan and other countries that have been buying our bonds.

Reacting to this scary prospect, the House and Senate budget committees took the paring knife to some of Obama's spending proposals and tax cuts last week. But many of the proposed savings look more like bookkeeping gimmicks than realistic cutbacks. The budget resolutions assume, for example, that no more money will be needed this year to bail out foundering businesses or pump up consumer demand, even though estimates of those needs start at $250 billion and go up by giant steps.

Republicans on the budget committees offered cuts that were larger and, in some but not all instances, more realistic.

But the main device the Democratic budgeteers employed was simply to shrink the budget ''window'' from 10 years to five. Instantly, $5 trillion in debt disappeared from view, along with the worry that long after the recession is past, the structural deficit would continue to blight the future of young, working families.

The Democrats did not invent this gimmick. They borrowed it from George W. Bush, who turned to it as soon as his inherited budget surpluses withered with the tax cuts and recession of 2001–02. But Obama had promised a more honest budget and said that this meant looking at the long-term consequences of today's tax and spending decisions.

There are plenty of people in Congress for whom the CBO report was no surprise, and some of them have proposed a solution that would confront this reality. Kent Conrad, the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, and Judd Gregg, its ranking Republican, have offered a bill to create a bipartisan commission to examine every aspect of the budget—taxes, defense and domestic spending, and, especially, Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. Congress would be required to vote promptly, up or down, on its recommendations, or come up with an alternative that would achieve at least as much in savings.

In the House, Democrat Jim Cooper of Tennessee and Republican Frank Wolf of Virginia have been pressing a similar proposal but have been regularly thwarted.

The roadblock in chief is Nancy Pelosi, the speaker of the House. She has made it clear that her main goal is to protect Social Security and Medicare from any significant reforms. Pelosi has not forgotten how Democrats benefited from the 2005–06 fight against Bush's effort to change Social Security. Her party, which had lost elections in 2000, 2002 and 2004, found its voice and its rallying cry to ''Save Social Security,'' and Pelosi is not about to allow any bipartisan commission to take that issue away from her control.

The price for her obduracy is being paid in the rigging of the budget process. The larger price will be paid by your children and grandchildren, who will inherit a future-blighting mountain of debt.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 85 (H. Con. Res. 85). This resolution builds on the work of this Congress to put our economy back on track, addressing the current crisis and building for future needs.

A budget is more than just a document, it is a statement of our priorities. This is an especially important budget and comes as our nation faces a number of challenges in our struggling economy. Across the country, millions of families are facing foreclosure or have lost their jobs, savings, or access to health care. We have seen the failure of many of our financial institutions, and a lack of credit that is necessary for our small businesses to grow. In my own state of North Carolina, the unemployment rate has risen to a historic high of 10.7 percent.

This budget begins to reverse the Bush Administration's failed policies and restore America's economic strength. H. Con. Res. 85 invests in priorities like health care, education, and energy independence to create jobs and get our economy back on track. As the former Superintendent of Schools in North Carolina, I know that the best investment we can make is in our children. I am pleased that H. Con. Res. 85 strongly supports early learning, including the President's initiatives to help strengthen and expand early childhood education and school meals initiatives. This budget also makes college more affordable and accessible by increasing Pell grants and providing additional assistance to help more low-income high school graduates attend and complete college. Education is the key to economic growth, future success, and access to opportunity for our citizens.

The legacy left by the previous administration includes mounting debt and economic decline and we must return to a fiscally sustainable path. In addition to education, this budget makes investments in health care, energy independence, and other areas in a fiscally responsible way. This budget cuts the deficit in half over four years and bolsters PAYGO, the rule requiring Congress to find revenue to offset spending proposals. As a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am also pleased that this budget supports $1.5 trillion in tax cuts for low and middle income families.

This Budget Resolution provides a strong blueprint for our economic future. I support H. Con. Res. 85, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the majority's Budget Resolution.

CAP AND TRADE

The majority and President Obama's budget proposal calls for the passage of Cap and Trade legislation.

The President estimates that the auction associated with Cap and Trade will bring in more than $640 billion.

The administration admitted that number would be more like $1 trillion and possibly as high as $2 trillion.

Cap and Trade is a regressive tax because those with less income spend more of their paychecks on energy.

This plan will raise taxes on an average family by $1,600 annually.

Furthermore, if the United States acts without the support of China and India, Cap and Trade will only force more jobs out of the country.

Beyond the loss of jobs, Cap and Trade will tax every American for using energy.

SIZE OF DEFICITS/NATIONAL DEBT

If raising your taxes by $1,600 a year wasn't enough; President Obama and the Democrat Majority's budget resolution will increase your share of the national debt by more than $20,000 in four short years.

Today, every American's share of the National Debt is $36,000.

By the end of President Obama's first term in office, the national debt will have exploded to $54,000 per American.

This is a picture of my grandchildren. If you want to saddle your children and grandchildren with this type of debt then I would encourage you to vote for the majority's budget resolution.

If you do not, there is an alternative way forward. The Republican budget alternative taxes you less, spends less and borrows much less.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Chair, I rise this morning to state my strong support for the budget resolution.

I'm excited to see that American working families will once again be prioritized.

It is a sight for sore eyes to see the President present an honest budget, putting an end to years of masking the costs of things we have to pay for, like the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This is good news for working and middle-class families who have been struggling to keep their heads above water. For far too long, these families have been bearing the brunt of misplaced priorities, above all, the ever-rising cost of healthcare.

Too many never see a doctor until they visit an emergency room. The cost to employers, local, state and the federal government is unsustainable.

It is shameful that while the United States spends more than every other nation in the world on health care, we fail to care for everyone.

This budget makes a down payment on health care reform, invests in working families, and sets America on a fundamentally new course. I urge my colleagues to support this critical investment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, adequate investment in our transportation and other public infrastructure is the foundation for future economic growth, and in these troubled times, it is needed more than ever.

The Budget Resolution before us today recognizes the importance of infrastructure investment— investment that will not only jump-start our economy now, but continue to pay dividends for many years into the future.

The Resolution provides a solid foundation for the surface transportation authorization act that must be completed this year. If the Resolution is applied over the six-year period from fiscal year 2010 through fiscal year 2015, it provides a base allocation of $324 billion for highway, highway safety, and transit programs. Importantly, this allocation restores $82 billion of highway contract authority that had been eliminated from the baseline because of FY 2009 rescissions that the baseline assumed to recur in all future years.

As a point of comparison, the budget resolution proposed by the Senate Committee on the Budget does not restore this $82 billion of highway contract authority. I will insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a state-by-state chart comparing the FY 2010 highway contract authority apportionments under the House and Senate budget resolutions (assuming the current law programs and formulas), to illustrate how devastating the Senate proposal would be for many States.

In addition, the House Budget Resolution establishes a Reserve Fund to allow the base allocation of $324 billion to be adjusted upward as necessary to accommodate higher funding levels to the extent they can be supported by the Highway Trust Fund. This Reserve Fund provides the flexibility necessary to accommodate surface transportation authorization legislation as it is developed and shaped by Congress this year.

For the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), the Resolution provides the full amounts authorized by H.R. 915, the ''FAA Reauthorization Act of 2009'', as ordered reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on March 5, 2009. Specifically, the Resolution allocates $4.0 billion for AIP in FY 2010, increasing to $4.1 billion in FY 2011, and $4.2 billion in FY 2012. This funding will allow the AIP program to keep pace with inflationary cost increases, and begin to address the investment gap in airport safety and capacity needs.

For passenger rail, the Resolution accommodates the President's proposal for a new Federal commitment to high-speed rail transportation by increasing investment to $1 billion in FY 2010. Building on the $8 billion for high-speed rail provided in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, this additional funding will lead to the creation of several high-speed rail corridors across the country linking regional population centers.

For environmental infrastructure, the Resolution assumes $2.4 billion for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program in FY 2010, consistent with the President's budget and H.R. 1262, the ''Water Quality Investment Act of 2009'', as passed by the House on March 12, 2009. I welcome and strongly support the President's proposal to significantly increase Federal support for restoring and maintaining the nation's water quality. It is indeed a refreshing change from the previous eight years, which saw some of the lowest funding levels requested by any administration since the creation of this program.

Finally, the Resolution rejects the Office of Management and Budget's proposal to change how programs funded by contract authority are treated for budget scoring purposes. This proposal, had it been adopted, would have converted the mandatory contract authority that currently funds our highway, highway safety, transit and airport grant programs to a simple

authorization of appropriations for budget scoring purposes. I am pleased that the Resolution continues to recognize the unique nature of trust-funded programs by rejecting this misguided proposal.

I thank Chairman SPRATT and the Committee on the Budget for their strong support for transportation and infrastructure programs, and I urge my colleagues to support the Resolution.

FY 2010 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY CONTRACT AUTHORITY COMPARISON OF HOUSE BUDGET RESOLUTION AND SENATE BUDGET RESOLUTION

State	House Budget Resolution (H. Con. Res. 85)	Senate Budget Resolution (S. Con. Res. 13)	Difference
Alabama	$750,502,172	$516,451,803	−$234,050,368
Alaska	439,554,461	302,479,599	−137,074,861
Arizona	734,391,521	505,364,622	−229,026,899
Arkansas	491,318,142	338,095,044	−153,223,098
California	3,429,330,000	2,359,845,892	−1,069,484,108
Colorado	519,743,051	357,654,101	−162,088,950
Connecticut	488,622,768	335,995,383	−152,627,385
Delaware	163,152,846	112,271,703	−50,881,142
Dist. of Col.	145,767,381	100,307,258	−45,460,123
Florida	1,895,296,186	1,304,234,359	−591,061,827
Georgia	1,279,712,245	880,623,534	−399,088,711
Hawaii	166,547,342	114,523,644	−52,023,698
Idaho	285,381,912	196,383,095	−88,998,817
Illinois	1,296,279,966	892,020,673	−404,259,294
Indiana	951,906,101	655,046,481	−296,859,621
Iowa	451,070,541	310,397,616	−140,672,924
Kansas	376,911,793	259,176,473	−117,735,320
Kentucky	652,507,863	449,017,053	−203,490,810
Louisiana	657,198,643	452,242,292	−204,956,351
Maine	174,639,887	120,551,562	−54,088,325
Maryland	596,761,038	410,652,679	−186,108,360
Massachusetts	604,230,800	415,488,222	−188,742,578
Michigan	1,037,618,157	713,504,389	−324,113,768
Minnesota	625,566,887	430,476,787	−195,090,100
Mississippi	466,071,827	320,721,163	−145,350,663
Missouri	889,273,176	611,943,309	−277,329,867
Montana	366,277,284	252,050,954	−114,226,329
Nebraska	286,487,562	197,142,114	−89,345,448
Nevada	311,525,651	214,373,365	−97,152,286
New Hampshire	166,488,270	114,483,223	−52,005,047
New Jersey	972,008,432	668,876,265	−303,132,167
New Mexico	364,249,524	250,653,966	−113,595,557
New York	1,660,321,081	1,141,694,643	−518,626,438
North Carolina	1,039,925,752	715,614,469	−324,311,283
North Dakota	241,653,208	166,290,394	−75,362,815
Ohio	1,321,137,088	909,125,872	−412,011,216
Oklahoma	570,787,695	392,779,712	−178,007,984
Oregon	456,610,251	314,209,806	−142,400,446
Pennsylvania	1,623,581,576	1,116,433,610	−507,147,966
Rhode Island	193,230,364	135,659,996	−57,570,368
South Carolina	620,987,972	427,326,829	−193,661,143
South Dakota	268,773,569	184,953,497	−83,820,072
Tennessee	824,732,715	567,531,810	−257,200,905
Texas	3,168,619,579	2,180,458,508	−988,161,071
Utah	313,958,483	216,047,035	−97,911,448
Vermont	168,547,458	115,983,429	−52,564,030
Virginia	976,733,110	672,128,732	−304,604,378
Washington	633,569,542	435,980,466	−197,589,075
West Virginia	416,728,500	286,769,231	−129,959,270
Wisconsin	734,296,976	505,300,612	−228,996,364
Wyoming	257,349,706	177,091,532	−80,258,174
TOTAL	37,527,938,057	25,824,428,808	−11,703,509,249

*This table is based on Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) technical assistance, and illustrates the estimated distribution of FY 2010 contract authority under the House and Senate budget resolutions (assuming current law programs and formulas). To have sufficient funds to meet all criteria of the Equity Bonus calculation, as in effect in FY 2009, an estimated $39 billion in contract authority would be required for apportioned programs. To perform the calculations with the amounts provided by the House and Senate budget resolutions, FHWA altered the funding floor element of the Equity Bonus calculation by lowering the 121 percent floor that is in effect for FY 2009 to 117.5 percent for the House resolution, and 80.8 percent for the Senate resolution.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chair, I rise to voice my concern over this proposed budget. As many of my colleagues have said, it taxes too much, borrows too much and spends too much.

And it will raise taxes during a recession when we shouldn't even be discussing tax hikes. Why do they want to raise taxes? Not to pay down the deficit but instead to fund another massive expansion of government. This plan, as proposed by the Administration, would place an immense burden on middle-class families.

They want to raise taxes on homeowners by limiting the mortgage tax interest rate deduction. We're facing a wave of foreclosures and should be encouraging responsible homeownership. Instead, this tax will discourage homeownership and further weaken the economy by delaying housing recovery efforts.

The proposal also furthers the Administration's plan to raise taxes on charitable contributions, discouraging Americans from donating to charities and nonprofits. This comes at a time when these organizations are needed most by struggling families. We should be encouraging Americans to help one another, not the opposite.

Madam Chair, the budget also paves the way for higher taxes on small businesses by reversing cuts to the death tax, punishing thrift, discouraging entrepreneurship and devastating family-owned small businesses.

This is certainly change, and not for the better.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Chair, one of the most momentous votes I have cast as a Member of Congress occurred in my first year of service. It was a vote for President Clinton's budget, which made some difficult choices—among them, cutting spending and raising taxes to balance the federal budget. While controversial, I knew the Clinton budget charted the best course for the U.S. economy over the long run.

It came as no surprise, but my support for the Clinton budget became the primary issue in my first reelection campaign, which I won by only a whisker. Many of my colleagues were not so fortunate.

Today, the country is again in a perilous economic position—much more so than in 1993. And a new President is again outlining an ambitious economic agenda that could transform American society.

As in 1993, I intend to support the budget. President Obama inherited an economy and federal balance sheet in total disarray. He has made the difficult decision to prioritize long-delayed investments in health care reform, clean energy, and education, and to pay for them with responsible reversals of Bush Tax cuts for the most fortunate among us. I believe he has done so in an honest manner by, among other things, putting the costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan on budget for the first time.

The budget isn't perfect—no budget is. I would prefer more deficit reduction in its out years. But the President has his priorities right, and is making the investments that this nation has put off for too long. This Congress should support him and pass this budget.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, as the House of Representatives begins to consider the President's Fiscal Year 2010 Budget, I would like to highlight a number of priorities. First, I would like to begin by saying President Obama has inherited an extensive deficit from the previous administration—the result of mistaken policies, misplaced priorities and an era of profound irresponsibility. This was no April Fools joke. Our budget deficit is a real problem with real consequences for the American people.

For too long, we have ignored the tough choices we needed to make and failed to address the big challenges our economy faces.

This lack of responsibility has left our nation with an economy in recession and an untenable fiscal situation—$1 trillion a year deficits on average over the coming decade.

The FY2010 budget submitted by the President is up front and honest about the challenges we face. Unlike the previous administration which assumed revenue from the Alternative Minimum Tax overwhelming the middle class and not accounting for the Medicare doctor's fee fix and the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, there are no budget gimmicks in President Obama's budget to cover up the mess we're in.

I urge the President to include funding for summer jobs for youth. Our youth, and individuals that have opted not to go to college or institutions of higher learning, need to be engaged and employed. Employment will provide them with skills and aptitudes that are necessary to be productive in society. I urge funding for our youth.

I support the President's call for healthcare reform. I urge the Budget Committee to account for the cost of healthcare reform to ensure that the 45 million uninsured Americans (four million of which are children) have access to quality and affordable healthcare.

In addition, I urge the Committee to account for the following:

Funding the Minority AIDS Initiative at $610 million this year (an increase of nearly $200 million) to build capacity among minority run non-governmental organizations and to conduct outreach services among minority communities.

Funding the Ryan White CARE Act at $2.8 billion this year (an increase of $578 million) to support care and treatment programs at the local level to address the needs of people living with HIV/AIDS.

Funding the CDC Prevention activities for HIV, STD, TB and Viral Hepatitis at $2.28 billion (an increase of nearly $1.2 billion) to fund testing initiatives and support innovative prevention efforts at the local level.

Funding for Housing for people living with HIV/AIDS (HOPWA) at $360 million (an increase of $50 million) to provide supportive housing for people with AIDS.

Zeroing out funding for ineffective abstinence only until marriage programs to recover $99 million in funding. These programs have been proven to be ineffective.

Funding for comprehensive sex education programs that will be authorized by the REAL Act with at least $50 million this year to reduce spread of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases and reduce unintended pregnancies.

A $200 million increase in funding for the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities at NIH.

Reserve funding ($3.5 billion) for the Health Equity and Accountability Act (not yet enacted).

I commend the President for requesting an increase of $15 billion for the Department of State and other international programs in FY2010, which is a 40% increase over the FY2009 level. I urge the Budget Committee to include this increase in the budget resolution. I am hopeful that these additional funds will go towards the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; USAID; migration and refugee assistance; peacekeeping efforts in Darfur; education, healthcare and cultural exchange programs; child survival and health programs; and development assistance.

As the President begins to withdraw troops from Iraq, I also urge the Budget Committee to account for the need to increase Iraqi humanitarian assistance by $1.17 billion in FY2010.

I support the robust funding for our troops and America's national defense. I support reducing funding for the failed Ballistic Missile Defense program and reallocating those funds within the Defense Department to fund increases in shipbuilding, troop readiness, military and civilian pay, cancer research, and mental health services.

I have consistently fought for funding to weed out waste, fraud and abuse within the Department of Defense. The Defense Department has already saved an estimated $89 billion between FY01 and FY07 by implementing 1,682 of the Government Accountability Office's recommendations. President Obama's FY2010 Budget Overview reflects a similar commitment, as has the House Budget Committee under Chairman Spratt's leadership.

As the economy continues to worsen, I urge the Budget Committee to account for the increased need for income security programs, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Unemployment Insurance, Medicaid, and the Recovery Act's COBRA subsidy.

I urge the President to consider including the necessary budget authority to account for the cost of increasing the federal minimum wage and indexing it to inflation. In addition, the Committee should consider the cost of reforming current asset tests for economic assistance. As more and more Americans lose their jobs, it makes little sense to force families to drain their savings to the extent necessary to qualify for certain temporary economic assistance programs.

Finally, the President should also consider the cost of redefining the Federal Poverty Level, which is currently $22,050 for a family of four (100%). I urge the creation of a Decent Living Standard Threshold to determine the amount of annual income that would allow an individual to live beyond deprivation at a safe and decent, but modest, standard of living.

The housing crisis lies at the center of the economic problems we face today. After the series of TARP bills, the Congress has just found out that bank executives have used over $100 million in TARP funds to pay for executive bonuses and other forms of compensation. I urge the President to reverse eight years of underfunding of the nation's affordable housing programs and we are pleased that the Administration has proposed a HUD budget that increases funding for the Department by 19 percent. I urge the President to match this aggressive budget authorization and to support large investments into the Community and Regional Development and the Income Security functions in order to account for increases in Affordable Housing programs.

Specifically, the President should consider including the necessary budget authority to fund the Section 8 public housing operating subsidy at 100% of need. In addition, the President must also consider providing sufficient budget authority for the renewal of all Section 8 vouchers currently in use.

Although the public housing capital fund received an injection of $4 billion in the recent stimulus package, this only represents 12.5 percent of the estimated $32 billion backlog in deferred capital needs. The President should include sufficient budget authority to allow housing authorities to address ongoing and deferred maintenance needs.

In addition, I urge the President to support the Administration's proposal to fund the National Affordable Housing Trust Fund at $1 billion and to fully fund the Community Development Block Grant program. I also urge full funding of HUD's housing programs for the elderly, disabled, and Native Americans, as well as for those programs that prevent homelessness. I support an increase in funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which allows states, localities, and nonprofits to buy up and rehabilitate abandoned and foreclosed properties.

I urge the President to account for funding efforts to combat and reduce juvenile crime and efforts to rehabilitate ex-offenders. I strenuously urge the full funding of the Second Chance Act, which provides transitional assistance to assist ex-offenders in coping with the challenges of reentry. Removing barriers to reentry has proven to reduce recidivism, which in the long run reduces crime. In addition, the President should account for much needed increases in youth crime intervention programs. Research has shown that targeting funding towards intervention rather than incarceration is more effective at reducing crime and saving the taxpayer money in the long run.

I have long supported efforts to increase funding for the Justice Assistance Program, the Juvenile Justice Program, Civil Rights Enforcement, the COPS Program, the Byrne Justice Grant Program, and State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance. I urge the President to account for sustaining many of the important increases for these programs that was included in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

As the Chairwoman of the Children's Caucus, I support the President's efforts to reform and expand the Pell Grant program. Pell Grants are way to make education affordable to disadvantaged youth. This is very important to me.

I would like to see continued and sustained increases in education funding, especially for Title I and IDEA. Even though Congress is to consider the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act this year, the Budget Committee should still account for the need to address the substantial funding shortfalls of this program over the last eight years. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act made substantial increases, but I urge the President to account for sustaining many of these new investments.

The President must also account for needed increases in funding for Head Start, TRIO (including Upward Bound), GEAR UP, Youth Build, and vocational education programs. In addition, I urge the President to account for funding for expanded grants to states for workplace and community transition as authorized in the Higher Education Opportunity Act. These grants will better assist and encourage incarcerated individuals who have obtained a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent to acquire educational and job skills.

I urge this body to account for fully funding the historic increases in funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority

Serving Institutions authorized in the Higher Education Act reauthorization enacted last year.

I support the President's efforts at increasing spending for infrastructural projects. The President's priorities are reminiscent of the New Deal where this country invested in building up our Nation. The President has made a significant effort at achieving this by his signing of HR 1, the Stimulus Act.

In the Stimulus Act, the President authorized money to be spent on infrastructural projects that were shovel ready, i.e., ready to be started within 120 days. I know that America could use this money.

Indeed, Houston would benefit. Houston's Metro Rail needs to complete its RAIL service in certain quadrants of Houston. The project has been twenty years in the making. I have worked with Leadership and Chairman OBERSTAR to ensure that METRO Rail projects get the funding that they need to be completed.

Completion of this mobility project would decrease congestion and pollution as Houstonians would travel via rail instead of using their cars. This would increase Houston mobility and the health of Houstonians as they would be forced to walk around instead of using their private transport.

The House Budget Committee has shown a commitment to increased funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs. I commend the President's budget for including a $25 billion above baseline increase for the VA over the next five years.

Other Priorities: Fully fund the Community Development Block Grant;

Increased funding for the Public Housing Capital Fund to continue to address eight years of stagnant funding under the Bush Administration; fully fund the Child Care and Development Block Grant; fully fund the Social Services Block Grant; increased funding for HOPE VI; fully fund the Neighborhood Stabilization Program; increased funding for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund; support for the creation of a National Infrastructure Bank; continued funding for Hurricane Katrina recovery and rebuilding efforts; increased funding for the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program; increased funding for the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom program at the National Park Service. This is important to me. I worked to get funding for urban parks in the Stimulus bill. This increases the health and overall well being of constituents. It is necessary in urban meccas like Houston.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Chair 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. 85) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 and 2011 through 2014, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPRATT. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 85.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 316 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. 85.

□ 1329

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. 85) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 and 2011 through 2014, with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 85

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009 and for fiscal years 2011 through 2014.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House.
Sec. 202. Reconciliation in the Senate.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 301. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care reform.
Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for college access, affordability, and completion.
Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence.
Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and servicemembers.
Sec. 305. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for certain tax relief.
Sec. 306. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for a 9/11 health program.
Sec. 307. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for child nutrition.
Sec. 308. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for structural unemployment insurance reforms.
Sec. 309. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for child support.
Sec. 310. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
Sec. 311. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for home visiting.
Sec. 312. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program trigger.
Sec. 313. Reserve fund for the Surface Transportation Reauthorization.
Sec. 314. Current policy reserve fund for Medicare improvements.
Sec. 315. Current policy reserve fund for middle class tax relief.
Sec. 316. Current policy reserve fund for reform of the alternative minimum tax (AMT).
Sec. 317. Current policy reserve fund for reform of the Estate and Gift Tax.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Adjustments for direct spending and revenues.
Sec. 402. Adjustments to discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 403. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 404. Oversight of Government performance.
Sec. 405. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 406. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 407. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 408. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE V—POLICY

Sec. 501. Policy on middle-class tax relief and revenues.
Sec. 502. Policy on defense priorities.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

Sec. 601. Sense of the House on veterans' and servicemembers' health care.
Sec. 602. Sense of the House on homeland security.
Sec. 603. Sense of the House on promoting American innovation and economic competitiveness.
Sec. 604. Sense of the House regarding pay parity.
Sec. 605. Sense of the House on college affordability.
Sec. 606. Sense of the House on Great Lakes restoration.
Sec. 607. Sense of the House regarding the importance of child support enforcement.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2014:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009: $1,532,571,000,000
Fiscal year 2010: $1,659,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $1,933,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,190,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,361,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,507,846,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: $0.
Fiscal year 2010: –$6,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: –$155,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: –$170,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: –$153,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: –$125,832,000,000.

(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 2009: $3,675,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,892,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,866,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,913,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,095,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,286,135,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2009: $3,357,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,996,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,981,872,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,939,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,093,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,261,525,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:
Fiscal year 2009: $1,824,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $1,336,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $1,048,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $749,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $732,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $753,679,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 2009: $12,017,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $13,223,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $14,350,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $15,276,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $16,162,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,100,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2009: $7,730,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $8,768,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $9,684,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,344,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $10,934,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $11,577,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2009 through 2014 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $618,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $646,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $562,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $606,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $570,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $579,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $576,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $589,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $584,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $603,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,476,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $40,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $45,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $49,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $53,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $59,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,773,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $64,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,292,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $35,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $31,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $31,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $33,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $35,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,835,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $43,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $5,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $5,539,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $5,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $6,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $6,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,512,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $56,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $37,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $38,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $39,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,058,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $39,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $40,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,957,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $24,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $24,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,150,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $694,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $665,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $60,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $26,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$2,500,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $122,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $88,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $89,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $90,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $90,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $91,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,793,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $23,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $18,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,752,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $164,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $93,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $107,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $117,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $115,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $125,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,959,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $380,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $354,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $383,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $388,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $364,910,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $367,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $369,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $368,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $389,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $384,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $400,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,173,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $427,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $449,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $449,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $505,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $504,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $513,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $513,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $558,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $558,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $616,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $616,150,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $520,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $503,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $536,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $539,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $510,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $513,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $478,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $478,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $483,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $482,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $485,396,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $483,758,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $31,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $26,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,728,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $97,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $106,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $112,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $108,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $113,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $116,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,480,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $55,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $52,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $53,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $53,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,569,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $54,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,058,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $30,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $22,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,629,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $288,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $284,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $323,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $323,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $387,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $387,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $470,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $470,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,137,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,788,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $9,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $6,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $5,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $3,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,962,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, –$78,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$78,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, –$68,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$68,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, –$71,993,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$71,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, –$74,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$74,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, –$77,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$77,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, –$79,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$79,861,000,000.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $82,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $130,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,085,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE.

(a) HEALTH CARE REFORM.—

(1) Not later than September 29, 2009, the House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws to reduce the deficit by $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2014.

(2) Not later than September 29, 2009, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws to reduce the deficit by $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2014.

(b) INVESTING IN EDUCATION.—Not later than September 30, 2009, the House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws to reduce the deficit by $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2014.

(c) SINGLE ENGROSSMENT.—The House may direct the Clerk to add at the end of a bill addressed by this section the text of another measure addressed by this section as passed by the House to form a single engrossed reconciliation bill within the meaning of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 202. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(Senate reconciliation instructions to be supplied by the Senate.)

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes improvements to health care in America, which may include making affordable health coverage available for all, improving the quality of health care, reducing rising health care costs, building on and strengthening existing public and private insurance coverage, including employer-sponsored coverage, and preserving choice of provider and plan by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COLLEGE ACCESS, AFFORDABILITY, AND COMPLETION.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable or accessible or that increases college enrollment and completion

through reforms to the Higher Education Act of 1965 or other legislation, including increasing the maximum Pell grant award annually by an amount equal to one percentage point more than the Consumer Price Index, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides tax incentives for or otherwise encourages the production of renewable energy or increased energy efficiency;

(2) encourages investment in emerging energy or vehicle technologies or carbon capture and sequestration;

(3) limits and provides for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;

(4) assists businesses, industries, States, communities, the environment, workers, or households as the United States moves toward reducing and offsetting the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions; or

(5) facilitates the training of workers for these industries (''green collar jobs'');

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) enhances health care for military personnel or veterans;

(2) maintains the affordability of health care for military retirees or veterans;

(3) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(4) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay (concurrent receipt); or

(5) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation; and

does not authorize the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to bill private insurance companies for treatment of health conditions that are related to veterans' military service, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CERTAIN TAX RELIEF.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for tax relief that supports working families, businesses, States, or communities, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 306. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A 9/11 HEALTH PROGRAM.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that would establish a program, including medical monitoring and treatment, addressing the adverse health impacts linked to the September 11, 2001, attacks by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CHILD NUTRITION.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that reauthorizes, expands, or improves child nutrition programs by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STRUCTURAL UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORMS.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes structural reforms to make the unemployment insurance system respond better to serious economic downturns by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CHILD SUPPORT.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that increases parental support for children, particularly from non-custodial parents, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that capitalizes the existing Affordable Housing Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HOME VISITING.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides funds to states for a program or programs of home visits to low-income mothers-to-be and low-income families which will produce sizeable, sustained improvements in the health and well-being of children and their parents, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TRIGGER.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program more responsive to energy price increases by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for either time period provided in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 313. RESERVE FUND FOR THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that reauthorizes surface transportation programs or that authorizes other transportation-related spending by providing new contract authority by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure establishes or maintains a solvent Highway Trust Fund over the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2015. ''Solvency'' is defined as a positive cash balance. Such measure may include a transfer into the Highway Trust Fund from other Federal funds, as long as the transfer of Federal funds is fully offset.

SEC. 314. CURRENT POLICY RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) PROCEDURE.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that would increase outlays by an amount not to exceed $87,290,000,000 in fiscal years 2010 through 2014 and, for the purposes of the Rules of the House of Representatives, by an amount not to exceed $284,970,000,000 in fiscal years 2010 through 2019 by reforming the Medicare payment system for physicians to—

(1) change incentives to encourage efficiency and higher quality care in a way that supports fiscal sustainability;

(2) improve payment accuracy to encourage efficient use of resources and ensure that primary care receives appropriate compensation;

(3) improve coordination of care among all providers serving a patient in all appropriate settings; or

(4) hold providers accountable for their utilization patterns and quality of care.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—For the purposes of section 401(a) of this resolution, the revisions made pursuant to this section shall apply only to a measure that includes the policies and the amounts described in this section.

SEC. 315. CURRENT POLICY RESERVE FUND FOR MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF.

(a) PROCEDURE.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that would decrease revenues (or increase outlays, as appropriate) by an amount not to exceed $698,571,000,000 in fiscal years 2010 through 2014 and, for the purposes of the Rules of the House of Representatives, by an amount not to exceed $1,848,523,000,000 in fiscal years 2010 through 2019, by extending certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for middle class tax relief, including the—

(1) 10 percent individual income tax bracket;

(2) marriage penalty relief;

(3) child credit at $1,000 and partial refundability of the credit;

(4) education incentives;

(5) other incentives for middle class families and children;

(6) other reductions to individual income tax brackets; and

(7) small business tax relief.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—For the purposes of section 401(a) of this resolution, the adjustments made pursuant to this section shall apply only to a measure that includes the policies and the amounts described in this section.

SEC. 316. CURRENT POLICY RESERVE FUND FOR REFORM OF THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX (AMT).

(a) PROCEDURE.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that would decrease revenues by an amount not to exceed $68,650,000,000 in fiscal years 2010 through 2014 and fiscal years 2010 through 2019 by reforming the AMT so that tens of millions of working families will not become subject to it.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—For the purposes of section 401(a) of this resolution, the adjustments made pursuant to this section shall apply only to a measure that includes the policies and the amounts described in this section.

SEC. 317. CURRENT POLICY RESERVE FUND FOR REFORM OF THE ESTATE AND GIFT TAX.

(a) PROCEDURE.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that would decrease revenues by an amount not to exceed $72,033,000,000 in fiscal years 2010 through 2014 and, for the purposes of the Rules of the House of Representatives, by an amount not to exceed $256,244,000,000 in fiscal years 2010 through 2019 by reforming the Estate and Gift Tax so that only a minute fraction of estates owe tax, by extending the law as in effect in 2009 for the Estate and Gift Tax.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—For the purposes of section 401(a) of this resolution, the adjustments made pursuant to this section shall apply only to a measure that includes the policies and the amounts described in this section.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. ADJUSTMENTS FOR DIRECT SPENDING AND REVENUES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS TO MAINTAIN CURRENT POLICY.—

(1) Subject to the condition specified in paragraph (3), when the chairman of the Committee on the Budget evaluates the budgetary effects of a provision in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this resolution, or the Rules of the House of Representatives relative to baseline estimates that are consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, he shall exclude from his evaluation the budgetary effects of such provision if such effects would have been reflected in a baseline adjusted to maintain current policy.

(2) Paragraph (1) applies only to a provision with respect to which the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has exercised his authority to make budgetary adjustments under sections 314, 315, 316, and 317 of this resolution.

(3) Paragraph (1) shall apply only if the House of Representatives has previously passed a bill to impose statutory pay-as-you-go requirements, or the measure containing the provision being evaluated by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget imposes such requirements, and only if such bill is designated as providing statutory pay-as-you-go-requirements under this subsection.

(b) LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (LIHEAP).—Prior to consideration of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2010 that appropriates $3,200,000,000 in funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance program and provides additional appropriations of up to $1,900,000,000 for that program, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the budgetary treatment of such additional amounts and allocate such additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority to the Committee on Appropriations.

(c) DEPOSIT INSURANCE.—When the chairman of the Budget Committee evaluates the budgetary effects of a provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this resolution, or the Rules of the House of Representatives, the chairman shall exclude the budgetary effects of any provision that affects the full funding of the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of Public Law 110–343, the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008.

SEC. 402. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2010 that appropriates $273,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration and (except as provided in subparagraph (B)) provides an additional appropriation of up to $485,000,000, and that 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 2010.

(B) ASSET VERIFICATION.—The additional appropriation of $485,000,000 may also provide that a portion of that amount, not to exceed $34,000,000, instead may be used for asset verification for Supplemental Security Income recipients, but only if and to the extent that the Office of the Chief Actuary estimates that the initiative would be at least as cost effective as the redeterminations of eligibility described in subparagraph (A).

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2010 that appropriates $5,117,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service for Enforcement and provides an additional appropriation of up to $387,000,000 for Enforcement to address the Federal tax gap, and provides that such sums as may be necessary shall be available from the Operations Support account in the Internal Revenue Service to fully support these Enforcement activities, 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 2010.

(3) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2010 that appropriates up to $311,000,000, 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 2010.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2010 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 $50,000,000, 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 2010.

(5) PARTNERSHIP FUND FOR PROGRAM INTEGRITY INNOVATION.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides discretionary budget authority for a Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation in the Office of Management and Budget in an amount not to exceed $175,000,000 for fiscal year 2010 and that designates the amount for the Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation in the Office of Management and Budget, 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 2010.

(6) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection 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 this subsection.

(b) COSTS OF OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND EMERGENCY NEEDS.—

(1) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2009 or fiscal year 2010 for overseas deployments and related activities and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this subparagraph, then new budget authority, outlays, or receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or this resolution.

(2) EMERGENCY NEEDS.—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs, then new budget authority and outlays resulting therefrom shall not count for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or this resolution.

SEC. 403. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2011 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2012, accounts separately identified under the same heading.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2010 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2010.

SEC. 404. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

All committees are encouraged to conduct rigorous oversight hearings to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in all aspects of Federal spending and Government operations, giving particular scrutiny to issues raised by the Federal Office of the Inspector General or the Comptroller General of the United States. Based upon these oversight efforts, the committees are encouraged to make recommendations to reduce wasteful Federal spending to promote deficit reduction and long-term fiscal responsibility. Such recommendations should be submitted to the Committee on the Budget in the views and estimates reports prepared by committees as required under 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 405. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, 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 and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—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 off-budget discretionary amounts.

SEC. 406. 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 included in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution, 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 Committee on the Budget.

(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for legislation which has received final Congressional approval in the same form by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but has yet to be presented to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

SEC. 407. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing for a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall adjust any appropriate levels and allocations in this resolution accordingly.

SEC. 408. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

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

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY ON MIDDLE-CLASS TAX RELIEF AND REVENUES.

It is the policy of this resolution to minimize fiscal burdens on working families and their children and grandchildren. It is the policy of this resolution to extend the following tax relief consistent with current policy—

(1) relief for the tens of millions of middle-income households who would otherwise be subject to the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) under current law;

(2) middle-class tax relief; and

(3) elimination of estate taxes on all but a minute fraction of estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified tax credit.

In total, this resolution supports the extension of $1,700,000,000,000 in tax relief to individuals and families relative to current law. This resolution supports additional, deficit-neutral tax relief, including the extension of AMT relief, the research and experimentation tax credit, the deduction for State and local sales taxes, the enactment of a tax credit for school construction bonds, and other tax relief for working families. The cost of enacting such policies may be offset by reforms within the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that produce higher rates of tax compliance to close the ''tax gap'' and reduce taxpayer burdens through tax simplification. The President's budget proposes a variety of other revenue offsets. Unless expressly provided, this resolution does not assume any of the specific revenue offset proposals provided for in the President's budget. Decisions about specific revenue offsets are made by the Ways and Means Committee, which is the tax-writing committee.

SEC. 502. POLICY ON DEFENSE PRIORITIES.

It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) there is no higher priority than the defense of our Nation, and therefore the Administration and Congress will make the necessary investments and reforms to strengthen our military so that it can successfully meet the threats of the 21st century;

(2) acquisition reform is needed at the Department of Defense to end excessive cost growth in the development of new weapons systems and to ensure that weapons systems are delivered on time and in adequate quantities to equip our servicemen and servicewomen;

(3) the Department of Defense should review defense plans to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant and are applicable to 21st century threats;

(4) sufficient resources should be provided for the Department of Defense to aggressively address the 758 unimplemented recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) since 2001 to improve practices at the Department of Defense, which could save billions of dollars that could be applied to priorities identified in this section;

(5) the Department of Defense should review the role that contractors play in its operations, including the degree to which contractors are performing inherently governmental functions, to ensure it has the most effective mix of government and contracted personnel;

(6) the Department of Defense report to Congress on its assessment of Cold War-era weaponry, its progress on implementing GAO recommendations, and its review of contractors at the Department as outlined in paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) by a date to be determined by the appropriate committees;

(7) the GAO provide a report to the appropriate congressional committees by December 31, 2009, on the Department of Defense's progress in implementing its audit recommendations;

(8) ballistic missile defense technologies that are not proven to work through adequate testing and that are not operationally viable should not be deployed, and that no funding should be provided for the research or development of space-based interceptors;

(9) cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing ''loose nukes'' and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat;

(10) readiness of our troops, particularly the National Guard and Reserves, is a high priority, and that continued emphasis is needed to ensure adequate equipment and training;

(11) improving military health care services and ensuring quality health care for returning combat veterans is a high priority;

(12) military pay and benefits should be enhanced to improve the quality of life for military personnel and their families;

(13) the Department of Defense should make every effort to investigate the national security benefits of energy independence, including those that may be associated with alternative energy sources and energy efficiency conversions;

(14) the Administration's budget requests should continue to comply with section 1008, Public Law 109–364, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, and that to the extent practicable overseas military operations should no longer be funded through emergency supplemental appropriations; and

(15) when assessing security threats and reviewing the programs and funding needed to counter these threats, the Administration should do so in a comprehensive manner that includes all agencies involved in our national security.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 601. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON VETERANS' AND SERVICEMEMBERS' HEALTH CARE.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the House supports excellent health care for current and former members of the

United States Armed Services—they have served well and honorably and have made significant sacrifices for this Nation;

(2) the President's budget will improve health care for veterans by increasing appropriations for VA by 10 percent more than the 2009 level, increasing VA's appropriated resources for every year after 2010, and restoring health care eligibility to additional nondisabled veterans with modest incomes;

(3) VA is not and should not be authorized to bill private insurance companies for treatment of health conditions that are related to veterans' military service;

(4) VA may find it difficult to realize the level of increase in medical care collections estimated in the President's budget for 2010 using existing authorities; therefore, this resolution provides $540,000,000 more for Function 700 (Veterans Benefits and Services) than the President's budget to safeguard the provision of health care to veterans;

(5) it is important to continue providing sufficient and timely funding for veterans' and servicemembers' health care; and

(6) this resolution provides additional funding above the 2009 levels for VA to research and treat mental health, post-traumatic stress disorder, and traumatic brain injury.

SEC. 602. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.

It is the sense of the House that because making the country safer and more secure is such a critical priority, the resolution therefore provides robust resources in the four budget functions—Function 400 (Transportation), Function 450 (Community and Regional Development), Function 550 (Health), and Function 750 (Administration of Justice)—that fund most nondefense homeland security activities that can be used to address our key security priorities, including—

(1) safeguarding the Nation's transportation systems, including rail, mass transit, ports, and airports;

(2) continuing with efforts to identify and to screen for threats bound for the United States;

(3) strengthening border security;

(4) enhancing emergency preparedness and training and equipping first responders;

(5) helping to make critical infrastructure more secure and resilient against the threat of terrorism and natural disasters;

(6) making the Nation's cyber infrastructure resistive to attack; and

(7) increasing the preparedness of the public health system.

SEC. 603. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON PROMOTING AMERICAN INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the House should provide sufficient investments to enable our Nation to continue to be the world leader in education, innovation, and economic growth as envisioned in the goals of the America COMPETES Act;

(2) this resolution builds on significant funding provided in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act for scientific research and education in Function 250 (General Science, Space and Technology), Function 270 (Energy), Function 300 (Natural Resources and Environment), Function 500 (Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services), and Function 550 (Health);

(3) the House also should pursue policies designed to ensure that American students, teachers, businesses, and workers are prepared to continue leading the world in innovation, research, and technology well into the future; and

(4) this resolution recognizes the importance of the extension of investments and tax policies that promote research and development and encourage innovation and future technologies that will ensure American economic competitiveness.

SEC. 604. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PAY PARITY.

It is the sense of the House that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 605. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY.

It is the sense of the House that nothing in this resolution should be construed to reduce any assistance that makes college more affordable and accessible for students, including but not limited to student aid programs and services provided by nonprofit State agencies.

SEC. 606. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON GREAT LAKES RESTORATION.

It is the sense of the House that this resolution recognizes the importance of funding for an interagency initiative to address regional environmental issues that affect the Great Lakes, and that coordinated planning and implementation among the Federal, State, and local government and nongovernmental stakeholders is essential to more effectively addressing the most significant problems within the Great Lakes basin.

SEC. 607. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) additional legislative action is needed to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty; and

(2) when 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the concurrent resolution is in order except the amendments printed in House Report 111–73. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

□ 1330

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 111–73.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 111–73 offered by Ms. WOOLSEY:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010.

Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 through 2019 are set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2019:

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

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

Fiscal year 2010: $1,873,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,212,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,530,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,568,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,651,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,778,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,884,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,000,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,105,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,214,880,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2010: $207,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $123,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $169,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $53,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$12,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$28,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$44,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$64,154,000,000.

(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 2010: $3,624,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $3,073,855,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $3,205,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,458,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,667,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,841,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $4,054,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $4,236,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $4,428,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,701,771,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2010: $3,394,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $3,250,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $3,257,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,455,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,654,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,819,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $4,032,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $4,201,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $4,383,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,662,115,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2010: −$1,520,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: −$1,037,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: −$726,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: −$886,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: −$1,002,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$1,041,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$1,148,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$1,200,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$1,277,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$1,447,234,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2010: $13,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $14,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $15,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $16,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $19,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $20,726,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: $22,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $23,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $24,774,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2010: $9,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $11,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $15,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $16,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $17,746,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2010 through 2019 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $484,913,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $556,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $490,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $519,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $496,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $498,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $502,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $501,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $510,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $521,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $534,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $530,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $547,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $539,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $561,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $548,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $575,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $566,608,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $114,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $111,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $116,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,351,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $121,624,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $126,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $132,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $134,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $136,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $137,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $131,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $138,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,313,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $31,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $31,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $33,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $35,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $38,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $39,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $40,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,711,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $4,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $34,404,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $49,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $49,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $49,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $49,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $49,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $49,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $48,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $48,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,432,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $37,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $38,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $39,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $39,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $39,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $40,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $41,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $42,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,376,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $20,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $20,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,968,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $21,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $21,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,455,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $311,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $335,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $25,624,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $8,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $15,716,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $9,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $10,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $9,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $14,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $15,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $17,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,842,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $75,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $75,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $98,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $119,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $120,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $134,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $123,757,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $126,638,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, $141,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $150,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $156,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,113,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26.559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $16,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $16,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $17,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $17,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $18,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,368,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $133,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $154,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $164,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $172,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $168,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $180,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $175,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $184,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $181,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $191,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $187,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $197,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $192,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $202,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $198,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $207,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $203,039,000,000
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $457,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $458,262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $449,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $450,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $473,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $495,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $489,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $518,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $518,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $544,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $541,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $571,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $568,888,000,000
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $605,267,000,000
(B) Outlays, $602,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $638,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $673,957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $670,849,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $449,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $449,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $505,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $505,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $513,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $513,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $558,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $558,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $615,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $616,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $646,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $646,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $638,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $643,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $640,482,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $649,064,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $645,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $666,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $662,774,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $628,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $602,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $611,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $603,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $608,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $603,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $618,526,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $615,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $620,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $626,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $622,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $638,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $643,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $640,482,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $649,064,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $645,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $666,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $662,774,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $26,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,728,000,000
(B) Outlays, $32,728,000,000
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,875,000,000
(B) Outlays, $35,875,000,000
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,021,000,000
(B) Outlays, $39,021,000,000
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $42,449,000,000
(B) Outlays, $42,449,000,000
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $46,094,000,000
(B) Outlays, $46,094,000,000
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $49,994,000,000
(B) Outlays, $49,994,000,000
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $106,043,000,000
(B) Outlays, $105,412,000,000
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $113,588,000,000
(B) Outlays, $113,372,000,000
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $108,754,000,000
(B) Outlays, $108,301,000,000
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $149,292,000,000
(B) Outlays, $148,847,000,000
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $150,628,000,000
(B) Outlays, $150,314,000,000
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $152,378,000,000
(B) Outlays, $152,044,000,000
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $157,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $157,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $156,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $156,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $154,286,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $161,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,244,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $54,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $55,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $55,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $54,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $54,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $55,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $56,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $57,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $60,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $62,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,692,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,371,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $24,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $24,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $26,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $26,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $27,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $28,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $29,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,112,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $287,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $287,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $328,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $328,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $393,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $393,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $482,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $482,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $584,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $584,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $672,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $672,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $750,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $750,106,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $823,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $823,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $910,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $910,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $996,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $996,787,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $299,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,594,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$68,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$68,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$72,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$72,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$75,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$75,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$78,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$78,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$80,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$82,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$82,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$94,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$94,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$99,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$99,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$103,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$103,004,000,000.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $130,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,729,000,000.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

As we face the huge challenges ahead of us, the financial crisis, wars in two countries, rising unemployment, crumbling infrastructure, lack of affordable health care, high energy prices and global climate change, the budget is the legislation that will address all of these issues at one time. That's why, as co-chair, with Congressman RAÚL GRIJALVA of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, I'm pleased to present the Fiscal Year 2010 Progressive Caucus Budget Alternative.

In November the American people voted to take the country in a new direction, and that is exactly what the CPC budget does, not by making small adjustments, but by fundamentally changing the way our government allocates its resources. That's why the CPC budget eliminates more than $60 billion in unneeded spending at the Pentagon, much of which is spent on weapons designed to fight the former Soviet Union. Our budget cuts defense spending by a total of $158 billion in Fiscal Year 2010.

The CPC alternative budget saves another $8.7 billion a year by fully implementing the nearly 800 outstanding GAO recommendations to reduce waste, fraud and abuse at the DOD.

And finally, we can save another $90 billion by executing a timely and complete withdrawal of our troops from Iraq.

Our budget restores fairness and balance to the Tax Code by rolling back the Bush tax breaks for the top 1 percent, closing loopholes for corporations that would equal $100 billion in savings a year, ensuring that Wall Street pays its fair share for the burden placed on taxpayers by the TARP program, and limiting the tax deductibility of excessive CEO pay.

With these offsets, the CPC budget then sets forth an ambitious agenda to address the most pressing matters facing America today. We invest $991 billion in nondefense discretionary spending for fiscal year 2010, which is $469 billion over the President's budget. This bold infusion of resources includes $300 billion in stimulus that was left out of the economic recovery package, and increases spending for domestic priorities. These investments include: $120 billion a year to ensure that every American has health care; $90 billion a year to cut the poverty rate in America by 50 percent; up to $80 billion a year to rebuild and reinvest in our infrastructure; and an increase of $60 billion for international assistance for nonmilitary foreign assistance to fight the root causes of terrorism, to support the 21st century diplomacy.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield myself as much time as I may consume. And to meeting basic human needs, universal education and worldwide prevention of HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria.

Thirty billion dollars a year in our budget is for the President's budget to fight global warming and promote energy independence.

Over $70 billion a year will fully fund the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and IDEA, and $45 billion a year to make veterans health care an entitlement.

Madam Chair, these are the major priorities of the Progressive Caucus alternative budget, and I urge my colleagues to pay attention to it and to vote for it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, first I do want to offer my congratulations to the gentlelady for simply offering the budget. As one who has written budgets before, on behalf of the Republican Study Committee, it is hard, difficult, challenging work, but I know the lady is committed to her set of principles. They are diametrically opposed to mine, but I respect her body of work and her commitment to her philosophy.

Madam Chairman, as we look at this budget and the other Democrat alternatives, frankly, they have a whole lot more in common than they have in their differences. All of these budgets, all of these Democratic budgets, are simply radical. They are radical departures from over 200 years of history in America.

Every single one, Madam Chairman, spends too much. They tax too much, and they borrow too much. We are looking, even prior to the submission of this progressive budget, much less the Democratic-controlled House Budget Committee budget, we were looking at drowning in a sea of red ink. We were looking at entitlement spending simply being out of control.

And don't take my word for it, Madam Chairman. Let's listen to the Federal Reserve. ''Without early and meaningful action to address the rapid growth of entitlements, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened, with future generations bearing much of the cost.''

Listen to our most recent former Comptroller General Walker of the General Accountability Office. ''The rising costs of government entitlements are a fiscal cancer, a fiscal cancer that threatens catastrophic consequences for our country and could bankrupt America.''

Now, Madam Chairman, that was all before the submissions of these budgets. And let's look at the recent history of this Democratic-controlled Congress. Seven hundred billion dollars of bailout money, costing every American household $6,034. Now, some Members on the other side of the aisle claim the taxpayer is going to get his money back. I hope that proves to be true. As history is my guide, I have some doubts.

A $1.13 trillion government stimulus plan, not a plan to stimulate the economy, a plan to stimulate big government, costing every American household $9,810. Madam Chairman, where are they going to get this money? People are losing their jobs. Credit is being contracted. And yet, spending bill after spending bill after spending bill.

Then, Madam Chairman, a $410 billion omnibus spending bill, costing every American household $3,534. Now, on top of all this, on top of all this massive spending, we have the single largest budget in American history being proposed, more spending than this Nation has ever seen. More spending than this Nation has ever seen, even with respect to the economy, with the exception of World War II.

These are budgets that are going to impose costs on the average American family of over $30,000. Again, Madam Chairman, this progressive budget, along with all the other Democratic budgets, spends too much, it taxes too much, and it borrows too much.

Now, Madam Chairman, speaker after speaker has come to the floor to decry the inherited economic mess. There is an economic mess. But our President inherited this economic mess from a Democratic-controlled Congress. When the Republicans were last in control of Congress, the deficit was $160 billion and falling. And now, just 2 years later, just 2 years later, it was $1.3 trillion, and the President decided to add on another 500, $600 billion on top of that. We're looking at an increase in the Federal deficit of tenfold in just 2 years.

And now, Madam Chairman, each one of these Democratic budgets is proposing more debt, more debt in the next 10 years than has been run up in the previous 200 years of our Nation's history, going back to the dawn of the Republic. We have never seen these levels of debt.

Again, Madam Chairman, never in our history have so few voted so fast to indebt so many and do so little good. As history is my guide, no nation, no nation has ever borrowed or spent its way into prosperity, no matter how they tried. This is simply radical.

Madam Chairman, who ever thought we would see the day where European socialists are lecturing the United States of America about fiscal responsibility. What a topsy-turvy world we live in, Madam Chairman. Never thought we would have seen the day. But now that spectacle is on television.

Madam Chairman, who ever thought we would see the day where our Secretary of State has to go to China and beg them to keep on buying our debt? Even the Chinese, the Communist Chinese, are now lecturing the United States of America about its profligate spending.

Madam Chairman, if any of these Democratic budgets are passed, we will be the first generation in America's history to leave the next generation with less freedom, less opportunity and a lower standard of living. It is unavoidable. And that's why this budget is so radical.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, BARNEY FRANK of Massachusetts, who is the author of this year's reduction of Cold War weapons in our CPC budget.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chairman, I admire the work that's been done by the leadership of the Progressive Caucus and the staff.

Before getting to that I would like to make two, I think, corrections to my friend from Texas. First, I know people on that side have a propensity to see socialists everywhere. But the people who are most lecturing the American Government are the president of France, Nicolas Sarkozy, and the chancellor of Germany, Angela Merkel, two conservatives. So his invocation of socialists lecturing us is a further example of the propensity to see socialists where they are not. In fact, we have not heard that from the British Government, which is run by the Labor Party. But the Gaullist president of France and the Christian Democratic chancellor of Germany would object to being called socialists by my friend from Texas.

Secondly, he says this would be the first administration in history to hand on to the next generation a lower standard of living. No, it won't even be, if that happens, the first administration to do it in this century because the Bush administration has done just that. If you look at what the standard of living was after this terrible economic crisis that came under the Bush administration, we've already hit that goal.

Now, as to spending. A riddle, Madam Chairman. When is government spending not government spending? And on the other hand, when does government spending which, according to the conservatives, destroys jobs, in fact creates jobs? The answer is when it's for weapons.

We have, on the other side, a form of weaponized Keynesianism. When it comes to spending money to build roads or improve medical infrastructure or do other things that are enhancing the quality of life, they tell us that government spending doesn't create a job. But when we are talking about continuing to produce weapons that have the admirable purpose of defeating the Soviet Union in the Cold War, and we're still producing the weapons, then somehow we have to keep them going because of its job creation capacity.

Military spending. George Bush, in his exit interview with the Wall Street Journal, hardly a harsh critic for him on the editorial page, said the main reason he had to spend so much was the ramp-up in military spending. I just disagree with him that it was necessary. The wholly unnecessary, in fact, damaging Iraq war has cost us hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars.

I am amazed that people can lament spending and forget the elephant in the room. And when the elephant forgets the elephant in the room, I suppose it's even more surprising, because it is massive military spending now and for the future that is the problem.

We're worried about entitlements. I am less concerned about a 73-year-old woman getting a cost of living increase than I am about building the F–22 when we no longer need it.

And we have missile defense. Now, I don't keep up, since I became chairman of the committee I've been a little diverted, with the news as much as I used to. And I haven't reviewed all the fatwas out of that lunatic regime in Iran. But I do not remember them threatening to destroy Prague. I do not remember the pronouncement in which Iran said, you Czechs better watch out; we're going to bomb you.

Despite the absence of any such threat, the budget that my friends on the other side would like commits us to spending billions of dollars to defend Prague against Iran. I'd rather protect old people against poverty.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I would first yield myself 30 seconds to say to the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee, and my friend, that I would certainly concede the point that he is probably far more familiar with socialists in Europe than I am, and I concede that point.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSARLING. I would be happy to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, the people I mentioned were Nicolas Sarkozy, who is the non-socialist, Gaullist president of France and Angela Merkel, the non-socialist chancellor of Germany.

Mr. HENSARLING. With 30 seconds, I'll reclaim my time.

I would also point out to the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee Article I, section 9 of our Constitution that puts the spending power with the Congress, and to remind him that his party has been in control for the last 2 years.

□ 1345

With that, Madam Chair, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Chair, I congratulate the gentleman on his work on this alternative that we are going to see.

The one before us is the Progressive budget, and it seems to me that what we have here is a continuation of the problem that we are all focused on, which is we've overdosed on credit, and there really is a limit to how much you can spend. This is an unfortunate thing. We wish that we had no limits, but there are limits. I hope that Progressives won't stand on the floor and say what I've often heard them say before, which is, ''The question is not whether we can afford to do this. The question is whether we can afford not to do this,'' which is, of course, inherently irresponsible because there are limits. There are limits on how much money there is available, on how many resources we can commit to various programs and projects, and we've got to live within those limits.

There has been a lot of talk about inheriting this financial mess, and as the gentleman from Texas said a little while ago, it is a mess, and it is something that this administration is dealing with and that this majority is dealing with, but it's also something that we've got to admit has been coming for a long time. This is not, really, a brand new thing. The housing bubble was new—or the bursting of it was new. The buildup and the blowing up of that bubble took a while. The bursting of it is more recent, but the thing has been going on for a long time under, frankly, Republicans and Democrats. It is the runaway spending and entitlements that must be constrained. I would submit the only way to change it is to change the underlying programs and the incentives and the way that those programs work.

For example, in Medicare, we just have got to find a way to incentivize the patient to care about how much it costs, and we have just got to find a way to make prevention part of our health system. Now, that's something we need to come together on and figure out—Progressives, conservatives, Republicans, Democrats.

How do you do that? How do you change the underlying incentives in a program like Medicare to bring it under control? I would submit that these sorts of things where you just sort of cap the rate of growth really don't work because we've seen that, we've done that, and then we've extended the cap, so that doesn't work.

What's going to have to happen is we have to figure out a way to come into those programs, those big ones—Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security—and figure out a way to change the underlying program. Hopefully, we can do that in a cooperative, collaborative way. There are ideas on this side of the aisle that will work in health care—that will work to bring down the cost, the runaway cost of Medicare and Medicaid. I hope that we can get to that.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I'm honored to yield a minute and a half to the former co-chair of the Progressive Caucus, Barbara Lee from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, let me just say that I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget substitute, and I want to commend Congresswoman WOOLSEY and Congressman GRIJALVA—co-chairs of the CPC—and their staffs for their very hard and tireless work on this great budget.

Budgets are not only fiscal documents; they are moral documents. They reflect our Nation's values and priorities. For example, in our budget, we redeploy all of our troops and contractors out of Iraq, and we cap the tax deductibility of excessive CEO pay. That totals about $120 billion in our budget. Our budget, however, puts $120 billion a year into health care for all Americans. Those are our values.

The CPC budget provides critical relief to those who are suffering during this economic crisis. It revitalizes our economy, and it cuts poverty in half in 10 years. We eliminate waste, fraud and abuse at the Pentagon, and we eliminate Cold War era weapons systems to the tune of about $60 billion a year. Smart security is also a critical component of this budget, and we must use this in places like Afghanistan where we know that there is clearly no military solution.

I was concerned about that reality on September 14, 2001 when I voted against the military authorization to provide a blank check for endless wars, and I still remain unpersuaded today that sending more troops to Afghanistan will actually advance our national security interests. We must be a Nation committed to exercising the tools of smart security for the 21st century, and this budget puts us on that path.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. At this time, Madam Chair, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Democrat budget, and I do so reluctantly. We were hoping that we could come together on something that takes the country forward.

When you look at how Americans are hurting—and I'm from Michigan, and nobody knows about hurting economies like we do in Michigan—it's painful, but the prescription that the Democrats offer is dangerous: Borrow more money. Spend more money. Tax the very people who are going to get us out of this recession—the small business people. It's not that we're taxed too little already, and we have to be taxed more.

I mean this bill says: Listen, you know what? With your electric bill, Americans, you're not paying enough. We're going to charge you the largest utility tax increase in the history of the United States under this cap-and-tax program in the Democrat blueprint. We're going to borrow more in the next 10 years than for all the wars that we've ever fought combined. We're going to spend every penny of it.

So what happens if you're building cars or if, actually, you work for a small business in Lansing, Michigan? You're getting up in the morning under the Democrat tax bill, and you're going to pay a lot more for your shower in the morning. You're going to put the laundry in before you go to work, and you're paying a lot more to do your laundry. Your kids are doing their homework on the Internet. They're paying more to do their homework on the Internet. You turn on your coffee maker, and you're paying more. You get out to the car of which you paid a sales tax. You pay a tax for your license plate. You pay a tax for your driver's license. You pay a State gas tax and a Federal gas tax. Guess what?

Your gas bill is going up to drive to work under this plan.

You get to work, and for the privilege of showing up at this small business, you're going to pay more for taxes for that small business. The electric bills in that place are going up, in some cases the estimates are, by 177 percent. You're paying more. You pay a city income tax, a State income tax, a Federal income tax. You pay your unemployment tax and your Workers' Comp tax.

You get home, and you're paying a huge property tax. Oh, by the way, that's going up, too. When you go to call your Congressman to complain, you pay a special universal tax on your phone. You sit down to have a beer to relax, and you pay a Federal excise tax on that beer. You pay more for wine to get it in the country. You pay more for 1 percent milk.

All of this is at a time when people are hurting. It's the most regressive tax you can propose. The poorest Americans are already taxed to death. This is the wrong prescription. It borrows too much; it spends too much; it taxes too much.

I encourage my friends and colleagues from the other side of the aisle who talk about priorities to name me the importance of raising the cost of doing your laundry, of keeping your food cold, of cooking your food, and of keeping your house either warm or cool to the average American, and tell me that's a good priority for the future of job growth and development.

Madam Chair, I would urge the rejection of the Democrat budget, and would urge putting some common sense back in this equation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I yield a minute and a half to a Progressive vice chair, KEITH ELLISON from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Progressive budget, and I want to thank our leadership in the Progressive Caucus for pulling the budget together. Though I do plan on supporting the House Democratic budget resolution, I believe that our Progressive budget differs in two important ways, and that's why I urge my colleagues to support the Progressive budget.

First, the Progressive alternative fully funds President Obama's international affairs request—Function 150 account. I believe robust funding for international affairs, which covers funds to combat HIV, tuberculosis and malaria as well as funding to help reconstruction in Afghanistan, is critical to our Nation's public diplomacy.

Our country has a unique opportunity to rebuild alliances across the globe, and we need to meet our foreign policy challenges in the 21st century. To accomplish this task, our country and this Congress must demonstrate a strong commitment to funding international aid.

Second, the Progressive Caucus budget embraces President Obama's commitment to retire Cold War weapons systems, and the Progressive budget goes further than the House Democratic budget in cutting defense spending. The Progressive budget reduces wasteful spending that, according to the GAO, costs taxpayers $8.7 billion a year. The Progressive Caucus budget also eliminates unnecessary and obsolete Cold War weapons systems, saving taxpayers $60 billion a year. I know my Republican colleagues are in favor of cutting those wasteful programs.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California may control the time of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. At this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

Madam Chair, folks in western North Carolina are hurting. We've seen the rise in unemployment. We've seen the economic dislocation that this recession has created. We've seen the impact it has on small towns and communities, on families that are struggling to make ends meet, and we've seen the rise in unemployment that generally has occurred. These are tough economic times, and I think we have to have a responsible Federal budget to meet these tough economic times.

Families have to tighten their belts during these tough times. Likewise, I think the Federal Government should do the same. I think it's wrong to raise taxes in a time of recession. I think it's wrong to raise taxes on people who are already hurting. That's why I oppose this budget that's being presented here today.

In fact, it's not simply enough as a public policymaker to reject a proposal, but you should offer your own, your own ideas on the way to properly act. Therefore, I am voting for two alternatives that will be better than the budget offered here today—the Obama-Pelosi budget—that I'm offering through the Republican Study Committee and through the Republican Members.

We have a budget that spends far less without raising taxes and that borrows far less than this current budget. Moreover, I'm supporting a budget alternative that balances the budget without raising taxes, in fact, making the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts permanent, which will help families and small businesses. After all, we should not be taxing and spending and borrowing more. We should be cutting, saving and incentivizing great economic growth, and we should be helping small businesses expand and maintain even the workers that they currently have, and we should be helping small families as well.

So I think it's reasonable to support a balanced budget without raising taxes, and I think it's irresponsible to support a budget that raises taxes, especially to the magnitude of this liberal budget offered here on the House floor.

With that, I urge the adoption of the Republican Study Committee alternative, of the Republican alternative, and urge the rejection of the Obama-Pelosi budget and especially of this very liberal budget offered here on the floor today.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I am honored to yield a minute and a half to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

□ 1400

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you. I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this.

It was interesting here to watch the exchange on the floor where my good friend, the Chair of the Financial Services Committee, had to instruct my friend from Texas—I guess who's left the floor—about who is a socialist and who isn't.

It's no small point that people on the other side who are offering their world view don't actually know who our allies are and who runs two of the top eight economies in the world. It's the same sort of disregard for facts that has encouraged them to willfully misrepresent the costs of coming to grips with global warming and carbon pollution. And in fact, the chair of the Global Climate Committee Program at MIT had to send a letter to the Republican leader explaining that they are misleading people by attaching a $3,000 figure, indicating that that is grossly out of proportion and depends entirely on what would happen with a much smaller burden.

The point is, under the progressive budget, under the other Democratic alternatives, these moneys would be returned to people to reduce their energy costs, create green jobs. There was a time when conservatives would be worried about cost overruns in the Department of Defense and wasteful spending on Cold War weapons. That time is not now.

It's why I support these budgets and urge the rejection of the Republican alternatives.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Chair, I will reserve at this time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the outspoken Progressive leader, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, we come to this floor with a sobering recognition: $657 billion spent on the war in Iraq. Certainly we would not take one cent away from

our soldiers, their care, the care of their families. But $657 billion on a war that generated the kind of controversy and questionable results that the Iraq war created puts us in the position we're in today.

For at the same time that we were fighting a war, the last administration saw no reason to ask America to sacrifice. And so it gave these enormous—that administration gave these enormous tax cuts that put us in this very difficult position of reaching $1 trillion in debt.

What we do today with this budget—and I stand here as a vice chair and one believing in the principles of this administration of helping America restore itself in energy, health care, education—this budget, the Progressive Caucus budget, puts more money to extinguish poverty, it cuts the tax cuts that have been given to the rich, and it invests those moneys in education, climate control, as well as providing for our veterans, and, yes, it does something enormously unique: it provides a pathway for rehabilitation for ex-offenders. It intervenes with respect to youths who are involved in crime, and it provides the resources to fully fund what we call the Second Chance bill, allowing ex-offenders to be rehabilitated to go back to their families and get their families off of welfare.

Research has shown that targeting funding towards intervention rather than incarceration is more effective than reducing crime and saves the taxpayers' money in the long run.

This is a bill for the people of America. I ask my colleagues to support it and to support the President's budget.

Madam Chair, I would like to rise in support of the budget put forward today by the Congressional Progressive Caucus. This alternative budget combats the worsening poverty and Hurricane Katrina redress, renews federal commitment to fully address the on-going suffering of the victims of Hurricane Katrina and help cut the poverty rate in America by 50 percent during the next decade with increased funding for decent affordable housing, anti-hunger programs, and more quality child care. This Progressive budget restores the 21st century social contract and safety net; Economic Stimulus #2 ($300 billion), which provides more immediate help to overcome the "Iraq recession" through increased federal assistance for unemployment insurance, food stamps, Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) payments to states, and housing assistance.

The Congressional Progressive Budget targets waste, fraud, and abuse in federal government, starting with Pentagon savings and projects enactment of the Common Sense Budget Act, which would save at least $60 billion/year on largely obsolete Cold War weapons systems plus billions more in waste, fraud, and abuse in DOD spending identified by the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office (GAO).

This Progressive budget repeals the Bush tax cuts for the top 1 percent of taxpayers—due to expire in 2010 regardless and beyond—savings of at least $222 billion and cracks down on corporate welfare while projecting elimination of various corporate tax loopholes such as deductibility of advertising for junk mail, imaging purposes, etc. and special tax breaks for oil and gas industry and other extraction industries.

This alternative budget shifts some spending and increases other non-military spending to fight root causes of terrorism—21st century diplomacy, meeting basic human needs (e.g. HIV/AIDS/TB, universal basic education for all); Global Warming and Energy Independence, sustained investments in renewable energy and energy independence, including needed extension of production and investment tax credits. This budget includes full funding of authorized levels for green jobs and pathways out of poverty grants. In addition, climate policy should significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions in a manner which supports economic security and health of low-income and moderate-income families and communities of color and education for all—fully fund Elementary and Secondary Education Act and IDEA prospectively and improve Teacher Corps and job training. This "progressive" budget includes Medicare for All—affordable, accessible, quality health care for all Americans, starting with full funding of SCHIP to cover every child in America.

Included in this budget is Guaranteed Veterans' Health Care—which ensures whatever federal funding is needed to provide health care (including mental health) for all America's veterans (including but not limited to veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan military operations; support for the Middle-Class—increase funding to protect fundamental worker rights, enforce fair credit and lending practices, and promote livable wages and safe workplaces; and rebuild America's Communities—substantially increase funding for Community Development Block Grants, Social Services Block Grants, and community policing, and authorize release of funds available through the gas tax to clean-up leaking underground storage tanks that threaten the drinking water of nearly half of all Americans. This progressive budget increases funding supporting the Office of Environmental Justice and environmental justice programs, including community grants and a review of the EPA and other agencies' policies to ensure they are protective of minority and low-income communities. Madam Chair, we need to pass a real budget for America that's forward thinking and "progressive" that will get us back on the right track.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Chair, when I listen to some of the debate on the floor, I wonder what the American people might think. As I reflect on the words that were just spoken, it sounds like we have a greater imperative to somehow deal with this notion of climate change than we do with defending the American people.

The budget that's presented to us by the Congressional Progressive Caucus cuts defense enormously, and yet we keep hearing that, well, we don't want to take any money away from the troops, we don't want to take any money away from the equipment. But we cut defense enormously.

And one has to ask, what is the first obligation of government? It is to create a modicum of security so the American people can live their lives in a sense of safety, so they can attempt to be the best that God gave them the skills to be. That's the first obligation of local governments, the first obligation of State governments, and I would hope at some point in time in this debate it would be acknowledged by the other side that it is the first obligation of the Federal Government.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the Progressive Caucus vice chair, DONNA EDWARDS from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Progressive Caucus budget alternative. Budgets are about goals, aspirations, values and vision. This budget sets the right priorities for the future of this Nation, cutting Cold War weapons systems and investing in the future, investing in our veterans, investing in their families and children and in workers and de-investing in the things that don't work.

Investment number one. The lack of affordable health care is the number one drain on our economy, and it must be fixed immediately. The Progressive budget steps up the President's commitment by investing nearly $120 billion a year to ensure that every American can have affordable, high-quality health care.

Investment number two. We need a national commitment to accelerate the development and commercialization of clean, renewable energy sources to get serious about our dependence on fossil fuels. And any climate change policy must recognize that we have to protect the most vulnerable by significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions in a manner that supports economic security and the health of low- and moderate-income families and communities of color.

The Progressive budget spends $30 billion a year for the next decade to create 3 million clean energy jobs dedicated to increasing our energy independence and protecting our environment.

This is about the future, and the budget takes unprecedented steps to eliminate outdated and Cold War weapons systems, repeal the Bush tax cuts and make much-needed investments in our Nation's infrastructure, including wastewater and energy-efficient transportation systems.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Congressional budget alternative to build on the President's commitment for a comprehensive approach to meet our current and future fiscal priorities.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. At this time, Madam Chair, I would yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Chairman, the United States, according to the Bureau of Public Debt, has already borrowed $2.07 trillion this year. This is in borrowings of short-term debt and adding new debts to the accounts of the United States.

But what is known, and not well in this Congress, is we gave new authority to the Fed to buy Treasury securities. That means that one part of the government is already borrowing money from another part of the government. This new Fed authority has been used very heavily since the start of the new year. In fact, records from the Bureau of Public Debt show that the Fed has bought $75 billion of U.S. debt.

But here's the key thing: All of that purchasing power is from newly printed money. These charts show how the printing presses of the United States are now running on overtime to fund the current spending of this Congress, and the budget underlying this proposal that we're talking about would accelerate that.

You have to worry with the President of the United States at the G–20 summit now, being told by the Chancellor of the German Republic and by the French President that our borrowing is already too heavy. In fact, according to CBO scoring for the majority budget, which is the real debate that we will consider here today, the United States, if it applied to enter the European Union, would not be allowed because our borrowing is already too heavy and would violate the Maastricht Treaty. You've got to worry when the Chinese Government is saying that the dollar is unsound. And when you see these results of the Fed printing money and then purchasing U.S. securities, how the debasing of the dollar threatens the long-term economic future of the United States.

When we see the borrowing rate of the Bureau of the Public Debt, we see that they are now borrowing at a rate of $159 billion per week. Look it up on their Web site. And that is just to support the underlying budget. To accelerate the borrowing requirement of the United States would be fundamentally unsafe and unsound.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairwoman, I now yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS of Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, I am happy that my friend on Judiciary, DAN LUNGREN, is managing the time on the other side because he will remember that it was last Thursday that the Republicans held a press conference and announced their non-budget budget with—but then they said that it's coming out. And then yesterday the Republican budget came out, and it had a few numbers in it.

And I am intrigued by, I think it's a general Republican assumption that with a stimulus plan by the present administration to create jobs, to give relief to the poor, to give relief to people who are in distressed markets, we are now saying that the President's budget is going to—as my friend from Michigan, MIKE ROGERS, just enunciated on the floor—that your electric bills will go up and all costs will rise under the Democratic budget.

Now, clearly both of these can't be the same. There is something missing here. And what I submit is that we have a progressive budget that goes beyond the good budget offered by the President. But to be comparing, as someone—I think it was the gentleman from California was just talking about—how can you be cutting all of this out of national defense?

Well, easy. Wasting money and having fraud is not a way of protecting the Nation. And the OMB has found billions of dollars of fraud. So that's what we're taking out of the military budget. That doesn't make the country weaker. It makes the country stronger.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I can't. And furthermore, we're talking about cutting out all of these ancient missile systems. I am sure that the gentleman from California, a veteran legislator in his second career back here, knows that there are a lot of these exotic missile systems that don't work any more. You can't use them in the Middle East or in the kind of warfare that we're fighting when we're fighting against terrorists and insurgents. And people are just fed up with it.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to whether or not the other side has more than one speaker on this subject.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairwoman, we have two speakers including closing.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I will reserve.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairwoman, I am proud to yield 1½ minutes to the chairman of the Africa and Global Health Subcommittee, DONALD PAYNE of New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Chair, let me commend the gentlelady from California for presenting this very important budget. And let me also state, to the gentleman from California, that it's no question that in our parameter we provide for providing for the common defense but we also say that it's a part of our country to promote the general welfare. It seems that that part tends to be left out in many instances.

□ 1415

So I rise in strong support of the Progressive Caucus budget. As a member of the caucus, I am proud of the work we have done to restore common sense to the Federal budget by addressing our Nation's most pressing domestic needs.

As I travel around my congressional district in New Jersey, it is obvious that families are suffering as a result of many of the decisions of the previous administration, including their determination to siphon valuable resources away from our communities and direct them towards the ill-advised invasion and occupation of Iraq.

It is time to rebuild our own Nation by embracing the priorities embodied in this bill: providing a strong economic stimulus package of $300 billion that includes an extension of unemployment insurance, as well as improvements in transportation infrastructure, school construction, and needed water projects. Our budget pays for these domestic needs by redeploying U.S. troops out of Iraq and repealing the Bush tax breaks for the wealthiest among us.

I urge that we support this commonsense Progressive Caucus budget because it puts America first.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of our time.

I have never been in a place where a $4.3 trillion budget over the period that we're talking about, which is what the Republican budget is, is somehow seen as parsimonious. The other side seems to suggest that we are not attempting to try and pay for those things for which there is a reason for the Federal Government to be involved.

Secondly, I would say this. I have been a leader for the last two Congresses in an effort, on a bipartisan basis, to try and reduce or to encourage the President to negotiate with Russia to reduce our overall nuclear weapon arsenal, and the President has indicated this last week he's going to do that. But I have looked at the figures, and if we reduced it to the numbers that the President is talking about that we've urged, it wouldn't even come close to be the cut that you're talking about on your side.

The suggested cuts in defense spending in this budget, in the Democratic budget, but in this budget particularly, it doesn't just cut fat. It cuts muscle. It cuts sinew. It cuts bone. It makes us less able to defend the American people. And let's just be very, very clear about that. No one, no respected member of any previous administration in terms of national defense has suggested that you can support this kind of a budget presented here.

So let's make it very clear to the American people what we're talking about here. Are we going to do the fundamental job of preserving liberty and preserving freedom or are we, in fact, going to cut defense and, in the process, burden our people with more spending, more taxation, more borrowing, increasing the size of government, which ultimately takes freedom away from individual Americans?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, well, I'd just like to point out that the other side of the aisle must like the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget very much because they've spent the entire hour either promoting their own budget or attacking the President's budget and letting our budget stand as it is.

I'm proud of the Congressional Progressive budget. We cut defense spending by $158 billion in fiscal year 2010 alone, and we increase nondefense discretionary spending to $991 billion, and that's quite an effort and quite an accomplishment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 84, noes 348, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

AYES—84

Abercrombie
Baldwin
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Ellison
Engel
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Markey (MA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—348

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harman
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Ortiz
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Hinojosa
Lewis (GA)
Miller, Gary
Sablan
Westmoreland

□ 1446

Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Messrs. MASSA, KIND, MURPHY of Connecticut, VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. ABERCROMBIE, CLEAVER, and WAXMAN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 111–73.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 111–73 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010.

Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009 and for fiscal years 2011 through 2019 are set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2019:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009: $1,530,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $1,635,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $1,885,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,068,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,186,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,284,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,406,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,507,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,617,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,716,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,818,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: −$3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: −$31,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: −$203,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: −$292,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: −$329,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: −$350,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$370,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$390,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$412,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$435,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$461,000,000,000.

(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 2009: $3,100,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,468,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,302,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,416,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,501,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,569,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,650,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,728,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,775,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,833,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,907,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: $3,041,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,587,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,495,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,536,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,602,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,659,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,733,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,787,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,837,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,897,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,933,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: $1,511,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $952,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $610,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: $468,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $416,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $375,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $327,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $280,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $220,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $181,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $116,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: $9,674,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $11,454,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $12,440,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $13,416,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $14,111,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $14,717,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $15,361,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $15,904,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $16,443,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $16,930,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $16,914,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: $7,416,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $8,070,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $8,543,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $8,914,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $9,177,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $9,425,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $9,603,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $9,723,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $9,782,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $9,428,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $9,362,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2009 through 2019 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $700,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $692,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $620,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $629,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $639,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $653,830,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $660,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $665,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $670,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $675,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $688,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

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

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $169,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $169,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $162,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $190,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $236,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $236,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $293,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $293,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $350,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $388,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $388,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $412,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $412,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $425,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $454,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $454,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $470,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $470,000,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,560,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,395,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $2,193,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,978,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $2,064,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,877,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $2,153,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,892,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,186,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,927,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,210,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,954,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $2,278,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,021,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $2,363,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,087,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $2,434,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,166,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $2,503,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,242,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $2,597,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,311,000,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 050.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 050.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION SUBMISSIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS TO SLOW THE GROWTH IN MANDATORY SPENDING AND TO ACHIEVE DEFICIT REDUCTION.—(1) Not later than July 13, 2009, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,370,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2010 and $10,185,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,100,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2010 and $8,300,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $19,990,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2010 and $241,900,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

(D) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT.—The House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $92,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2010 and $1,710,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

(E) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $250,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2010 and $4,937,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

(F) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by $7,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2010 and $214,800,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2014.

(G) SPECIAL RULE.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may take into account legislation enacted after the adoption of this resolution that is determined to reduce the deficit and may make applicable adjustments in reconciliation instructions, allocations, and budget aggregates and may also make adjustments in reconciliation instructions to protect earned benefit programs.

(b) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN REVENUE.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill not later than June 8, 2009, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $31,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2010 and by not more than $1,205,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2014.

(c) REVISION OF ALLOCATIONS.—(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) 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 of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(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.

SEC. 202. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS ON MANDATORY SAVINGS.

In the House, not later than June 15, 2009, all House committees shall identify savings amounting to one percent of total mandatory spending under its jurisdiction from activities that are determined to be wasteful, unnecessary, or lower-priority. For purposes of this section, the reports by the reports by each committee shall be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget not later than June 15, 2009.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. 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) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2011 and fiscal years 2012 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.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2010 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2010.

SEC. 302. TURN OFF THE GEPHARDT RULE.

Rule XXVII shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

SEC. 303. EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In the House, if a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in paragraph (2). If such legislation is to be considered by the House without being reported, then the committee shall cause the explanation to be published in the Congressional Record in advance of floor consideration.

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any such provision is an emergency requirement if the underlying situation poses a threat to life, property, or national security and is—

(i) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(ii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iii) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(iv) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report that contains an emergency designation unless that designation meets the criteria set out in subsection (a)(2).

(c) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (c).

(d) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.—As disposition of a point of order under subsection (b) or subsection (c), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the point of order. A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent of the point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

SEC. 304. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, including measures filed in compliance with section 201(b), that propose to change Federal revenues, the impact of such measure on Federal revenues shall be calculated by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account—

(1) the impact of the proposed revenue changes on—

(A) Gross Domestic Product, including the growth rate for the Gross Domestic Product;

(B) total domestic employment;

(C) gross private domestic investment;

(D) general price index;

(E) interest rates; and

(F) other economic variables;

(2) the impact on Federal Revenue of the changes in economic variables analyzed under paragraph (1).

(b) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make any necessary changes to allocations and aggregates in order to conform this concurrent resolution with the determinations made by the Joint Committee on Taxation pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 305. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution in the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not take into account the provisions of any piece of legislation which propose to increase revenue or offsetting collections if the net effect of the bill is to increase the level of revenue or offsetting collections beyond the level assumed in this concurrent resolution.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any provision of a piece of legislation that proposes a new or increased fee for the receipt of a defined benefit or service (including insurance coverage) by the person or entity paying the fee.

SEC. 306. 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 carry out this resolution.

SEC. 307. DIRECT SPENDING SAFEGUARD.

(a) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an direct spending legislation that would increase an on-budget deficit or decrease an on-budget surplus as provided by subsection (e) for any applicable time period.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term ''applicable time period'' means any of the following periods:

(1) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The period of the 5 fiscal years following first 5 years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) For purposes of this section and except as provided in subsection (d), the term ''direct-spending legislation'' means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) For purposes of this section, the term ''direct-spending legislation'' does not include—

(1) any legislation the title of which is as follows: ''A bill to preserve Social Security.''; or

(2) any legislation that would cause a net increase in aggregate direct spending of less than $100,000,000 for any applicable time period.

(e) If direct spending legislation increases the on-budget deficit or decreases an on-budget surpluses when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or decrease the on-budget surplus when taken together with all direct spending legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline assumed for the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget, except that direct spending effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted pursuant to reconciliation instructions since the beginning of that same calendar year shall not be available.

(f) This section may be waived by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(g) For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(h) The Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order proposing a waiver of subsection (a).

SEC. 308. BUDGET PROTECTION MANDATORY ACCOUNT.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the ''Budget Protection Mandatory Account''. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, except that it shall not include the Committee on Appropriations.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution (other than an appropriation bill), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Mandatory Account by the amounts specified in paragraph (2); and

(B) reduce the applicable section 302(a) allocations by the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in paragraph (1)(A) shall be the net reduction in mandatory budget authority (either under current law or proposed by the bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment that was adopted in the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution, other than an appropriation bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in mandatory authority (either under current law or proposed by a bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in paragraph (1) is as follows: ''The amount of mandatory budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.''

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified

in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term—

(1) ''appropriation bill'' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2008 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(2) ''mandatory budget authority'' means any entitlement authority as defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 309. BUDGET DISCRETIONARY ACCOUNTS.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the ''Budget Protection Discretionary Account'';. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee's suballocations, under section 302(a) and 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Discretionary Account by the amounts specified in paragraph (2).

(B) reduce the applicable 302(a) and (b) allocations by the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment that was adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in paragraph (1) is as follows: ''The amount of discretionary budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.''

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term ''appropriation bill'' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2010 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 310. TREATMENT OF RESCISSION BILLS IN THE HOUSE.

(a)(1) By February 1, May 1, July 30, and November 11 of each session, the majority leader shall introduce a rescission bill. If such bill is not introduced by that date, then whenever a rescission bill is introduced during a session on or after that date, a motion to discharge the committee from its consideration shall be privileged after the 10-legislative day period beginning on that date for the first 5 such bills.

(2) It shall not be in order to offer any amendment to a rescission bill except an amendment that increases the amount of budget authority that such bill rescinds.

(b) Whenever a rescission bill passes the House, the Committee on the Budget shall immediately reduce the applicable allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 by the total amount of reductions in budget authority and in outlays resulting from such rescission bill.

(c)(1) It shall not be in order to consider any rescission bill, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, unless—

(A) in the case of such bill or conference report thereon, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet for at least 48 hours before its consideration; or

(B)(i) in the case of an amendment to such rescission bill made in order by a rule, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet within one hour after the rule is filed; or

(ii) in the case of an amendment under an open rule, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet immediately after being offered; in a format that is searchable and sortable.

(2) No amendment to an amendment to a rescission bill shall be in order unless germane to the amendment to which it is offered.

(d) As used in this section, the term ''rescission bill'' means a bill or joint resolution which only rescinds, in whole or in part, budget authority and which includes only titles corresponding to the most recently enacted appropriation bills that continue to include unobligated balances.

TITLE IV—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON EARMARK REFORM

SEC. 401. JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON EARMARK REFORM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION.—There is hereby 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 party by the Speaker of the House, and 4 from the minority party to be appointed by the minority leader; and

(2) 8 Members of the Senate, 4 appointed from the majority party by the majority leader of the Senate, and 4 from the minority party to be appointed 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 used 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.

SEC. 402. MORATORIUM ON CONSIDERATION OF EARMARKS.

(a) IN THE HOUSE.—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 used in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives) until the filing of the report required under section 401.

(b) IN THE SENATE.—[To be supplied.]

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition and ask unanimous consent

that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) control the remainder of my time.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the chair of the Republican Study Committee, our colleague from the State of Georgia, Congressman PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, we all know that we cannot continue to burn through the future of our kids and grandkids with oversized Federal spending. Our Republican Study Committee budget takes a bold but responsible approach to getting our fiscal house in order, achieving balance by the year 2019. Yes, Madam Chair, achieving balance, as you see from this chart right here.

Our budget preserves the tax relief adopted earlier in this decade, it encourages small businesses to create jobs, and it protects families from any tax increase.

Now, how do we get to balance? Our budget ends, ends the misguided spending bills and bailouts of recent years. Our budget includes a 1 percent annual reduction to all nondefense discretionary spending. Defense is fully funded. We simply require each Department to find and eliminate 1 percent of wasteful spending under their jurisdiction each year, one penny out of every dollar. Is that too much, Madam Chair?

The key to fiscal sustainability lies in reforming entitlements, particularly Medicare, and our Republican Study Committee budget says we must address our entitlement of crisis boldly and today.

Our RSC budget responsibly slows the growth of Medicare to the rate used during the Contract with America. A successful result was a balanced budget. Our budget responsibly says that we cannot just kick this can down the road any further.

In fact, in an op-ed this morning in the Wall Street Journal, Majority Leader STENY HOYER writes, ''The single most important thing we can do to get our budget under control is to deal with the costs of our entitlement programs. We simply must act in a bipartisan way to choose and implement such reforms.'' Absolutely, Mr. Leader. But, unfortunately, their budget and the Democrat's budget ignores a $34 trillion unfunded liability.

Our RSC budget says we will get our entitlements under control, and we will do it today. We recognize the responsibility we have to come together in a bipartisan way to find solutions that preserve Medicare without bankrupting our Nation.

Budgets are priorities, Madam Chair. And the priority of our budget is a responsible, stable, and commonsense approach to spending that saves our children's and our grandchildren's future. It is not an easy task, but governing is about making tough choices, and we need to do it today.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for taxpayers, to stand up for market principles, to stand up for the solvency of our Nation and support this responsible, stable, commonsense budget.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute.

Today, you are going to have an opportunity to listen to debate from our friends on the other side of the aisle on an alternative that seems too good to be true, and in fact it is, because they are proposing today a budget alternative that they never imposed when they had control of all the levers of power: Additional tax cuts that are outmoded and discredited, and we can't afford; and, most important, cutting aid to Americans most in need, students, the elderly, the sick, disabled, assaulting our environment, the elements that are so important as we are fighting, with our new President, to try and get the economy back on track and moving forward.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

Mr. HODES. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the Republican budget because, simply put, their plan represents more of the same failed policies that caused our economic collapse. Their plan is designed to move us backwards.

I support our budget because it will move our country forward. Our plan is honest because it gives the American people a true picture of what we are facing. It is visionary because it invests in health care, energy, and education. And, it is fair because it gives middle-class families real tax relief. It is fiscally responsible because it cuts the deficit in half by 2013.

Our economic plan provides for the overhaul of our health care system, because we can't afford half-hearted reform. Our plan invests in renewable energy to make us energy independent, and creates green jobs to power America for the 21st century.

Our plan invests in educating our citizens, and building a 21st century workforce that can beat the global competition. Our plan will cut the deficit in half by 2013, and provides the largest tax cut for middle-class Americans in history. It is the economic plan to help families who have lost their jobs, who are worried about paying their bills, concerned about how they will afford their children's education and pay for health insurance. Our economic plan will move our economy forward for the millions of working families who are struggling in this economy.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican alternative and support our plan to invest in America's future.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the Chair. Before yielding to our colleague from Tennessee, I would say this. Our budget grows every year. It just doesn't grow at a pace that is going to saddle future generations of Americans with a debt they can't pay back. And that is why it is a responsible budget.

I yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee, a champion of conservative principles, Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 2 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his great work on our RSC budget, because it is a responsible approach. It is good common sense. It is built on stability. And that is what the American people want to see right now.

I am also so pleased that we continue the tax reductions that were passed in 2001 and 2003. One of the things we are hearing from so many of our small business constituents is that they want to be sure that the death tax does not come back in 2010. Of course, we know the Democrat budget does that. And it is so interesting; our budget does something that is important: It leaves money with the taxpayer, leaves it in their pocket.

And, Madam Chair, I have heard comments from this floor about failed policies and tax codes being too convoluted. But I will tell you, leaving money in the taxpayers' pockets is neither a failed tax policy nor a convoluted tax policy. It is what ought to be done. They have earned that money. They deserve to keep it.

The fact is that our budget would balance, it would come into balance without a tax increase. Without pulling more money out of the taxpayers' pocket, it would come into balance by 2019.

That is something that is important for our children, our grandchildren, and for future generations, because we know you get there by making a reduction in discretionary nondefense, nonveteran spending. That 1 percent across-the-board reduction is legislation I have offered every year that I have been in Congress, and I am so pleased it is included in this budget, as it was in 2006 in the Deficit Reduction Act.

I commend my colleagues for their good work on this. This is a responsible, stable, commonsense approach to our Nation's fiscal situation. I encourage an ''aye'' vote for the RSC budget.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, a member of the Ways and Means Committee and a distinguished member of our leadership.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

This budget is a carbon copy of the failed policies we have seen over the last 8 years. It is a budget that looks in the rearview mirror in the past; it is not a budget that looks to the future. In fact, this budget, like the next Republican budget we will see, is going to slam a brake on the economic recovery plan that this Congress passed and is

now working its way through our economy, through all the communities in this country.

While that economic recovery plan is putting shovels in the ground and putting people back to work, this budget puts up a big stop sign and says, we are not going to provide any funds after the first year. We are going to take those shovels away. We are going to take those jobs back.

I think anybody who thinks that the economic recovery plan should be stopped after only 1 year does not have a clear understanding of the economic pain that is being experienced throughout this country.

On health care, President Obama has said that we need to reform our health care system to provide universal coverage, quality care, and reduced health care costs. This approach takes a meat ax to the Medicare program, cutting hundreds of billions of dollars in an automatic way. It doesn't tell us how to do it, it just says you have got to find a way to do it, cut hundreds of billions of dollars. If you are going to do that, tell us what your plan is so people know how it is going to affect them.

□ 1500

The Republican plan goes back to the same old tax cutting for the wealthiest Americans, whereas the Democratic plan provides tax cuts of $1.5 trillion for working Americans, not just the wealthiest. We invest in clean energy. They, again, give big tax breaks to the oil companies when we need to be diversifying our sources of energy.

We have seen this plan before. It is the plan that has been given to us for the last 8 years. This is the Bush administration program all over again. I think the American people have learned that those policies that are reflected in this budget helped get us into this fix that we are in today. Let's not look to the past. Let's move to the future. Let's adopt the Spratt budget.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chair, before I yield to my colleague from Louisiana, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond briefly.

We do put up a stop sign. We put up a stop sign to debt. Under the Obama Democratic budget plan, $23 trillion in national debt would be brought to the citizens of this country. Now think about what it takes to repay that. You would have to first get to balance, then you would have to run a $1 trillion surplus for 23 years just to pay that debt off. So we do put up a stop sign. It is a stop sign to that kind of debt.

And with that, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding and especially for his leadership on bringing here to the floor a vote on a balanced budget. If you look, there is a clear contrast right now between the budget that President Obama presented and this budget that we are going to get to vote on.

If you look at the deficits over the last few years, represented by the blue figures, and in the current budget and the continuation of these runaway deficit spending budgets over the next few years, many of my friends on the other side have criticized this spending, these deficits, right here. Of course, many of them voted for these budgets that increased these deficits. I didn't vote for any of these budgets. And I'm tired of the runaway spending. But those same people who criticized these deficits are voting for this level of spending, these deficits, $1.9 trillion this year, deficits going out as far as the eye can see. In fact, if you look at the ultimate result of that runaway deficit spending, President Obama, in his first 5½ years, will double the national debt.

We have got to get control of runaway spending and these out-of-control debts that we are racking up for our children and grandchildren to pay off. And if you are wondering what the American people are telling us, do they want this runaway spending? No. All across the country, you are having these uprisings, taxpayer tea parties. Citizens out there are showing up in thousands at a time, two in my district on April 15, bringing tea bags saying, ''Enough is enough. Stop this runaway spending.''

We finally have a balanced budget that we will get to vote on. And for those people, and I know I reach out to my Blue Dog friends on the other side, anybody who says they are fiscally responsible has to vote for a balanced budget, because you cannot vote for the President's budget for this level of runaway spending and call yourself ''fiscally conservative.'' You just can't do it. Don't go back home and say you're fiscally conservative and come up here in Washington and spend trillions of dollars of our children's and grandchildren's money. This is money we don't have.

We have got to stop this madness. People across the country are saying just that. Four thousand people are showing up in Cincinnati, Ohio, or Orlando and saying ''stop.'' We have an alternative. I would urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to vote for a balanced budget.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is interesting that my friend from Louisiana didn't vote for those budget deficits in the past because he wasn't in Congress. But if he had been here and joined with the Republican majority, he would have voted for them. That is what got us into this fix.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), a new Member who wasn't a part of this in the past, but is working on solutions in the future.

Mr. SCALISE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I'm happy to yield on your time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCALISE. Then I would ask a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The CHAIR. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. SCALISE. The gentleman from Washington, rather than directing his question to the Chair, made a comment about me saying I would have voted for a bill that I would not have voted for. I would just ask the Chair, isn't it parliamentary procedure to direct questions or comments about people to the Chair, not to individual Members, especially when what they are saying is not accurate about that Member?

The CHAIR. All comments must be directed to the Chair.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I will take 15 seconds, if I may, before recognizing the gentleman from New York.

What I said was the gentleman didn't vote for it because he wasn't here. But if he was and voted with the majority of Republicans, he would have been part of that problem.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Chair, I rise today to express my support for a budget that will help improve our economy and institute a plan to reduce the deficit in the long term. My hope is that this House will pass a budget that provides for a reduction of the deficit of over 50 percent by the year 2013 by cutting ineffective programs and reforming government contracting and defense purchasing.

In addition, we need a budget that finally addresses health care reform, which will reduce the single largest portion of our Federal budget. In addition, critical reforms and investments in energy will increase our energy independence, which will protect our economy and improve our national security.

We must not forget how we got here. It was during the prior administration, the Bush administration, and the Republicans in control of Congress that squandered a record surplus inherited by this House through irresponsible spending and tax cuts. Those solutions were more of the same. But the American people are demanding a new direction, and this budget must represent the reforms that we need. America spoke clearly this past November with a resounding voice. They called for action. They called for a change in the course of the direction of this country. They called for growing our economy. They called for addressing the budget deficit. They called for creating jobs.

This budget that we can vote on, presented by the President, will allow us to address those four major points. I stand in defense of that budget and ask that this House approve that given budget that will be before us later today.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chair, I would yield 2 minutes to our good friend from Georgia, Congressman KINGSTON.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I just wanted to remind my friends, because there seems to be a

historical glitch in their brains, but the Democrats took over in October of 2006. For you guys to keep reaching back and insisting all of our problems belong to George Bush is ridiculous. Speaker PELOSI was sworn in in January 2007. Do you have a problem with the spending up here? Talk to Speaker PELOSI. Your budget spends too much, taxes too much and borrows too much. Think about the borrowing for a minute. Here, the RSC budget, which I'm glad to support, moves us towards a surplus. Instead, you take the Pelosi debt of $11 trillion and you double it in 5 years and triple it in 10 years. Great work.

On tax relief, the Pelosi Democrats call for a $1.3 trillion tax increase and one that is going to take away from the working people, whereas the RSC budget calls for $1.2 trillion in tax relief. And I know the Democrat Party has moved away from people who have a lot of achievements. In fact, there seems to be some problem that if you have achieved something, then you're guilty and we need to tax you more. But the RSC budget works for tax fairness.

And I think it is important, particularly for small businesses and corporations. We go out there, and I know we have got our first European President right now going over there to the EU, but those folks, those corporations pay 25 percent in taxes. Globally, we have got to compete against them, where our corporations pay 35 percent in taxes. We need tax fairness. The RSC budget will create 2 to 3 million jobs. And that is what this is about.

In terms of reform, the Pelosi Democrats seem to be determined to put their head in the sand and ignore reforms that are needed for Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare. Now they have taken away from the seniors Medicare Advantage. I'm not sure why they think that is pro-senior. All the seniors I have talked to are very disturbed that the Democrats would take that away from them. But the reality is what we want to do is preserve——

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. What we want to do is preserve the doctor-patient relationship. It appears that the Pelosi Democrats want to have a government-hospital relationship. And speaking for me, I don't like bureaucrats running health care.

There are some tough decisions that are going to be made. I was a Member of Congress when President Clinton started AmeriCorps. He said it was going to be a 5-year program. Now we just renewed it at $5 billion. And it is almost two decades later. We need to come together and make some tough choices.

The Republicans have offered several alternatives. We are ready to work with you. If you could back off some of your taxing, some of your spending and some of your borrowing, I think we could come out of here with a good, pro-job budget that turns the economy around. And I look forward to working with you on that.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield myself 15 seconds just to point out to my good friend from Georgia that he confuses the marginal rate with the rate that corporations actually pay. Thirty-five percent is the marginal rate. If he looks at how much American corporations actually pay, because almost nobody pays the marginal rate because of the loopholes, it is down to about 5 percent. It's the second lowest of the top 20 economies.

I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from the real State of Washington, not Oregon, and a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. LARSEN.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Chair, perhaps I can rise today and try to lower the temperature a little bit as I rise to oppose the substitute budget before us and express my strong support for the Budget Committee resolution that is on the floor today a little later.

It is because our budget puts President Obama's plan to invest in our Nation's priorities into action, our budget is part of a comprehensive approach to create jobs and to build a foundation for our country's long-term economic strength. Congress and this administration have already taken action to save or create 3.5 million jobs, to keep families in their homes and to stabilize our financial markets. The economy is clearly job number one for all of us here. President Obama inherited an economic mess from the last administration, including record deficits and soaring unemployment. It is going to take some time, some hard work, some very difficult choices for us to get past this economic and this fiscal crisis and to move our country in a new direction.

I hosted some town talks with about 200 of my constituents this past weekend in Marysville and Lake Stevens. And let me tell you, they are worried. They are worried about the economy. They are ready for a new direction. They are looking for answers from this Congress and from the President. President Obama and Chairman SPRATT have proposed a budget resolution that moves our country in the right direction by investing in clean energy, in education and affordable health care for families and businesses. This budget also invests in our Nation's national security, provides a nearly 4 percent increase in funding for the Department of Defense to keep our country safe and to support our military folks and their families. And for the first time, the President's budget in this resolution includes an honest and transparent accounting of the cost of sustaining our wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. It creates jobs that target investments. It reforms health care, energy and education.

The substitute before us today does the opposite, cutting those investments that we need to strengthen our economy for the long term. Instead of moving us in a new direction that we need, this substitute unfortunately relies on the failed approaches of the past.

So I'm urging my colleagues to oppose the substitute and support the budget resolution that we are going to see later on the floor today.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to former RSC chair and current conference chair, the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his work on the Republican Study Committee Budget Alternative, and I especially commend the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, TOM PRICE, for his extraordinary and visionary leadership.

The budget brought to the majority today, as has been said again and again, spends too much, taxes too much and borrows too much, and the American people know it. The Democrat budget will double the national debt in 5 years. It will triple it in 10. The 2010 spending $3 trillion, 25 percent of gross domestic product, more than $1 trillion in tax increases on virtually every American, a 2010 deficit of $1 trillion and nearly $1 trillion deficits every year for the next 10 years.

The hard truth is the Democrat majority has brought to this floor the most fiscally irresponsible budget in American history. And the American people know we can do better. They are doing better. And every family farm or small business across this country, around every kitchen table, Americans are making tough choices. They are sitting down as families and in enterprises, deciding what they can put off for tomorrow, what they don't have to spend today, finding ways maybe for a job in town for a little more income. Everywhere in America, the American people are meeting these challenging economic times with frugality, with sacrifice, and with courage, everywhere but in Washington, D.C.

□ 1515

The American people long for men and women in this Congress to show the same character, to make the same tough choices. And I'm proud to stand with the Republican Study Committee and this budget alternative that answers that call.

A balanced budget; under the RSC alternative the budget outlook improves every single year, and achieves a surplus budget in 2019, $1.2 trillion of tax relief over the next 5 years for virtually every American, fully funding defense spending, and provides zero growth baseline for non-defense spending, and repeals the obscene spending

spree of stimulus bills and omnibus bills that has overtaken our country.

No changes in Social Security, increases in Medicare, and provides increases equivalent to inflation in Medicaid. And a raft of reforms of unnecessary spending, ending the earmarking culture on Capitol Hill.

After years of runaway spending, the American people long for courage and sacrifice on the floor of this Congress. And my Republican colleagues have brought together an alternative that answers that call.

It's time that we embrace fiscal discipline and reform, lower taxes and growth. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Republican Study Committee budget alternative.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI).

Mr. BOCCIERI. My friends here and colleagues here today, there's a rap song that goes ''Don't Believe the Hype.''

Let me give you the rap sheet on the hype of the proposal that we're about to discuss here today. It's about giving to the wealthiest among us, giving back to the corporate influences that have led us to the job loss that we have found, to the market principles that have led us to near and utter collapse of our housing industry, and cuts in vital programs that invest in our country, our people, and in America.

Now, I know there are some on the other side who believe the principles of Rush Limbaugh, that they want to see our President fail. And by asking our President to fail, they are asking America to fail. And this budget right here that we are talking about, that President Obama has introduced, invests in our people, invests in our programs, and invests in our country.

You know, in 2004, our Secretary of Health and Human Services, under the Bush administration, Tommy Thompson, flew to Iraq to make sure that every man, woman and child in Iraq had universal health care coverage. Billions of dollars were spent. Yet, my colleagues on the other side didn't bat an eye when those proposals were before us; didn't bat an eye to invest in other countries. But now we have an opportunity to invest in America. A $1.5 trillion tax cut to middle-class families. We're going to cut the deficit in half by 2013.

And finally, finally, my colleagues, we're going to have honest budgeting accounting principles for America and our people.

The question before us today is, will we act or will we stall? Will we invest, or will we continue to divest in America? Will we believe in our country, and will we believe in our people? That's what this budget debate is about. That's what these investments are about, and that's why it's so important that we reject this notion and embrace our ideas of success.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona, a friend and colleague, Congressman FLAKE.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I think we owe our constituents a little honesty here. We know that we can't grow an economy when we're dragging around debt that equals about 80 percent of GDP. Yet that's what is contemplated in the Democrats' budget.

We know that future generations will be taxed far in excess of their ability to sustain today's level of spending, yet that is what we are going to impose on future generations.

Now, part of the reason we're in such dire financial straits today is because we had a real estate bubble that burst. More money was invested in the real estate sector than the market could ultimately sustain.

But the budget being proposed today funds another bubble in another sector of the economy, the government sector. Under this budget, more money is being spent by government than the market can ultimately sustain. Now, you can call it government spending. You can call it critical investment. You can call it whatever you want. But it doesn't change the fact that the market simply can't sustain this level of spending.

Madam Chair, we can't suspend the laws of economics. We're trying awful hard here, but we can't. Yet that's what this budget pretends we can do.

We need to pass a budget that recognizes that our job here is to allow the private sector to pull us out of this recession. We should enact a budget that doesn't serve political ends, but rather, imposes a tax and regulatory environment that allows the private sector to allocate capital in a way that rewards hard work and ingenuity. That's what the RSC budget does. It recognizes who will eventually pull us out of this recession, the private sector, not the government sector.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining for both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you.

I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I rise in opposition to the amendment. And I must say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, I think they've lost the moral right to lecture us about fiscal responsibility, given their record over the past 8 years.

I will support the overall budget, although I want to state that I have a couple of reservations, which I'm assured will be worked out. The cuts in Function 150 in foreign assistance need to be restored. And I believe very strongly that the $250,000 threshold that the budget assumes in terms of taxing people above that, that needs to be raised because in high-cost-of-living States like mine in New York, it is not fair to have it at that level. The level needs to be higher.

I like this budget. It talks about the President's vision and America's vision, not only in terms of fixing our economy, but in terms of education, health care, and energy. We should support the overall budget and reject this amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chair, I would be pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Chair, I speak against the Democrats' budget and for the alternative. Justice John Marshall said that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Now, that power shouldn't be used unless we understand the consequences.

This Democrats' budget taxes without regard to consequences. And I know that because it includes over $30 billion in tax increases on America's energy economy.

Now, what are these consequences? The energy industry, which employs about 320,000 people in Louisiana, will not hire new workers and may have to lay some off. And, because we disincentivized domestic production, America will buy more foreign oil, as opposed to using our own oil, which is produced by American workers.

I offered an amendment yesterday to establish a point of order against tax legislation that would either destroy U.S. energy jobs or increase our dependence on foreign oil, and I was defeated on a straight party-line vote.

The only recourse to save these jobs, which are not for CEOs, but are for people who work on rigs, they're welders, they are pipeline pipefitters. The only way to save these jobs and defend America's energy security is to vote against this Democrats budget.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this budget. I didn't do it without some reservation, because I've been spending a lot of time listening to the needs of this country as it juxtaposes itself in the world, in Afghanistan and in Iraq, certainly in South America where I served as a Peace Corps volunteer. And what I think is very dangerous about the thinking of cutting the foreign aid, the 150 account, is that is all the humanitarian aid. If the combatant commanders tell us that you cannot win this war on military terms, that you're going to have to use civilian power, that's what we call soft power, smart power, then that's the account that invests in it, the account that invests in foreign aid and extended IMET programs to bring foreign officers to train in the United States, to send Peace Corps volunteers around the world. And I'm a strong supporter of what has been promised to be working that out. And I think that it's a bold budget for

a great new President of the United States, and I look forward to supporting it.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chair, I think we'll reserve.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I will yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am committed to what the President is committed to. All of us who believe that there needs to be a new day in America are committed to a new era of responsibility renewing America's promise.

And my good friends on the other side of the aisle are in direct contrast to that because if we pass this budget, the Republican Study Group, study caucus, we will see a continuation of crumbling bridges, workers and veterans waiting months or years for benefits, the very veterans, 167,000 plus, that are returning back from the Iraq war, many who will be returning back from Afghanistan, the very families that we see in our community, we will see them missing out on the necessary resources to provide a new era of responsibility.

One of the important aspects of this legislation, our budget, focuses on protecting families.

Let me share one vision; protect families' financial health. Our budget, the President's budget, has a plan that must reduce the growing premiums and other costs American citizens and businesses pay for health care. People must be protected from bankruptcy due to catastrophic illness. We have a placeholder, a place to address the question of reforming our health care. We have a provision or a concept to make health care coverage affordable. The plan must reduce high administrative costs, unnecessary tests and services, waste and other inefficiencies.

In the President's budget he believes in renewing America. The budget that we have on the floor now believes in undermining the health care safety net. It does not have the details that are necessary. It cuts key services. It certainly doesn't provide a bridge, an ongoing bridge into the 21st century.

My friends, we need to move forward with the President's vision, and we need to oppose the RSC budget.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague from Ohio for crafting a reasonable budget that brings us to balance. And I'm proud to stand on the House Floor today and support the Republican Study Committee alternative budget, which would bring our Federal budget to balance within the budget window.

The Obama budget, the Obama-Pelosi budget offered here on this House floor today, adds massive amounts to our Federal debt and does not come to balance. Even over 75 years they're running massive deficits that further add to our national debt and pass those debts on to the next generation. I think that's irresponsible.

The Republican Study Committee budget, as I said, brings us to balance. It also funds necessary and important government functions like veterans' health care. It has no cuts to veterans' health care. But it also maintains our commitment to seniors and Social Security. It maintains our commitment to Medicare and Medicaid, but makes those programs sustainable over the next generation and generations to come and, at the same time, reduces our deficit and brings us to balance.

This is a strong budget. It funds veterans' health care, as I said, and it also funds our necessary defense of this great country and maintains a strong posture internationally as well.

This is a good budget that I'm proud to support. As a Member of Congress, and as a policy maker, I think it's important that we put forward realistic ideas. We cannot simply say no to the massive spending of the Obama-Pelosi budget. But we have to say yes to something. And this is a budget that we can say yes to because it brings us to balance. It's good for, not just the current generation, but puts us on the right footing for economic growth, for small business growth and for our families as well.

I think it's very important that we support a balanced budget, and that's why I'm here today to support this budget, and I'm proud to vote ''yes.''

□ 1530

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I will yield myself the remainder of the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you.

It is interesting listening to my other friends because, when they had their hands on the levers of power—of the Presidency and of Congress—they engineered the massive debt that the President inherited with a combination of tax cuts for people who needed it the least and with a rate of spending increase that was greater than Lyndon Johnson's in the Great Society. Not only was it greater than Bill Clinton's spending, but it was greater than Lyndon Johnson's in the Great Society.

Now, all of a sudden, when they're out of power, they're suggesting that they're going to do something that they never did when they had control. They're proposing a massive, across-the-board cut of about $1.4 trillion over the next 10 years. Now, this is serious money, dealing with serious programs that the American people count on, and they count on them today more than ever before: Pell Grants, food stamps, nutrition activities, health care for low-income people, Medicare.

Madam Chair, the range of activities that would be subjected to the budget knife—again, that they never did when they were in control but that they propose to do now—would have the impact of scaling down our growth and our activities, and it would put the burden on those who can least afford it.

When it comes to taxes, well, they're back to the same old story. They want to make permanent tax cuts that we found out were not affordable in the form that they passed them, and worse, they would increase taxes on about a quarter of the Americans who are lower income Americans.

Madam Chair, in the Democratic budget, there are no tax increases this year. We understand that it's not appropriate to raise taxes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I will yield on your time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Well, I have no more time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I will yield on your time.

Mr. MCHENRY. The tax increase yesterday was in place on tobacco, which the gentleman supported.

The CHAIR. The gentlemen will suspend.

The gentleman from Oregon has the time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. In this budget that we are going to be offering up, there are no tax increases. The House of Representatives, in its wisdom, did recently approve a tobacco tax increase that provides health care for 4 million American children, something that the last Congress passed, and there were bipartisan votes who supported that because that's good for Americans.

What we are seeing in paychecks this month across America is that 95 percent of the people are witnessing the promise of a reduction in taxes being delivered by President Obama and this Congress. This is for 95 percent of the American people.

I find it interesting the rhetoric about bureaucrats running health care. In fact, my friend from North Carolina just pointed out that they protect the bureaucrats running health care for veterans. They protect the veterans with the program.

Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman yield since he used my name?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I will yield on your time only. I have very few minutes left.

Mr. MCHENRY. You don't control the time. Therefore, you can't yield it.

The CHAIR. The gentlemen will suspend.

The gentleman from Oregon does control the time in opposition, and the gentleman from North Carolina has already been told at least once that he is not going to be yielded to.

Mr. MCHENRY. Thank you.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. MCHENRY. Thank you.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, health care is one of these critical areas. There is nothing in the Democratic budget that suggests we're going

to turn over to some shadowy, bureaucratic influence a bureaucratic mechanism that's going to control Americans' health care.

What President Obama has suggested and what we've been discussing in our Ways and Means Committee, for instance, is having an opportunity for more choices for Americans, including some that are subsidized by the Federal Government to help fill some of these gaps.

It's interesting that, on one hand, they'll talk about something that isn't true—the shadowy bureaucratic control of health care—while they kind of conveniently forget that some of the best health care in America is provided by government, itself, by government bureaucrats, if you will, in the Veterans Administration. It's a little embarrassing to watch this schizophrenia that our friends are engaged in.

One of the most insidious portions of both of these budgets is to be found in taking back the recovery funds that States across America are counting on for economic recovery. I suggest that's a mistake as well and another reason to reject the Republican alternative.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Before yielding the balance of our time, let me just thank our chairman of the RSC for his leadership on this particular issue. Also, our staff did tremendous work in helping us put this budget together that we think is responsible, stable and represents common sense.

With that, I would yield to our former chairman, the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman SHADEGG.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I compliment the Republican Study Committee budget.

Madam Chair, it has been, indeed, the most conservative and the lowest spending budget ever presented on this floor, year after year, for every year that I have been here.

I want to address one of the comments made on the other side. The other side has said over and over again there isn't a tax increase. Well, you can use those words carefully, but you have to look at the reality of the budget.

In point of fact, there is, roughly, $682 billion in government revenue to be derived from the imposition of a cap-and-trade program. That revenue has to come from somewhere. It will come from the American people. Indeed, it probably isn't a tax increase because it will come from every single American, including those who currently don't pay taxes. If that's not a burden on this economy at the wrong time, I don't know what is.

In point of fact, this budget contains the largest deficit, $1.8 trillion in 2009, four times larger than the largest previous record of $407 billion. It contains the largest deficit as a percentage of the gross domestic product since World War II, and it will result in the largest national debt, $12.7 trillion in 2009, greater than the sum of all debt from 1789 to today.

Our grandparents and parents have been recognized as the greatest generation. They conquered fascism. They saved freedom. They put America on a course to prosperity. With this budget, we are progressing rapidly toward what will be labeled, I fear, the ''reckless generation.'' We are shirking our responsibility to our children and to our grandchildren. It will double the national debt in 5 years, and it will triple it in 10.

Do we want to be remembered as that ''reckless generation''? Every American balances their budget. We must balance the Nation's budget.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 111, noes 322, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

AYES—111

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Deal (GA)
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Inglis
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latta
Linder
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Olson
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—322

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boehner
Bono Mack
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler

Wilson (OH) Wittman Wolf Woolsey Wu Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Hinojosa Miller, Gary Sablan Westmoreland

□ 1606

Messrs. MARSHALL, CAPUANO, McDERMOTT, RUSH, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. WILSON of Ohio, LEWIS of California, TIERNEY, GUTIERREZ, Ms. SPEIER, Messrs. McMAHON, MOLLOHAN, and BUYER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. ALEXANDER, REHBERG, SENSENBRENNER, ADERHOLT, BOOZMAN, and LATTA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 111–73.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I rise to offer that amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 111–73 offered by Ms. LEE of California:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010.

The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, including appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 through 2014.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014:

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

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

Fiscal year 2010: $1,716,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $1,959,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,205,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,377,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,524,106,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2010: $50,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: −$129,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: −$154,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: −$138,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: −$109,552,000,000.

(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 2010: $2,928,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,880,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,920,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,102,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,292,316,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2010: $3,015,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,999,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,951,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,101,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,268,044,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2010: −$1,298,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: −$1,040,351,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: −$745,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: −$724,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: −$743,938,000,000.

(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 2010: $13,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $14,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $15,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $16,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,033,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2010: $8,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $9,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $10,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $11,510,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2010 through 2014 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $562,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $606,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $570,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $579,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $576,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $589,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $584,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $603,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,476,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $47,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $50,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $54,242,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $59,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $64,888,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,864,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $31,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $31,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $33,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $35,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,936,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $5,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $5,789,000,000
(B) Outlays, $11,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $5,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,561,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $6,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $6,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,747,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $38,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $39,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $39,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $39,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $40,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,240,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,990,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $24,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,145,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,226,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $61,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $26,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,426,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,296,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $92,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $90,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $91,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $91,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $92,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,793,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $19,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,362,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,300,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $101,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $110,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $119,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $117,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $127,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,938,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $391,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $391,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $368,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $371,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $391,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $402,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $402,273,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $449,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $449,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $505,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $504,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $513,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $513,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $558,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $558,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $616,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $616,150,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $539,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $541,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $511,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $514,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $478,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $478,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $483,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $483,126,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $485,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $484,026,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $26,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,728,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $108,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $113,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $109,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $114,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $116,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,987,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $55,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $54,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $54,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $54,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $54,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,593,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $22,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $22,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $23,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,952,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $283,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $322,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $322,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $386,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $468,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $468,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $557,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $557,618,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $10,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $9,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $6,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $5,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $4,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,266,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$68,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$68,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$71,993,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$71,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$74,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$74,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$77,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$77,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$79,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$79,861,000,000.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $130,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,085,000,000.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) between 2001 and 2007, GAO provided the Department of Defense with 2864 recommendations, many related to improving their business practices and, to date, the Department of Defense has implemented 1389 recommendations and closed 215 recommendations without implementation; and

(2) the GAO estimates that the 1389 implemented recommendations have yielded the Department of Defense a savings of $63.7 billion between fiscal years 2001 and 2007.

(b) ASSUMPTION; REPORT.—

(1) ASSUMPTION.—This resolution assumes $300,000,000 to be used by the Department of Defense to implement the remaining 1260 recommendations of the Government Accountability Office.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense should submit a report to Congress within 90 days that demonstrates how each such recommendation will be implemented, and, in the case of any such recommendation that cannot be implemented, a detailed reason for such inability to implement such recommendation.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

As chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and along with my colleague from Virginia, Congressman SCOTT, I rise to offer the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget amendment.

Madam Chair, a budget is more than a fiscal document. It really is a moral document. It defines who we are as a Nation. It reflects our priorities and our values. That's why I'm pleased that the Congressional Black Caucus' budget priorities are a reflection of our values and the challenges that we face as a Nation. The theme of the CBC budget is, ''Building Upon the President's Blueprint for Success.''

President Obama's budget is a welcome shift in priorities away from the failed policies of the previous administration. By investing in education, health care, clean energy, transportation, and our veterans, the CBC

budget, Mr. SPRATT's budget, the Democratic budget, the President's budget, are all excellent blueprints to continue with our economic recovery and to return to fiscal responsibility.

However, the CBC budget actually builds upon these investments by immediately repealing the 2001 and 2003 Bush-era tax cuts that benefit the wealthiest Americans and shifts those savings towards education, health care, job training, international trade, justice, transportation, and veterans.

The CBC budget assumes that funding for the ballistic missile defense system will be reduced and reallocated within the national defense function to increase funding for vital health care research programs and care for our wounded warriors.

In addition, reallocated funding should also be set aside to allow the Defense Department to finish implementing the remaining Government Accountability Office's recommendations to address waste, fraud, and abuse within the Defense Department. Our CBC budget targets waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government, starting with, of course, savings at the Pentagon.

Critical reviews by the GAO have already saved $89 billion—that's just since 2001—in waste, fraud, and abuse, often simply by improving the Pentagon's business and accounting systems.

The CBC budget would fully fund the continued work of implementing all of GAO's recommendations and squeeze these savings from the Department of Defense without sacrificing any of our military strength or readiness.

GAO released the report that my language in the Democratic fiscal year 2009 budget required. The GAO has issued 637 reports to the Defense Department between 2001 and 2007 that included 2,700 specific recommendations for the Department of Defense to save our taxpayers dollars. We have successfully implemented 1,600 of those, saving over $89 billion, which over the next 7 fiscal years is going to be about $12.7 billion.

So the Congressional Black Caucus supports our President as he works to clean up this mess that was left to him. This budget, though, reflects our historical reputation, our historical work for the last 40 years, and really does reflect the CBC's role as the conscience of the Congress. This budget builds upon our moral imperative to really ensure the American dream for all.

Now, Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) be able to control the remainder of the time.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus substitute. The Congressional Black Caucus believes that the historic investments outlined in the President's budget and the Democratic budget are excellent blueprints to continue our road towards economic recovery and return to fiscal responsibility.

The base bill and the CBC alternative adopt the economic theories which were the basis for the 1993 budget which eliminated the deficit and produced surpluses sufficient to pay off the national debt held by the public by last year when we had the surpluses. It produced record jobs and more than tripled the Dow Jones Industrial Average. And we reject the economic theory that eliminated the surpluses, replaced them with record deficits, produced the worst job performance since the Great Depression, and the Dow lower after 8 years than it started.

The CBC is fully behind the committee budget, as far as it goes. However, the CBC budget builds upon that budget.

First, the CBC budget immediately repeals the remaining Bush tax cuts that primarily affect that portion of the family's income that exceeds $250,000, rather than waiting for these tax cuts to expire at the end of 2010, as the committee budget does. Over the last 8 years, these tax cuts have cost the Federal Government trillions of dollars, while the promised benefits of trickle-down economics never materialized.

The CBC budget also immediately eliminates the phase out and repeal of what are called PEP and Pease, which deal with itemized deductions and personal exemptions.

□ 1615

These important tax provisions were part of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990, which was signed into law by the first President Bush.

Together, repealing these provisions of the 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts will have virtually no effect on taxpayers with family incomes under $250,000, and will yield an estimated $42.2 billion in additional revenue in fiscal year 2010 alone.

In addition, the CBC budget also creates a Bush debt tax, which adds approximately one-half of 1 percent surtax on that portion of a family's income that exceeds $1 million. The CBC proposes to use the proceeds of this surtax exclusively for deficit reduction. Over a 10-year period, the Joint Committee on Taxation estimates this surtax will raise about $63 billion.

The CBC budget uses the additional revenue to increase our investments in our priorities for a more prosperous future for every American. Above the committee bill, the CBC budget provides an additional $18 billion for health care; $17 billion for education, job training, and social services; $8 billion for transportation and infrastructure; an additional $5.5 billion for administration of justice; $5 billion for international affairs; $4.7 billion for income security; and the CBC is particularly proud to add $4.5 billion for veterans' benefits and services—more than enough to fund each of our VA hospitals by more than $20 billion a year.

The CBC pays for all of these increases and still produces a 5-year budget deficit that is $67 billion lower than the base bill and saves the American people $7 billion in interest on the national debt.

The Congressional Black Caucus wants to reject the reckless budgets over the last 8 years and return to the fiscal responsibility of the 1990s, while creating jobs and addressing our national priorities.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I'd like to yield myself 1 minute.

First and foremost, I want to thank the CBC for putting together a budget. It's a difficult task. We know how much work it takes. So we thank them for their efforts. I want to thank them for proposing a substitute budget that really highlights the dramatic differences between the two sides—the priority differences.

If you loved the tax increases and the spending binge and the soaring deficits and the unprecedented debt that the underlying budget brings you, you will fall in love with this budget as well. This is the Democratic budget on steroids—even more spending, even more tax increases, and even more deficits.

As economic conditions continue to deteriorate for 2009, this budget immediately increases taxes for small businesses and for individuals that are set to expire in 2011.

Just like the Democrat's budget, this substitute increases taxes by $1.5 trillion, with a T—make sure we don't get confused here—over the next 10 years. Just like the Democrat's budget, this substitute budget increases spending by $18.3 trillion, with a T, over just the next 5 years. And just like the Democrat's budget, this substitution also increases the national debt to $17 trillion by 2014. Again, unprecedented levels of spending of taxes.

I urge a defeat of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. First of all, I want to thank the President for his commitment to transforming our health care system so that everyone has access to quality health care—and demonstrating that commitment in this budget.

I then would like to thank Chairwoman BARBARA LEE and Congressman BOBBY SCOTT for adding to and filling out that outline to even better meet

the needs of our communities and all Americans, while remaining fiscally responsible.

In health care, with the additional $18 billion the CBC budget includes, we are able to fund a robust Ryan White that ends ADAP waiting lists; increases funding to the hard-hit South; brings services to incarcerated and ex-offender populations; and increases funding for the Minority AIDS Initiative.

An estimated in excess of 83,000 African Americans die from preventable causes every year. Our budget will raise the National Center for Minority and Health Disparity Research to an institute and increase its funding.

Lastly, our budget sets aside funding for the Health Equity and Accountability Act, which expands needed data collection, provides quality services for individuals with limited English proficiency; expands health programs to build a diverse workforce that is needed today; provides targeted and comprehensive services for diseases causing the disparities; elevates and expands the Indian Health Service; supports facilities and institutions in underserved communities and responds to the call for community-driven programs that address the health and social determinants that fuel the disparities through the creation of Health Empowerment Zones.

I urge our colleagues to pass this budget, to vote ''aye'' on a budget which ups the investment in all Americans and reduces the deficit.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I now yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chairman, today, in America, there is a set of parents that are sitting at the table with their teenage son. Their teenage son does not have a job, but he's provided an allowance by his parents.

They're sitting at the table because, unbeknownst to the parents until today, he has taken out four credit cards and run them up to the maximum. So the discussion with the teenage son is, What are we going to do about this?

The teenage sons says, I will find a summer job mowing lawns. And they say, Well, what are you going to do in the fall? It's going to take you longer than that to pay back your credit cards. Let's worry about that when the fall comes.

In order to avoid a big scene, the parents say, Okay, we'll worry about it when the fall comes. Now give us your credit cards so we can tear them up and stop this bleeding.

The son, of course says, You can't have my credit cards. I've become used to this lifestyle. I'm going to keep my credit cards and run them up some more.

As we know, that teenage son is the Democrat budget and the parents are the American taxpayers.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Let me commend the Congressional Black Caucus and its chair, Congresswoman LEE, and to our leader on the Budget Committee for many, many years, Representative BOBBY SCOTT from Virginia, for presenting this very sound budget.

As we know, we are supposedly a country that not only promotes the general welfare, as it does to provide for the common defense but, in many instances, we find that promoting the general welfare is lost. The Congressional Black Caucus budget takes care of that.

But, in the meantime, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, I have been deeply disturbed by the damage done over the past 8 years to the reputation and the standing of the United States of America around the globe.

By replacing diplomacy with the use of force and military threats in the Middle East and other regions and dismissing our longtime allies, France and Germany, as ''Old Europe,'' the previous administration alienated those who had looked to the United States for moral leadership.

Under the Obama administration and the Democrat Congress, we now have the opportunity to move in a more constructive and positive direction by investing in overseas development and restoring diplomacy to our international relations efforts.

In crafting the international affairs portion of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, we have allocated increased funding to assist other nations in lifting themselves out of poverty, a critical part of the plan to restore America's reputation and prestige around the world.

We were pleased that in the Budget Committee our chairman's mark increased funding for international affairs by 11 percent over FY 2009 levels. The CBC budget provides for an additional $2.5 billion on top of that, which puts funding for international affairs closer to the President's request.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PAYNE. The President's request puts us closer to there. The additional allocation would go toward increased funding for the global fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria; USAID programs; Iraq humanitarian assistance; migration and refugee assistance; peacekeeping efforts in Darfur; education, health care, and cultural exchange programs; child survival and health programs; and development assistance.

Vote for the CBC budget and let's restore America's promise and America's greatness in the eyes of the world.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I'd like to yield myself 30 seconds. I just want to mention that the relationship the gentleman mentioned with Germany and France—how ironic that those two countries are now lecturing the United States because the United States is spending too much. I never thought I'd live to see that happen.

With that, Madam Chairwoman, if I may, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. This is really about the future of our country. For those of us that have worried about the trends in spending and we've watched, of course with alarm—from George Washington to George Bush—we have watched what Thomas Jefferson warned us about. This proclivity in politics to spend now and leave this burden on the next generation has advanced and advanced.

But all of that debt together is not as great as the debt we're undertaking in the next 10 years. We are going to see that debt level double in the next 5½ years because of the massive increase in government spending that we are embarking on. Over the next 10 years we're going to see it triple.

I want you to think for a minute about what this means to your children. The Congressional Budget Office is nonpartisan. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that the tax rates for lower-income Americans, when we finally get around to recognizing that we can't borrow more, will have to go up drastically; will have to go up, in their estimation, to 26 percent. For middle income, it will go from 25 to 66 percent. Think what that's going to mean for small businesses.

No. The time to get a handle on this is now. The time to bring this back into check, because the Congressional Budget Office—even the Director of the President's Budget Office has come out recently and said Oh, these numbers are not sustainable. No, they're not.

And it's here in the House where spending bills originate that we're going to have to reverse this course, because if we do not, how are we going to maintain the ability to continue to go out with these Treasuries and borrow as much as we've borrowed several times again from the Europeans and from the Chinese?

Yes, the governments in Europe are lecturing us. All over the world people are lecturing us. At the G20 they're saying: How can you go forward with these massive spending increases? It is not sustainable. And they're right. They're absolutely right.

I oppose this budget because this unchecked spending will result in borrowing hundreds of billions of dollars from China and the Middle East and other nations that own our growing debt.

I think we all know as individuals that money doesn't grow on trees. But it is the American taxpayer who will eventually end up paying for all this spending. At a time when many taxpayers are hurting—they can't afford their mortgages right now, they are losing money in their pensions, they're

worried about losing their jobs—it is wrong at this time to make the argument that we're going to seize this opportunity to expand all of these government agencies and programs.

When Americans are tightening their belts, shouldn't the government be at least trying to balance its books?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. Madam Chair, I rise in favor of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. The CBC budget builds on the essential investments made by the President and the Democratic resolution. Both of these budgets represent the same important priorities—investing in education, health care, energy independence, and veterans.

□ 1630

In order to build on these investments, the CBC budget unashamedly immediately repeals the 2001 and 2003 trickle-down, ownership society, on-your-own tax cuts that benefited the wealthiest Americans, and puts those savings towards strategic investments in ordinary Americans.

In times of recession, the most fortunate must do more to contribute to the common good and to reduce the raging deficit.

The CBC budget supports increased funding for international affairs, which pays for critical life-saving foreign assistance such as HIV/AIDS, TB, malaria, and child survival. Indeed, as Secretary Clinton has said, hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos are our greatest enemies abroad.

The CBC budget increases funding for veterans' benefits, weatherization assistance, energy efficiency, renewable energy programs, and invests in clean energy technology. The CBC budget increases funding for education which will go towards key programs like title I, Head Start, TRIO, GEAR UP, STEM programs, and early education programs. It is important that we give our young people an opportunity to succeed, and the CBC budget does this.

Last night on the floor, I emphasized that the spread of inequality is astounding, which means more people are forced to take minimum wage jobs, more people receiving government assistance, and even more people falling into poverty. Just this week, over 600,000 people filed for unemployment compensation, and the CBC budget does not ignore this.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. The WIC program and Low-Income Energy Assistance Program all recognize this.

I just want to end, Madam Chair, with a quote from Plato.

''The form of law which I propose would be as follows: In a state which is desirous of being saved from the greatest of all plagues, not faction, but rather distraction, there should exist among the citizens neither extreme poverty nor, again, excessive wealth, for both are productive of great evil. Now the legislator should determine what is to be the limit of poverty or of wealth.''

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Chair, I now at this time recognize for 3 minutes a gentleman who comes with years of leadership experience in the California legislature, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I feel a moment of rare bipartisan agreement coming on. I noticed several of my friends on the left said that our problems are rooted in the fiscal mismanagement of the Bush administration. The gentleman from Virginia had a very good chart entitled Record Deterioration of the Budget Under Republican Administration.

I agree. There is no denying it, George W. Bush increased spending twice as fast as his predecessor Bill Clinton did. He turned a budget surplus into a chronic deficit. You are absolutely right.

So if we all agree that Bush spent too much and borrowed too much, then why in the world would we want to pursue the same folly on an even grander scale? Why would we take that Bush administration's unsustainable rate of spending growth and send it even higher? Why would we want to take that budget deficit, which is indefensible, and triple it?

If budgets that spend too much and borrow too much on the road to economic prosperity work, then why aren't we already enjoying a period of unprecedented economic expansion? The fact is, these policies don't work. And it doesn't matter whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican. They don't work, because government cannot inject a single dollar into the economy that it has not first taken out of that same economy. Those policies don't work for the same reason that you can't spend yourself rich or borrow your way out of debt or tax your way to prosperity.

If you want to know where these policies lead, just look to my home State of California. I have watched three governors, Republican and Democrat, do exactly what my friends on the left assure us is the road to prosperity. They increased spending at unsustainable rates, they ran up unprecedented debts, and they imposed crushing new taxes. And the result is that today California has been transformed from the Nation's Golden State to a state of collapse.

A record level of government spending has not produced prosperity; it has produced one of the highest unemployment rates in the country. Interest costs driven by years of borrowing are now eating into its budget. Its tax burden is producing a population exodus unknown since the days of the Dust Bowl. In fact, the State has spent so much that it has just imposed the biggest tax increase by any State in American history. California has borrowed so much that it is now in very real danger of defaulting on its obligations before the end of the summer. And, I am concerned that the President and many Democrats in Congress are making exactly the same mistake that the Bush administration made and that three California governors made, only on a much greater scale.

Madam Chair, I would suggest that, at a moment like this, perhaps it is time that we recognize the first law of holes: When you are in one, stop digging.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative, and I thank the able leadership of Chairwoman LEE and Mr. SCOTT for providing us an alternative budget that builds on the framework set forth by President Obama, while increasing investments in areas we in the CBC deem most critical for some of our most vulnerable communities and setting a framework for the future.

Budgets are about priorities, and what has happened over this last decade has been a reframing and reshifting of the priorities, and it is time to get those straight and that is exactly what this budget does:

Provides investments of $18 billion for health care reform, because the lack of health care is the single largest obstacle to a future of economic prosperity and health for all Americans. This budget provides an additional $17 billion to improve our education system, including important funding for Job Corps centers across this country to train our young people for jobs for the future. An additional $8 billion would be added to transportation and infrastructure, because we must increase mass transit capabilities and update our crumbling water and sewer infrastructure nationwide.

And we have to invest in green jobs, which this budget does, for a 21st century global economy. And we make these real commitments for our veterans and military families; and we don't do it by accident; we do it by repealing the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 immediately. This would result in an estimated $42.2 billion in additional revenue for fiscal 2010 alone. That's what this budget proposes.

Madam Chair, we have to remember that it was the failed policies of the previous administration that left President Obama and the American people with the largest deficit in history.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. And an economy in the worst recession in 70 years.

I urge my colleagues to vote in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative as an important step on the road to economic recovery and prosperity for all for the future.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 4¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would like to now recognize the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) for 3 minutes.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Chair, there have been people that are saying that America as a nation is going down the path of socialism. We are becoming a socialized nation. But, you know, that isn't really quite fair. Not like the socialized nations of Europe anyway. Because, according to the standards of the European Union, they would not accept America with the budget that is being proposed here this very day.

Now, the spending that we are looking at is unprecedented. We have heard about the Bush administration spending money. They spent too much. We have acknowledged that. But let me tell you, what we have seen here in just 3 months makes the Bush administration look like mere pikers.

The Wall Street bailout, we did half of that this year, $350 billion. Then we added to that this economic stimulus, or as I would prefer to call it, porkulus, $787 billion. Let's understand what this number ''a billion'' means.

You have heard that the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq were really expensive. Day after day we have been told, hey, this war in Iraq is just draining money out of America. Yet, add up every day of that war, add it to the war in Afghanistan, and that number is smaller than what the House approved for this stimulus bill in the first 5 weeks that Congress has been in session. And then you have got the omnibus, another 400-some.

So what happens with this level of unprecedented spending? Well, the theory is supposed to be that if you spend enough money, it will make the economy better.

Now, I don't know very many American families who would buy something as silly as that. If you are in trouble financially, do you go and buy a brand-new car and spend money like mad? No. You hunker down a little bit and you try to be careful what you are spending. And yet somehow there is this theory that if we spend money, it is going to make everything okay.

They tried that in the days of FDR. The Secretary of Treasury, after 8 years of trying that foolishness, came before this Congress in 1939 with the quote, ''We have tried spending. The unemployment is as bad as when we started.'' And it didn't work. It didn't work for Japan, and it won't work for us if we keep down the spending.

Look at the comparison. We have heard about Bush spending. This is his average annual deficit, $300 billion. This is proposed by the President. The budget we are looking at here is even more, twice as much. If you take a look at the highest deficit, this was Bush in 2008 with the Democrats in Congress, $459 billion, and yet we are looking at $1.2 trillion. Our new President makes President Bush look like a piker.

Now, did you ever go to first grade and they said, what is it that doesn't fit in in this picture? Take a look at the deficits that have been run or the actual surpluses of all of these different years. And here we go along. These are the Bush years. And guess what line doesn't fit? I mean, we are talking about absolutely radical levels of spending, and here on the floor right now is being proposed even more than that.

Then we hear that the Democrats are saying, oh, this is really good because, look, we are going to take this great big spike and we are going to spend it at half the rate. It is like somebody has been smoking funny cigarettes around here.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I do believe that it matters whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican. I do believe it matters whether we give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest 1 percent of the population or whether we rescind them.

I want to commend Representatives LEE, SCOTT, and MOORE for their strong leadership on the development of this budget, and I rise in strong support of it. Especially do I want to commend them for looking after the criminal justice needs that exist in our country, and putting in resources for programs to assist those who are in need of help, in need of reentry, in need of trying to get their lives back together so that they, too, can share in the American dream.

So this budget is about the future development of America, and I support it strongly and urge its adoption.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Chair, I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Florida for the time.

Madam Chair, the American people deserve order in the fiscal house of government. America deserves a responsible, fair, creative, and smart Federal Government that protects our most vulnerable, strengthens opportunity, and protects our country. Our constituents deserve for us to say together ''yes'' to fiscal stability, ''yes'' to a balanced budget, ''yes'' to small business and entrepreneurs, and ''yes'' to creating opportunities to help families get ahead in life. But they also need us to say ''no,'' no to the concept that there is free money, free money for the government to give, to spend, and to bail out with. The only thing free here is that the government is acting free from restraint and free from responsibility.

Let's put today's debate into context. Six months ago, Congress passed a bailout for Wall Street, forcing America to buy bad corporate assets. Weeks ago, an omnibus holdover budget bill increased spending by 10 percent. Then a stimulus bill added another $800 billion. Not to mention that between the Federal Reserve, the Department of the Treasury, and the FDIC there is another $10 trillion of taxpayer dollars on the line right now. Now, today another budget adds another layer of spending.

It is a dizzying array of interventions that is reshaping the nature of the relationship between this government and our people. The result: Massive Federal debt, $2 trillion this year alone, larger than the entire Federal budget was before the year 2000.

□ 1645

This debt is a tax passed on to our children, or it is a sale of the Nation's assets overseas. We owe China $1 trillion. Or potentially it creates inflationary pressures. That is a particularly regressive form of taxation for the poorest and most vulnerable among us.

Madam Chair, we all know what we must do. And we know it will be hard. There is no denying that. We must prioritize. We must choose. We must be creative. We must be like a family that has to tighten its belt and steady itself during a rough period, but also look forward toward a more excellent way.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. May I inquire from the Chair how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I would like to yield myself 1 minute.

Again, I just want to emphasize that we keep hearing criticism of the previous administration for spending too much. And yet this bill makes that spending look like child's play. It makes that debt look like child's play. It makes that deficit look like child's play. And so you cannot on one side, like this bill does, criticize a previous administration for spending too much, for putting us in too much debt, and then do much more of the same, much more to an unprecedented level like this country has never seen, never seen such large tax increases, never seen such large debt, has never seen such large deficits as this bill would put on the American people. Again, facts are stubborn things.

With that, I reserve.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me acknowledge the leadership of our CBC chair, BARBARA LEE, and Congressman SCOTT and Congresswoman MOORE for spending the time to develop this alternative budget. And this is not because we don't support the President's budget. This is because we wanted to see some progressive and visionary funding that is motivated by principle and compassion. We are not socialists. We do not, however, want to forget that we do have poor and vulnerable people that do not have homes, that do not have health care and do not have enough food.

We are here not because we know we are going to win this vote. We are here because we feel the responsibility to put it before the people. There are a lot of people in this country with problems, and we as a Congressional Black Caucus do not intend to allow it to be forgotten. We are not talking about African Americans. We are talking about all of the poor, the children and the homeless families. They need attention. And we must not forget it. And we must not remain in denial.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman BARBARA LEE, the Congressional Black Caucus and my colleague, Congressman SCOTT from Virginia, for their leadership and unwavering support for the development of this alternative budget.

The CBC alternative budget is filled with progressive and visionary funding that is motivated by principle and compassion. It is a budget that voices the concerns and needs of the poor, the children, and the elderly.

I support and agree with President Obama's Budget. I also support CBC budget to increase American priorities such as our transportation system. The CBC budget would add an additional 8 billion dollars to support our transportation needs.

The CBC alternative budget understands that our Nation's transportation system is the backbone of our economy and our way of life, neither of which we can afford to shortchange.

Our Nation's future depends more and more on the quality of our innovative ideas. The fruits of these investments meet vital national needs and improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Like the President's budget, CBC alternative budget also provides funding for programs and services crucial to the American people, rather than continuing to provide tax breaks for the wealthy.

As lawmakers, we do have the responsibility to ensure that all Americans, including minorities, are able to move ahead to achieve the American Dream. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness meant all people.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I would like to now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When you look at the Democrats' budget, the numbers are just staggering. 2010 spending, $3 trillion, 25 percent of gross domestic product, $1.2 trillion tax increase over 10 years, $1 trillion spending increase over 5 years, nondefense discretionary spending increases 12 percent, the national debt increases $5.1 trillion, doubling over 5 years. The 2010 deficit will be $1.2 trillion.

How can you look at these numbers and conclude anything other than we simply can't sustain this level of debt? We can't grow an economy when we are dragging this level of debt. It simply defies the laws of economics. We can't do that.

Now some in defense of the Democratic budget will say, ''we inherited this fiscal mess that we are in.'' I will stipulate to that. We didn't do a very good job when we were in the majority controlling spending. But you don't put your foot on the accelerator when you are headed toward a fiscal cliff. And that is what this budget does. It simply gets us there a lot faster. And we simply can't do that.

Madam Chair, I would urge us to reject the overall budget, adopt something that we can actually afford and sustain and that will get us growing economically again.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

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

Mr. FATTAH. To my great friend from Arizona, sometimes if you're turning in front of an 18-wheeler, you should hit the accelerator and get out the way. The important point here is that no matter what the cost of education, ignorance costs our country more. What we have is, some who stand in opposition today, they know the cost of everything, but the value of seemingly nothing. It is critically important. And that is why the conscience of the CBC members dictates that this alternative be brought to the floor, that we point a direction, not just complain and recite the problems, but that we offer up real solutions, and that we are required to, as Members of this body, not just go along to get along.

As a major supporter of President Obama's budget and program, I think he is moving our country in the right direction. But it is important for us to show that even more can be done and should be done. And I believe as we go forward, it will be done. We will work together. Republicans have forfeited their right to lead based on the situation they brought this country to. We are prepared to lead. Others need to step aside.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve at this time, Madam Chairwoman.

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining. He is reserving his time. The gentleman from Virginia has 1¼ minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I would inquire to the gentleman from Florida if he has additional speakers?

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, we might have one but maybe not. We are definitely getting to the bottom here, the bottom of the list I should say.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I will yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Madam Chair, I wanted to get to the floor to congratulate Congressman BOBBY SCOTT for the hard work that he has done to bring the CBC's budget before this Congress and all of those who worked with him. I would like to thank my colleagues of the CBC, and especially our chairwoman, BARBARA LEE, for continuing the tradition of having an alternative budget. It is so important because each year we show the world what is possible, what can be done, how we can invest in human potential. This budget does just that. What I really like about this budget is it truly is building upon the President's blueprint for success. This budget, in investing in human potential, invests $18 billion more on health care, $17 billion more on education, job training and social services, $8 billion more on transportation and infrastructure. And I am sure you have heard some of these numbers as CBC members have come before you today to support this budget. I won't go any further except to say that this a good budget. Please support it.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I would like to yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chairwoman, one of the things that we need to be aware of is that when we keep hearing about more spending, more spending, more spending, more spending, more spending, all that spending is being paid for how? Well, it is very simple, by either huge tax increases, and that is why this budget has the largest tax increases in the history of this country, tax increases that we have never seen before, and unprecedented levels of debt, of borrowing.

What does that mean, government borrowing? Let me tell you what that means, Madam Chairwoman. It is basically like identity theft. The Federal Government is now in the process, if this were to become law, of taking, of stealing our children's and our grandchildren's credit cards and running them up at unprecedented levels. And yes, those credit cards are going to have to be paid back with interest. And that is what we are about to do at unprecedented levels. So when we keep hearing about all these great things that government is going to be doing, just remember, it is on the credit card of our children and our grandchildren.

This is a country that always, always by tradition worked hard to make sure that future generations were better off. We are about to embark on a road that this country has never been on before, leaving our children and our grandchildren with the largest debt, the largest debt that anybody has ever seen, has ever left for future generations. That is totally unacceptable.

I reserve.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I'm prepared to close. Does the gentleman want to proceed?

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, we thought we had another person. He is not here. I believe we get to close, is that correct?

The CHAIR. Yes. The gentleman from Florida has the right to close.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 15 seconds.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Chair, before I start, I would like to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentlelady from Texas.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Seventeen billion dollars in education and social services. I rise in support of the CBC budget for America.

Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) Budget Substitute for the Fiscal Year Budget for 2010, introduced by my distinguished colleague from California, REPRESENTATIVE BARBARA LEE and my colleague from Virginia, Representative ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT.

While I support the Budget as put forth by our majority on the Budget Committee, the CBC budget augments the President's budget and the Democratic budget by providing for modest spending increases above the Democratic Budget on important programs.

The President's budget is astonishing as he inherited one of the worst economic situations in recent history. The former administration, after being the first administration since the Civil War to have a surplus turned over to it, the former President left President Obama with the largest deficit in history and an economy that is in the worst recession in seventy (70) years. The CBC Budget will help turn our economy around and return the economy to fiscal responsibility.

I, along with other members of the CBC, support our President as he works to clean up the mess that was left to him. Nevertheless, the CBC has submitted its budget proposal which I also support.

The CBC budget fully funds No Child Left behind (NCLB), the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and it provides additional funding for the fight against global AIDS, Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and higher education among other items.

The CBC pays for these increases by immediately repealing the Bush-era tax cuts for those earning over $200,000 for single filers and $250,000 for joint filers. The CBC budget also eliminates the phase-out and repeal of PEP and Pease. These important tax provisions were apart of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990 and signed into law by the first President Bush and ensure that the wealthiest Americans are paying their fair share in taxes. Repealing these provisions of the 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts will yield an estimated $42.2 billion in additional revenue for Fiscal Year 2010.

Importantly, the CBC Budget creates the Bush Debt Tax, which adds a modest 0.565% surtax on adjustable gross income exceeding $500,000 for individuals and $1 million for joint filers. The CBC budget will use this surtax for deficit reduction. Over a ten year period, the Joint Committee on Taxation estimates this surtax will raise about $63 million. The CBC budget takes these savings and applies them towards increased investments in important functions that will help Americans become more prosperous.

The CBC Budget provides an additional $18 million for healthcare; $17 billion for education, job training, and social services, $8 billion for Transportation and Infrastructure; $5.5 billion for the administration of justice and approximately the same for international affairs; $5 billion for income security and veterans benefits, and $3 billion for community and regional development and homeland security.

The CBC Budget pays for all these increases and still produces a five-year budget deficit that is $67 billion lower than the Democratic Budget and saves America $7 billion on the National Debt.

ADVANCING THE PRIORITIES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

We must not only be economically healthy, but assist in balancing it with the health, education, and security of our citizens. The CBC budget will advance the priorities of the American people by:

Covering all eligible children with health insurance through funding SCHIP, more than the Democratic budget to help one of our most vulnerable populations—children;

Ensuring No Child Left Behind (NCLB) has increased funding for Head Start programs, IDEA, college access programs, college loan programs and job training;

Honoring our veterans by increasing funding for health care, benefits and educational opportunities;

Making more local communities with support through increases to Community Development Block Grants, nutrition programs and housing programs; and

Contributing to the global community by investing in child survival and health, international family planning and the global effort to fight AIDS.

HEALTH INITIATIVES

The CBC budget under the Health Function 550 included a program that I continually push for increased funding, and that is the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation. Hope for juvenile diabetes cure lies in research. Real progress is being made, thanks largely to government funding of the Special Diabetes Program.

The health and health care spending in the CBC budget alternative is the fiscally, socially and morally appropriate and responsible response and it will improve the health, well being and life opportunities of all Americans.

The CBC budget like the President's budget, strengthens our nation's overwhelmed and under-resourced health care system, champions the critically important health care needs of health care seekers, and fills the gaps in health care access and quality that detrimentally affect our nation's health care providers and the overall health care system.

The CBC budget alternative strengthens and expands the State Children's Health Insurance Program to ensure that the majority of the nation's 9 million uninsured children have access to health care. This is of particular relevance to the CBC because a disproportionate number of the 9 million uninsured children today are African American or Hispanic. Without reliable access to quality health care, children are in poorer health, are less productive in school and in their communities, and are less likely to fulfill their life's potential.

STRENGTHENS MEDICARE

The CBC budget alternative strengthens Medicare—a critically important program that ensures that our nations' senior citizens, as well as those living with disabilities, have access to the health care services and treatments they need to live longer, healthier and fuller lives.

The CBC budget alternative also:

Saves Title VII (health professions training) programs, which are integral to strengthening and expanding tomorrow's health care workforce;

Funds the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program in a manner that allows it to expand ADAP, the efforts of National Minority AIDS Education Training Centers, and the other important services and treatments offered to our most vulnerable with HIV infection;

Funds the Minority AIDS Initiative in a manner that will build the needed capacity in racial and ethnic minority communities throughout the nation to respond and address HIV/AIDS;

It is our children that will bring forth a thriving future. We need to invest in tomorrow by investing in them today. This starts with their physical well-being. Children, who cannot see the doctor when they are sick, research programs that are not adequately funded to find a cure for diseases such as diabetes, hurt our future generations, and not help lay a foundation for a bright future.

EDUCATION AND AFRICAN AMERICANS IN TEXAS

A quality education continues to be the best pathway to social and economic mobility in this country. As a Member and Senior Whip of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have consistently advocated for the maintenance of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This budget provides greater funding to our nation's schools and colleges than even our Democratic budget supplies.

For African Americans health and education concerns spill beyond budgetary issues into the criminal justice consequences. In Texas, over 87,000 African-Americans are incarcerated compared to approximately 48,000 African-Americans attending college or university.

The disparity between the percentages of our youth in prison versus the number of young people in college, particularly in the African-American community, is disturbing to say the least. Higher education continues to be one of the main pathways to social and economic mobility, particularly in the African-American and Hispanic communities.

PORT OF HOUSTON AND SECURITY MEASURES

Last week, I had the pleasure of meeting with the Port Authority of Houston. They were here to discuss their security measures but also their need for continued federal dollars. The Bush Administration claims they want to secure our nation but cuts funding in areas that are important to our local security such as the ports in Houston, Texas. The CBC seeks to cure that shortfall.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Under the proposed CBC budget, there is emphasis on the administration of justice and the protection of all Americans. The CBC budget funds programs that are important to our communities. The CBC budget funds the

Justice Assistance Grant Program, Juvenile Justice Programs, the Byrne Weed and Seed Program, Office of Violence Against Women, COPS and JAG programs. All of these programs help keep American communities safe and provide for greater law enforcement at the federal, state, and local enforcement levels. The CBC budget reinvests in DOJ Prisoner Reentry Program. In addition, the CBC budget invests in our children by requiring funding for Boys and Girls clubs. This investment in our communities and in our children helps keep our youths safe and out of the prison system.

GENERAL SCIENCES, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY

The CBC budget proposes to invest heavily in our nation's development in science, space, and technology. The CBC budget also invests in the NSF—Education and Research Programs, with a special emphasis on Minority Post Doctorates. The CBC budget not only invests in minorities, it also invests in women by providing for Graduate Research Fellowships for Women in Engineering and Computer Science.

ENERGY

The CBC budget addresses the environment, energy, and natural resources. These programs are of particular interest to the people of Texas and I think it is necessary for America to remain a vital, energy efficient country.

EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

The proposed CBC budget puts greater emphasis on education, training, employment, and social services. These are critical to the needs of Americans and minority populations in general.

The CBC budget provides funding for the No Child Left Behind Act. Included in that Act is funding for Title I, Safe and Drug Free Schools, 21st Century Learning Centers, and Teacher Quality Programs. We must continue to invest in our children because they represent the future of America.

The CBC budget also recognizes that there must be investment in Head Start, mentoring, and drop out prevention. The proposed CBC budget provides money to vocational programs and increases the funding of HBCUs. The CBC budget provides for funding in investment in Minority Science and Engineering Improvement. The CBC budget invests in adult employment and training activities.

CONCLUSION

This important piece of legislation gives us a budget that is balanced fiscally and morally. It does not sacrifice the great many programs and services that this nation needs to correct eight years or more of decay.

Defense of our nation is important, however, we must not support only one portion of the budget to the detriment of everything else. The CBC budget makes tough choices that result in a fiscally and morally responsible budget that will fund essential programs and services vital to our communities and the American people as a whole.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Congressional Black Caucus Budget Substitute for FY2010.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, the Congressional Black Caucus budget is based on the budget of 1990–1993 that worked. It rejects the budget of 2001 that didn't. It saves money and invests in our priorities. It is a good budget. The base budget is good, but the CBC budget is better.

Madam Chair, I ask that we adopt the CBC budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Chairwoman, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his hard work. I want to just throw some facts out there. This budget spends too much, it taxes too much and it borrows way too much.

The debt held by the public under this budget will double in 5½ years—double in 5½ years. It triples in a little over 10 years. The kind of red ink that this budget proposes for our children and our grandchildren is more under this presidency than under the presidencies between George Washington and George W. Bush combined.

Again, it increases taxes on all the American people. On January 1, 2011, the income tax rates go up. That is a tax increase. On January 1, 2011, as Mr. RYAN said, the capital gains rates go up. And as he repeated, that is also a tax increase. On January 1, 2011, the dividends tax rate goes up. That is a huge tax increase. On January 1, 2010, the AMT will go up to 26 million Americans who are now not paying it. This imposes a national energy tax, a new tax, a tax increase when you turn on the lights, when you pump your gas, if you use gas to cook, if you use it for industry, on all energy consumption in this country. That is what we are facing. This puts our country on the road to insolvency.

So I commend the gentleman from Virginia and his colleagues for putting together this amendment. But this is not where this country needs to go. Let's not forget who pays the bills, our children and our grandchildren. Let's not do this to them. Let's leave them a brighter future, a stronger America.

For those reasons, because this does not do that, because this burdens them like never before, I respectfully request a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, as we all know, the recession we are facing today is the most severe since the Great Depression. It is evident that the Bush Administration's economic policies have failed us. With a new President, we now have the ability to begin to repair our economy and get our country back on track.

Madam Chair, we must significantly cut our bloated defense spending. I agree with my friend and fellow chair, Representative BARNEY FRANK, that we should reduce defense spending by at least 25 percent. The CPC budget does this by withdrawing our troops from the senseless war in Iraq, saving American tax payers $105 billion in 2010, and by ending the procurement of antiquated Cold War weapons systems that no longer further our common national defense. These actions will save another $60 billion, yes $60 billion dollars, per year. This budget will also address the root causes of terrorism by enacting and fully funding the SMART Security Platform for the 21st Century. This is a more effective, targeted, and nuanced national security strategy that will focus more of our resources on the critical issues that affect our national security: nonproliferation, conflict prevention, international diplomacy, and multilateralism.

Furthermore, the CPC budget will offer serious reform that will bring back America's tradition of progressive taxation. First, it eliminates the Bush tax cuts for those in the top 1 percent, increasing government revenues by $84 billion. Moreover, the bill will force banks, who helped create this financial disaster, to self finance their received bail outs by implanting a one quarter of 1 percent tax on all stock and futures trading. Lastly, it will end outrageous overseas corporate tax havens in the Caribbean, Switzerland, and all elsewhere—bringing $100 billion in taxes back to the American treasury.

With these extra $300 billion government revenues the CPC budget will help hard working Americans through these tough economic times. Specifically, the budget alternative adds funding for job training, puts Americans to work with robust transportation funding, extends COBRA health benefits, and provides extra food stamps for the poor, women, and infants.

In these dire times, the Progressive Caucus budget will help us realign our fiscal policy with our values as a nation. As we cut useless defense spending and misdirected tax cuts for the wealthy, while providing aid to the middle and working classes, we will make an important statement: America honors work and those who play by the rules; we appreciate the success of the wealthy, but we expect them to reciprocate when it comes to promoting the common good. America will strengthen its national security by working with our allies around the world and by showing compassion to our brothers and sisters who lack our economic blessings. Finally, and most importantly, America is a flexible country that can and will change with the times, make smart investments, and lead the world in a new economic direction. I encourage my colleagues to support the Progressive Caucus' alternative budget so that we may move forward as a nation that honors work, justice, and peace.

Madam Chair, now more then ever Americans are seeking government to help them during these uncertain times. For too long, Members on the other side advocated for no government intervention, citing the mantra of extreme free market capitalism. Now we are seeing the devastating consequences. The Congressional Black Caucus budget is one way to confront our pressing issues and move America forward.

Today's legislation addresses minority health needs. It calls for significant increases in funding for the Minority AIDS Initiative, Ryan White CARE Act, and CDC Prevention activities for HIV, STD, TB and Viral Hepatitis. Furthermore, the CBC budget calls for a $200 million increase in funding for the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities at NIH. These programs will promote better public health services to the many who depend on these programs.

Madam Chair, in the richest country in the world, access to housing is a human right. After many years of underfunding of the nation's affordable housing programs, the CBC fully funds Section 8 public housing to 100% of need. Furthermore, the bill calls for $360

million increase to housing for people living with HIV/AIDS (HOPWA). Lastly, the CBC urges an increase in funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which allows states, localities, and nonprofits to buy up and rehabilitate abandoned and foreclosed properties.

As Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I whole heartily support The CBC efforts to reduce juvenile crime and efforts to rehabilitate ex-offenders. Today's legislation would fully fund the Second Chance Act, an important bill that gives assistance ex-offenders during their reclamation to society and may ultimately reduce crime. Furthermore, the CBC budget will increase funding for the Justice Assistance Program, the Juvenile Justice Program, Civil Rights Enforcement, the COPS Program, the Byrne Justice Grant Program, and State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance.

During these tough economic times, we need expanded and improved access to high quality education. The CBC budget supports the President' to expand the Pell Grant program to hardworking students. It is a national shame that the Bush administration woefully underfunded the No Child Left Behind Act and the today's legislation calls for substantial increase in funding level. Furthermore, CBC budget calls on Congress to fully fund Head Start, TRIO (including Upward Bound), GEAR UP, Youth Build, and vocational education programs.

I could go on about the features of this legislation but clearly it puts Americans first. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield back the remaining part of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 113, noes 318, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

AYES—113

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baldwin
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Ellison
Engel
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kilpatrick (MI)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lynch
Markey (MA)
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richardson
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—318

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Ortiz
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Davis (AL)

NOT VOTING—5

Buyer
Hinojosa
Miller, Gary
Sablan
Westmoreland

□ 1724

Messrs. BACA, CALVERT, HALL of Texas, FRANKS of Arizona, and HERGER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and HINCHEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 111–73.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 111–73 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 2010.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010 is hereby established and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009, fiscal years 2011 through 2019, and fiscal years 2020 through 2082.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

TITLE I— RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Recommended Levels and Amounts for Each of Fiscal Years 2009 Through 2019

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Functional categories.

Subtitle B—Recommended Levels and Amounts for Each of Fiscal Years 2020 Through 2082

Sec. 111. Major categories.
Sec. 112. Social Security spending levels.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—CONGRESSIONAL POLICY STATEMENTS
Sec. 301. Policy statement on Medicare.
Sec. 302. Policy statement on Medicaid.
Sec. 303. Policy statement on affordable and accessible health care.
Sec. 304. Policy statement on Social Security.
Sec. 305. Policy statement on energy.
Sec. 306. Policy statement on taxes.
TITLE IV—SHORT-TERM BUDGET ENFORCEMENT
Sec. 401. Restrictions on advance appropriations.
Sec. 402. Roll Call Vote Required on Increasing the Debt Limit.
Sec. 403. Budget compliance statements.
Sec. 404. Cost estimates for conference reports and unreported measures.
Sec. 405. Roll call votes for new spending.
Sec. 406. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 407. Social Security off-budget compliance statement.
Sec. 408. Applications and effects of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 409. Emergency spending and contingency operations.
TITLE V—LONG-TERM BUDGET ENFORCEMENT
Sec. 501. Spending and revenue increase controls.
Sec. 502. Prevent increases in the long-term unfunded liability of the Federal Government.
Sec. 503. Estimates of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.
Sec. 504. Projections.
TITLE VI—EARMARK REFORM
Sec. 601. Moratorium on consideration of earmarks.
Sec. 602. Joint select committee on earmark reform.
TITLE VII—PAY-AS-YOU-GO ENFORCEMENT FOR MANDATORY SPENDING
Sec. 701. Pay-as-you-go for mandatory spending legislation.
TITLE VIII—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS
Sec. 801. Discretionary spending limits.

TITLE I— RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Recommended Levels and Amounts for Each of Fiscal Years 2009 Through 2019

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2019:

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

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

Fiscal year 2009: $1,497,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $1,618,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $1,865,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,083,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,126,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,238,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,361,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,462,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,572,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,671,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,773,775,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: −$35,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: −$47,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: −$222,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: −$276,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: −$388,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: −$394,788,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$414,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$434,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$456,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$479,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$505,259,000,000.

(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 2009: $3,653,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,691,668,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,601,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,626,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,767,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,928,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,047,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,191,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,288,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,402,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,471,097,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: $3,355,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,727,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,684,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,653,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,778,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,924,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,037,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,184,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,278,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,388,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,487,199,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: $1,857,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $1,108,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $818,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $570,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $652,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $686,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $675,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $721,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $706,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $717,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $713,424,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: $12,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $13,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $13,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $14,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $15,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $16,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $17,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $19,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $20,683,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009: $7,763,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $8,571,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $9,252,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $9,728,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $10,240,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $10,831,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $11,405,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $12,039,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $12,677,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $12,978,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $13,655,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2009 through 2019 are as follows:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $693,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $671,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $696,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $696,128,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $619,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $663,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $628,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $643,223,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $639,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $642,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $653,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $647,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $668,321,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $659,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $683,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $677,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $699,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $688,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $715,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $699,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $731,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $720,053,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $40,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $35,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $38,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $39,983,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,758,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $41,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,179,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,496,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $35,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $29,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $30,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $30,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $30,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,828,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $30,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $32,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,153,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $43,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,952,000,000.
(A) Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $4,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $4,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $4,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $5,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $5,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $5,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $5,404,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $5,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $5,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,781,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $56,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $36,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $38,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $41,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,027,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $24,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $24,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,698,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $23,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $24,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,099,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $694,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $665,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $53,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $25,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,561,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $10,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $18,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $13,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $13,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $18,333,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $18,526,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,377,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $122,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $73,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $74,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $74,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $75,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $76,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $77,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $77,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $78,847,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $79,758,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $80,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,852,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $23,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $15,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $15,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $15,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $15,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $15,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $15,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $15,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $16,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $16,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,050,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $164,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $94,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $100,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $104,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $106,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $107,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $110,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $113,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $114,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $116,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,370,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $380,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $354,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $382,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $388,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $362,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $366,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $366,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $384,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $380,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $393,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $416,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $440,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $472,198,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $469,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $502,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $500,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $535,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $533,214,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $427,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $442,815,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $442,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $487,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $487,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $491,952,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $491,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $540,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $540,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $593,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $618,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $674,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $674,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $698,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $698,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $724,830,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $724,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $804,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $804,379,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $520,123,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $503,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $531,436,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $502,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $444,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $448,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $448,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $448,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $447,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $451,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $450,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $461,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $460,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $464,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $463,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $467,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $466,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $481,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $480,964,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $31,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $26,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $42,449,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $46,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $49,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,994,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $97,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $106,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $112,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $108,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $113,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $115,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $118,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $124,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $124,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $124,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $132,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $131,887,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $55,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $54,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $52,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $52,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,363,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $54,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,058,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $55,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $56,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $58,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $61,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $64,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,627,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $30,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $23,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $24,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $25,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $25,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,350,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $289,044,000,000.
(B) $289,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $282,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $282,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $317,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $373,346,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $373,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $447,727,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $447,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $530,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $530,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $595,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $649,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $648,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $695,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $695,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $757,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $759,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $813,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $813,257,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, −$120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$12,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$145,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$240,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$152,721,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$238,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$128,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$178,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$154,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$189,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$182,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$187,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$201,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$201,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$232,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$225,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$264,079,000,000.
(A) Outlays, -$253,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(B) New budget authority, −$296,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$283,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$445,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$409,457,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$78,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$78,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$68,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$68,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$71,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$71,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$74,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$74,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$77,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$77,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$79,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$79,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$82,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$82,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$85,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $94,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $98,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $102,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,274,000,000.

Subtitle B—Recommended Levels and Amounts for Each of Fiscal Years 2020 Through 2082

SEC. 111. MAJOR CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of outlays and revenues for the Federal Government for calendar years 2020 through 2082 are as follows:

Calendar Year	Debt	Health and Retirement Security	Other Non-interest Spending	Total Spending	Revenues	Deficits
2020	33%	10.3%	8.1%	19.8%	18.0%	−1.5%
2021	33%	10.6%	8.0%	20.1%	18.2%	−1.8%
2022	34%	10.8%	8.0%	20.4%	18.2%	−2.1%
2023	35%	11.2%	8.0%	20.8%	18.3%	−2.5%
2024	37%	11.4%	7.9%	21.0%	18.3%	−2.7%
2025	39%	11.6%	7.9%	21.3%	18.3%	−3.0%
2026	40%	11.7%	7.9%	21.4%	18.3%	−3.1%
2027	43%	11.9%	7.9%	21.7%	18.3%	−3.4%
2028	44%	12.1%	7.9%	22.0%	18.3%	−3.7%
2029	47%	12.0%	7.8%	22.1%	18.3%	−3.8%
2030	49%	12.2%	7.8%	22.3%	18.3%	−4.0%
2031	51%	12.2%	7.7%	22.3%	18.3%	−4.0%
2032	53%	12.3%	7.7%	22.3%	18.3%	−4.0%
2033	55%	12.2%	7.6%	22.3%	18.3%	−4.0%
2034	57%	12.2%	7.6%	22.2%	18.3%	−3.9%
2035	58%	12.3%	7.5%	22.4%	18.3%	−4.1%
2036	60%	12.2%	7.5%	22.4%	18.3%	−4.1%
2037	62%	12.2%	7.4%	22.5%	18.3%	−4.2%
2038	64%	12.1%	7.4%	22.5%	18.3%	−4.2%
2039	66%	12.0%	7.4%	22.4%	18.3%	−4.1%
2040	67%	11.8%	7.3%	22.3%	18.3%	−4.0%
2041	69%	11.7%	7.3%	22.2%	18.3%	−3.9%
2042	70%	11.5%	7.3%	21.9%	18.3%	−3.6%
2043	71%	11.4%	7.2%	21.9%	18.3%	−3.6%
2044	72%	11.3%	7.2%	21.8%	18.3%	−3.5%
2045	72%	11.2%	7.1%	21.6%	18.3%	−3.3%
2046	73%	11.0%	7.1%	21.5%	18.3%	−3.2%
2047	73%	11.1%	7.1%	21.6%	18.3%	−3.3%
2048	74%	10.8%	7.0%	21.3%	18.3%	−3.0%
2049	74%	10.7%	7.0%	21.2%	18.3%	−2.9%
2050	74%	10.7%	7.0%	21.3%	18.3%	−3.0%
2051	74%	10.6%	6.9%	21.1%	18.3%	−2.8%
2052	73%	10.5%	6.9%	20.9%	18.3%	−2.6%
2053	73%	10.5%	6.9%	20.8%	18.3%	−2.5%
2054	73%	10.4%	6.8%	20.7%	18.3%	−2.4%
2055	72%	10.4%	6.8%	20.7%	18.3%	−2.4%
2056	72%	10.3%	6.8%	20.5%	18.3%	−2.2%
2057	71%	10.3%	6.7%	20.5%	18.3%	−2.2%
2058	71%	10.3%	6.7%	20.5%	18.3%	−2.2%
2059	71%	10.4%	6.7%	20.7%	18.3%	−2.4%
2060	71%	10.4%	6.6%	20.5%	18.3%	−2.2%
2061	70%	10.3%	6.6%	20.4%	18.3%	−2.1%
2062	70%	10.3%	6.6%	20.3%	18.3%	−2.0%
2063	69%	10.3%	6.5%	20.2%	18.3%	−1.9%
2064	68%	10.3%	6.5%	20.3%	18.3%	−2.0%
2065	67%	10.3%	6.4%	20.4%	18.3%	−2.1%
2066	67%	10.2%	6.4%	20.2%	18.3%	−1.9%
2067	66%	10.2%	6.4%	20.0%	18.3%	−1.7%
2068	65%	10.3%	6.3%	19.8%	18.3%	−1.5%
2069	64%	10.3%	6.3%	19.7%	18.3%	−1.4%
2070	63%	10.3%	6.3%	19.7%	18.3%	−1.4%
2071	62%	10.3%	6.2%	19.7%	18.3%	−1.4%
2072	61%	10.3%	6.2%	19.8%	18.3%	−1.5%

Calendar Year	Debt	Health and Retirement Security	Other Non-interest Spending	Total Spending	Revenues	Deficits
2073	61%	10.3%	6.2%	19.9%	18.3%	−1.6%
2074	59%	10.4%	6.1%	19.9%	18.3%	−1.6%
2075	59%	10.2%	6.1%	19.6%	18.3%	−1.3%
2076	57%	10.2%	6.1%	19.5%	18.3%	−1.2%
2077	56%	10.2%	6.0%	19.4%	18.3%	−1.1%
2078	54%	10.2%	6.0%	19.0%	18.3%	−0.7%
2079	52%	10.2%	6.0%	18.9%	18.3%	−0.6%
2080	50%	10.2%	5.9%	18.6%	18.3%	−0.3%
2081	48%	10.2%	5.9%	18.3%	18.3%	0.0%
2082	47%	10.1%	5.9%	18.2%	18.3%	0.1%

SEC. 112. SOCIAL SECURITY SPENDING LEVELS.

The concurrent resolution assumes the following levels of Social Security spending as a percentage of gross domestic product from calendar years 2020 through 2082:

Calendar Year	Percent of GDP
2020	5.1%
2021	5.2%
2022	5.3%
2023	5.5%
2024	5.6%
2025	5.7%
2026	5.8%
2027	5.9%
2028	6.0%
2029	6.0%
2030	6.1%
2031	6.1%
2032	6.2%
2033	6.2%
2034	6.2%
2035	6.3%
2036	6.3%
2037	6.3%
2038	6.3%
2039	6.3%
2040	6.3%
2041	6.3%
2042	6.2%
2043	6.2%
2044	6.2%
2045	6.2%
2046	6.1%
2047	6.2%
2048	6.1%
2049	6.1%
2050	6.1%
2051	6.1%
2052	6.1%
2053	6.1%
2054	6.1%
2055	6.1%
2056	6.1%
2057	6.1%
2058	6.1%
2059	6.2%
2060	6.2%
2061	6.2%
2062	6.2%
2063	6.2%
2064	6.2%
2065	6.2%
2066	6.2%
2067	6.2%
2068	6.3%
2069	6.3%
2070	6.3%
2071	6.3%
2072	6.3%
2073	6.3%
2074	6.4%
2075	6.3%
2076	6.3%
2077	6.3%
2078	6.4%
2079	6.4%
2080	6.4%
2081	6.4%
2082	6.4%

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS TO PROVIDE FOR THE REFORM OF MANDATORY SPENDING.—(1) Not later than July 29, 2009, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations from the applicable committees of the House, 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 outlays by $38,481,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2019.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—The Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $22,708,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2019.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $666,135,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2019.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $28,400,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2019.

(E) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $1,839,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2019.

(F) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $4,320,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2019.

(G) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $1,984,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2019.

(H) 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 outlays by $10,263,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2019.

(I) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $1,665,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2019.

(J) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending outlays by $605,049,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2019.

(b) SUBMISSION OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of 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 of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

TITLE III—CONGRESSIONAL POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 301. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) MEDICARE POLICY.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress will enact legislation to ensure the Medicare benefit continues to provide health care coverage for seniors by establishing a new methodology to make the program solvent and fiscally sustainable. Legislation shall be enacted that:

(1) Expands protections for seniors against catastrophic medical costs, simplifies beneficiary contributions, updates Medicare payments, increases flexibility for hospitals serving unusually high numbers of low-income patients, and reduces the prescription drug benefit subsidy for high-income seniors (household incomes over $170,000). To ensure that the cost of frivolous litigation is not passed on to beneficiaries, the medical malpractice system is reformed.

(2) Preserves the current Medicare program for individuals 55 and older. For those under 55, the resolution gradually converts the current Medicare program into one in which Medicare beneficiaries receive a premium support payment—equivalent to 100 percent of the cost of the Medicare benefit—to purchase health coverage from a menu of Medicare-approved plans, similar to options available to Members of Congress. The premium support payment is risk-adjusted to increase with age and health status, and income-related so low-income seniors receive extra support. Premiums continue to be based on an all-beneficiary average, so the phasing of the younger population into the new program will not increase premiums for the population continuing in the existing program.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT OF THE MEDICARE TRIGGER.—The Medicare trigger as set forth in section 803 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 shall apply during the 111th Congress.

SEC. 302. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAID.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Medicaid—

(1) is outdated and fiscally unsustainable;

(2) has a payment error rate of at least 10 percent (as reported by GAO in January 2009);

(3) without major reform, its recipients' access to health care is in jeopardy;

(4) must be reformed to make the health care safety net stronger and more reliable for the neediest populations;

(5) must be modernized by enhancing State flexibility and their sensitivity to spending growth, while allowing States to offer their Medicaid populations more options; and

(6) recipients, like all other Americans, deserve to make their own health care decisions instead of government bureaucrats dictating them.

SEC. 303. POLICY STATEMENT ON AFFORDABLE AND ACCESSIBLE HEALTH CARE.

It is the policy assumption of this concurrent resolution that legislation should be enacted that reforms the health care marketplace by ensuring universal access to health coverage for every American regardless of pre-existing health conditions. It allows individuals who like their health coverage to keep what they have, and offers those without coverage access health care options similar to what Members of Congress have. The resolution prevents the expansion of entitlements, the creation of government-controlled health plans, and the imposition of new mandates or taxes on businesses. Individuals must have the freedom to choose the health care plan that best meets their needs and freedom from government bureaucrats making their health care decisions. Medical professionals must not be prohibited—either through the use of comparative effectiveness data or otherwise—from providing and/or prescribing care they believe to be medically necessary.

SEC. 304. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) More than 30 million Americans depend on Social Security as a key part of their retirement. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the ''three-legged stool'' of retirement security, which today includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) Every year, the Social Security Trustees report warns of the dire financial straits that Social Security is in. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious, and the threat to seniors becomes more pronounced—

(A) in 2041, the Trust Fund will be exhausted, and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) with the exhaustion of the Trust Fund in 2041, benefits will be cut 22 percent across the board—hurting all those who rely upon Social Security as a fundamental part of their retirement security; and by 2082, the cuts required would equal 25 percent.

(3) The current recession is exacerbating the crisis to Social Security. The most recent March 2009 CBO baseline finds that the cash surplus in 2010 will only be $3 billion—down $22 billion from just 3 months ago. Should the recession continue, we may enter into a cash deficit in 2010—8 years earlier than expected.

(4) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower-income Americans' retirement security.

(5) Americans deserve to have their elected Representatives take seriously the issue of Social Security reform. We must work together—in a bipartisan fashion—in order to solve this crisis. In this spirit, this resolution puts forth a reform that was first proposed by the current Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(b) POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should begin to act on Social Security. Should the Trustees of the Social Security Trust Fund determine that the Trust Fund would be unable to pay scheduled benefits within five years (currently estimated in 2036); reforms such as the following are recommended to be implemented to mitigate across-the-board cuts in benefit payments:

(1) Provide for a phase in of low-earner benefit enhancement. This would protect lower-income Americans meeting certain requirements by ensuring they receive a benefit of at least 120 percent of the poverty line.

(2) Reduce the 15-percent Primary Insurance Amount bracket by 0.25 percentage points per year, from the date at which SSA finds it cannot meet scheduled benefits within 5 years (currently 2036). Phase in over 20 years.

(3) The spending, revenue, deficit, and debt levels in this concurrent resolution assume current law benefits will be fully paid and do not assume any savings in Social Security.

SEC. 305. POLICY STATEMENT ON ENERGY.

(a) ENERGY POLICY.—It is recognized that:

(1) energy is recognized as a vital component to our national and economic security.

(2) our dependence on foreign oil, natural gas, and other sources of energy is a threat to our national and economic security;

(3) our dependence on foreign oil, natural gas, and other fuel sources is contributing to a massive transfer of wealth outside of the United States;

(4) increasing production of domestic energy will reduce our dependence on foreign oil, natural gas, and other sources of energy;

(5) high rates of taxes levied upon domestic production of oil and natural gas energy sources will place domestic producers at a competitive disadvantage relative to foreign competitors and will discourage domestic energy production;

(6) a significant amount of oil and natural gas reserves are believed to be located on Federal lands including the Outer Continental Shelf, the Gulf of Mexico, the Arctic National and Wildlife Refuge, the National Petroleum Reserve, the Intermountain West Region;

(7) domestic energy development on Federal lands should comply with environmental laws and regulations and should be conducted in an environmentally responsible manner that minimizes the disruption to fish, plant, insect, and animal wildlife;

(8) alternative forms of energy development including solar, wind, biomass, wave, tidal, hydro, and other forms can produce pollution-free energy with favorable environmental benefits, including the reduction of global green house gas emissions;

(9) increased nuclear energy is an important component to achieving an energy supply free of green house gas emissions;

(10) lower energy prices will do more to promote economic growth, raise living standards, increase incomes, and create jobs than will higher energy prices;

(11) numerous studies on cap and trade conducted by government agencies, universities, think tanks, and industry groups agree that cap and trade will raise energy prices for businesses and consumers; and

(12) revenues, royalties, fees, and taxes raised from developing energy projects located on Federal lands could provide billions of dollars to the Treasury which could be used to fund increased Federal participation and support for alternative, renewable, and nuclear energy projects without raising new taxes or increasing energy prices on businesses and consumers.

(b) STATEMENT ON ENERGY POLICY.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the energy policy of the United States is to—

(1) support our national and economic security by reducing our dependence on foreign oil, natural gas, and other sources of energy;

(2) support the increased development of energy on Federal lands in an environmentally responsible manner consistent with existing laws and regulations in a manner that minimizes the impact on fish, plant, insect, and animal wildlife;

(3) support the development of alternative, renewable, and nuclear sources of energy that will reduce reliance on foreign oil and contribute to reduced levels of global green house gasses;

(4) direct revenues from royalties, bonus bids, fees, rents, and other taxes levied on new energy projects on Federal lands to fund increased Federal participation in research, development, loans, loan guarantees, insurance, tax credits and subsidies, and other assistance that will encourage new development of alternative, renewable, and nuclear sources of energy;

(5) ensure taxes levied on domestic oil and natural gas produces do not place them at a competitive disadvantage relative to foreign competitors, lead to job losses, or encourage a greater dependence on foreign sources of oil, natural gas, or other energy sources; and

(6) pursue policies that keep energy prices low and contribute to economic growth and avoid policies that raise energy prices on American businesses and consumers.

SEC. 306. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The policies of this concurrent resolution include the following assumptions:

(1) The Federal tax code is needlessly complex and burdensome, and it tends to discourage economic growth and United States competitiveness.

(2) The policies included in this resolution are aimed at addressing these problems.

(b) TAXES ON INDIVIDUALS.—This concurrent resolution would give individuals a choice in paying their Federal income taxes. Individuals can choose to pay their Federal taxes under the existing tax code, with all the familiar deductions and schedules, or they could move to a highly simplified income tax system. This simplified tax system broadens the tax base by cleaning out nearly all the existing tax deductions and credits, compresses the tax schedule down to two low rates and retains a generous standard deduction and exemption level. The tax form for this system could fit on a postcard. Within ten years of enactment of this legislation, individuals would choose one of the two tax systems: the current tax code or the simplified system. Individuals are allowed one additional changeover between the two tax systems over the course of their lifetimes. Individuals are also allowed to change tax systems when a major life event (death, divorce, or marriage) alters their filing status. In contrast to the six rates in the current tax code, the simplified tax has just two rates: 10 percent on adjusted gross income (AGI) up to $100,000 for joint filers and $50,000 for single filers; and 25 percent on taxable income above these amounts. These tax brackets are adjusted by a cost-of-living adjustment as measured by the consumer price index. The simplified code eliminates nearly all existing tax deductions, exclusions, and other special provisions, but it retains a generous base exemption amount for all taxpayers. The standard deduction for joint filers is $25,000 for joint filers and $12,500 for single filers. The personal exemption amount is $3500. This proposal patches the alternative minimum tax (AMT) at the 2009 level for the foreseeable future in order to prevent millions of middle class Americans from being ensnared by an unfair tax hike. This tax system also maintains the current lower

rates on capital gains and dividends for all taxpayers.

(c) TAXES ON CORPORATIONS.—The U.S. corporate income tax rate is the second highest in the industrialized world. The tax leads to lowers wages for workers, higher prices for consumers, and it also discourages foreign investment in the U.S. This concurrent resolution assumes policies that address these problems by lowering the U.S. corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 25 percent, pushing it into the more competitive range among industrialized countries. In conjunction with this move, the resolution repeals the tax deduction for U.S. production activities (section 199), as companies receiving this benefit will now be taxed at the lower 25-percent rate. It also temporarily suspends the tax on capital gains for the rest of 2009 and 2010. These policies are designed to keep overall Federal tax revenues at approximately 18.3 percent of GDP for the foreseeable future, roughly equivalent to the long-term historical average.

TITLE IV—SHORT-TERM BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. 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 2011 and 2012 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 2010 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2010.

SEC. 402. ROLL CALL VOTE REQUIRED ON INCREASING THE DEBT LIMIT.

With respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, the clerk of the House shall not prepare an engrossment of a joint resolution increasing or decreasing, as the case may be, the statutory limit on the public debt.

SEC. 403. BUDGET COMPLIANCE STATEMENTS.

Each report of a committee on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain a budget compliance statement prepared by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report, which shall include assessment by such chairman as to whether the bill or joint resolution complies with the requirements of sections 302, 303, 306, 311, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 404. 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. 405. 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. 406. 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 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. 407. SOCIAL SECURITY OFF-BUDGET COMPLIANCE STATEMENT.

As required by section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 and section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the outlays and revenue totals of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act or the related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in the surplus or deficit totals.

SEC. 408. APPLICATIONS AND EFFECTS 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 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. 409. EMERGENCY SPENDING AND CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) EMERGENCY SPENDING DESIGNATION .—In the House, if any bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, and such provision is designated as an emergency pursuant to this section, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, or receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) 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 2010 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 the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

TITLE V—LONG-TERM BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 501. SPENDING AND REVENUE INCREASE CONTROLS.

It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, unless war has been declared or during a recession, as determined by the House Budget Committee, that causes aggregate—

(1) Federal spending levels, in any fiscal year to exceed the percentage of spending relative to the gross domestic product as set forth in section 510; and

(2) Federal revenue levels, in any fiscal year, to exceed the percentage of revenue relative to the gross domestic product as set forth in section 510.

SEC. 502. PREVENT INCREASES IN THE LONG-TERM UNFUNDED LIABILITY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) LONG-TERM SOLVENCY POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment thereto, or conference report thereon, if such measure includes a provision that causes a net increase in the long-term unfunded liability of the Federal Government.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each bill and joint resolution reported from committee (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations), and amendments thereto and conference reports thereon, an estimate of whether the measure causes, relative to current law—

(1) a net increase in the Medicare Part A Trust Fund's unfunded liability; and

(2) a net increase in the long-term unfunded liability of the Federal Government.

(c) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.—The GAO shall assess the level of the Federal Government's long-term unfunded obligations and provide a report to the Committee on the Budget of the House, and other appropriate committees, as soon as practicable after the beginning of each session of Congress.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.—The Department of the Treasury shall assess the level of the Federal Government's long-term unfunded obligations and provide a report to the Committee on the Budget of the House, and other appropriate committees.

(e) HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATION.—The chairman of the House Budget Committee shall advise the Chair as to the whether a measure referred to in subsection (a) complies with this section.

SEC. 503. ESTIMATES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall include in the report referred to section 308(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 an estimate of the level of total spending in outlays and revenue for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2082 as a percentage of gross domestic product for purposes of this section.

SEC. 504. PROJECTIONS.

(a) CBO LONG-TERM ECONOMIC GROWTH AND BUDGET PROJECTIONS.—By February 1 of each calendar year, for each fiscal year within the long-term period, as set forth in section 512, CBO shall prepare a report that sets forth the amount of total spending of the Government in outlays, and the amount of total

spending for the functional categories set forth in section 112 .

(b) INCLUSION IN THE FINAL SPENDING REDUCTION REPORT.—Each report prepared pursuant to subsections [(a) and (b)] shall be included in the preview spending reduction report and final spending reduction report, as applicable, set forth in sections [703 and 704].

TITLE VI—EARMARK REFORM

SEC. 601. MORATORIUM ON CONSIDERATION OF EARMARKS.

(a) IN THE HOUSE.—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 used in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives) until the end of the first session of the 111th Congress.

(b) IN THE SENATE.—[To be supplied.]

SEC. 602. JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON EARMARK REFORM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION.—There is hereby 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 party by the Speaker of the House, and 4 from the minority party to be appointed by the minority leader.

(2) 8 Members of the Senate, 4 appointed from the majority party by the majority leader of the Senate, and 4 from the minority party to be appointed 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 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; and

(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 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 used 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 VII—PAY-AS-YOU-GO ENFORCEMENT FOR MANDATORY SPENDING

SEC. 701. PAY-AS-YOU-GO FOR MANDATORY SPENDING LEGISLATION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any direct spending legislation, excluding the impact of any revenue provisions, that would increase the budget deficit or cause a budget deficit for any of applicable time periods as set forth in paragraph (2).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIOD.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''applicable time period'' means—

(A) the current fiscal year;

(B) the budget year;

(C) the period of the 5 fiscal years following the current fiscal year; and

(D) the period of the 5 fiscal years following the 5 fiscal years referred to in subparagraph (C).

(3) DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term ''direct spending legislation'' means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall use the most recent baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(c) POINT OF ORDER PROTECTION IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a). As disposition of a point of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a). The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

TITLE VIII—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

SEC. 801. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—As used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limits'' mean—

(1) NONDEFENSE DISCRETIONARY CATEGORY.—

(A) Fiscal Year 2010:
(i) Budget authority: $479,559,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $538,888,000,000.
(B) Fiscal Year 2011:
(i) Budget authority: $480,712,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $552,231,000,000.
(C) Fiscal Year 2012:
(i) Budget authority: $482,150,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $546,975,000,000.
(D) Fiscal Year 2013:
(i) Budget authority: $483,679,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $547,914,000,000.
(E) Fiscal Year 2014:
(i) Budget authority: $485,264,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $547,703,000,000.
(F) Fiscal Year 2015:
(i) Budget authority: $487,437,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $548,092,000,000.
(G) Fiscal Year 2016:
(i) Budget authority: $488,275,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $549,089,000,000.
(H) Fiscal Year 2017:
(i) Budget authority: $489,369,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $551,612,000,000.
(I) Fiscal Year 2018:
(i) Budget authority: $490,787,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $553,312,000,000.
(J) Fiscal Year 2019:
(i) Budget authority: $491,468,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $555,520,000,000.

(2) DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY CATEGORY.—

(A) Fiscal Year 2010:
(i) Budget authority: $691,128,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $690,463,000,000.
(B) Fiscal Year 2011:
(i) Budget authority: $614,293,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $658,207,000,000.
(C) Fiscal Year 2012:
(i) Budget authority: $623,612,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $638,011,000,000.
(D) Fiscal Year 2013:
(i) Budget authority: $634,421,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $637,332,000,000.
(E) Fiscal Year 2014:
(i) Budget authority: $648,249,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $642,132,000,000.
(F) Fiscal Year 2015:
(i) Budget authority: $663,024,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $653,987,000,000.
(G) Fiscal Year 2016:
(i) Budget authority: $678,064,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $672,185,000,000.
(H) Fiscal Year 2017:
(i) Budget authority: $693,507,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $682,823,000,000.
(I) Fiscal Year 2018:
(i) Budget authority: $709,411,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $693,937,000,000.
(J) Fiscal Year 2019:
(i) Budget authority: $725,737,000,000.
(ii) Outlays: $714,265,000,000.

(b) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—If the chairman of the Committee on the Budget adjusts the allocations set forth pursuant to section 302(a), or other adjustments as applicable, of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, corresponding adjustments may be made to the discretionary caps set forth in subsection (a).

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House, unless it has been designated pursuant to section 410 of this resolution, to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that causes the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded, as determined by estimates provided by the chairman of the Budget Committee of the House.

(d) CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET.—It shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget if such resolution—

(1) does not include discretionary caps for the fiscal years covered by this resolution with separate defense and nondefense categories; or

(2) includes discretionary spending levels higher than those included in this section for the nondefense category set forth in this section.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding.

Madam Chair and my colleagues, I think all of us know that our economy is in big trouble. American families are struggling; small businesses are struggling; unemployment is increasing, and one of the hallmarks of being an American is that each generation was proud of the fact that they were leaving for the next generation a better country with more opportunities, better than what they'd had. A lot of Americans today don't believe that that will happen.

But we can go back to the greatest generation. The greatest generation during World War II was called the ''greatest generation'' because those men and women stood up and fought for America and did what they had to do so that their kids and grandkids could pursue the American dream. They made the tough choice to get involved, to go to war, to do what they had to do.

As we look at this budget that we have in front of us, there are no tough choices. The Democrat plan to increase spending, to increase taxes and to increase the debt makes no difficult choices. Why? Because, when you just keep spending money, you don't have to make decisions. You just keep spending money. The fact is, if you look at this budget, it spends too much; it taxes too much, and it puts too much debt on the backs of our kids and grandkids.

□ 1730

If you look at the chart next to me, you can see this red line, and this red line indicates the amount of spending that we see in the plan offered by our Democrat colleagues. The green line, as an example, is the spending represented in the Republican budget alternative that does, in fact, spend less.

But it is not just spending. When you look at the taxes in this bill, it will increase taxes several trillion dollars—that's with a ''T.'' Now, the majority wants to say, Well, no, that's not what the budget says. That's why I have described their budget as the Bernie Madoff budget because they tinkered and hid all of the really serious proposals that they all have in mind to do.

They have talked about their cap-and-trade, their national energy tax, but you can't see it in here. And so let us just call it what it is, the Bernie Madoff budget, because if you look at the other documents, they want to do cap-and-trade, which is a national energy tax, $1.5 trillion, they want to let all of the tax cuts that were passed early in this decade, they want to allow them all to expire and even have other ideas to bring back the death tax, the tax that is on top of taxes that were paid when you earn the money, capital gain taxes you paid along the way. And if you saved money and you did the responsible thing, when you die, we're going to come in and take half of it. Now, this is un-American.

So you have got too much spending, you've got way too many ideas about raising taxes. And then we get to the really tough part of this budget.

We get to the debt. You know, we actually do have to borrow money. The Chinese have been our biggest loaners here over the last decade. We've accumulated some $5.8 trillion worth of debt over the last 220 years and 43 Presidents. This budget doubles the debt in 5 years. It triples the national debt in 10 years. And one only has to look at this chart—the blue line is the debt that we've accumulated, the red line being the amount of debt that will be accumulated over the course of this budget and into the future. The green line represents a Republican alternative, which I think is a much, much safer bet and, frankly, reduces the debt that our kids and grandkids are going to have to pay.

So if you look at a budget, it's always called an outline, a roadmap. Well, I have a description of what this budget is. It's a roadmap to disaster. As I said earlier this year, we're going to be the party of better solutions. We clearly are not in agreement with the Democrat budget. PAUL RYAN, or my colleague from Wisconsin, and the members of the Budget Committee on our side of the aisle have put together a better solution that has less spending, that has less taxes and much less debt on the backs of our kids and grandkids.

As I said before, previous generations have made tough decisions, tough decisions to ensure that your kids and grandkids would have a brighter future. The budget presented by the majority doesn't make those tough decisions. There is no question that our budget does require us to make tough decisions.

We actually deal with the issue of entitlements, which is important for us to deal with because there is no way to balance the budget and begin to reduce the debt unless you begin to look at these entitlement programs where our generations made promises to ourselves that our kids and grandkids can't afford. We need to do it in a responsible way. We need to do it in a bipartisan way to preserve these, perhaps to help those people who depend upon them, but also to make them affordable for our kids and grandkids who get to pay the bill.

And so we do make tough decisions. And that's the real point of why the American people send us here. They send us here to make the decisions on behalf of our country, on behalf of their kids and grandkids. And we can't just run away from those decisions—which was represented by the Democrat budget—we have to make them. And when we don't make those decisions, those tough decisions, it's our kids and grandkids who are going to pay the price: higher taxes, bigger government, and most importantly, less opportunities for them.

You know, one thing that has been great about America is that we allow the American people to keep more of what they earn in our budget, small businesses to keep more of what they earn. They are the engines of economic growth. They are the engines of opportunity in America. Most of you have traveled around the world and you know, there is no country like ours. None anywhere in the world. Why? Because in America, you can grow up and be anything you want to be, you can do anything you want to do.

And the reason for that is we have a system that allows the American people to keep more of their money, to make decisions for themselves and their own family. We have opportunities, opportunities you don't see any place else in the world.

The budget presented by the majority will stamp out those opportunities because the economic growth that we will have as a result of this budget will slow dramatically, and when you slow economic growth, you slow job creation in America and you slow down the opportunities available to our kids and grandkids to grow up and be anything that they want to be.

I would suggest to my colleagues it's time to say ''no'' to the irresponsible spending plan, taxing plan, and borrowing plan presented by the majority and to support the Republican alternative, which requires us to make the tough decisions that the American people sent us here to make.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Chairman, our minority leader said that it's time for us to say ''no.'' Well, that's all they've been saying since we've been involved in this crisis and every issue that we brought to the floor, saying ''no.''

Our great Nation is involved in a fiscal sickness that's equivalent to being in intensive care, and anyone who knows serious illness knows that is not the time to negotiate with your doctors or the hospitals as to how you've got to pay the bill. The essential thing is that we regain our health and come out of this as America always has, as a stronger, more competitive country.

Our President is going abroad trying to get the rest of the world to get some type of fiscal order. But we aren't down here to have Republican budgets and Democrat budgets and to take shots at each other, because our constituents that are losing their jobs, losing their health care, that are out there suffering as a result of this crisis, they are not Republicans or Democrats. They are Americans.

No. I don't think it's time to say ''no.'' I think it's time to say, how can we work together to restore the health of this great Nation? How can we educate the Nation? Give it health care, help to clean the atmosphere, move forward as the world leaders that God blessed us to have the resources.

It's time to stop the fighting and come together and support our President, our economy and our country.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, this has been a long day, a long couple of days. We're talking about the fiscal future of America.

Here is the budget we propose. There is something that's important, that's worth saying. Obviously we don't like the majority's budget, the President's budget, and I believe it's incumbent upon us to offer an alternative. So that's what we're doing here today.

I want to walk you through our alternative.

A couple of things off the bat.

It has lower deficits, lower spending, lower taxes, lower debt, and a lot more jobs. Specifically on spending, our budget spends $4.8 trillion less than the majority's budget.

Deficits. Our budget has lower deficits than the Obama-Spratt budget throughout the entire period, and half of it at the end of the period.

Jobs. We asked some economists to take a look at, well, which approach creates the most jobs, and they told us just in the fifth year alone you'd have more than two million more jobs under the Republican alternative than you would under the Democratic proposal, the Obama proposal. Why? Because they raise taxes on small businesses. They raise taxes on pensions, on the assets that make up our savings. They raise taxes on energy. They raise debt borrowing, which will lead to higher interest rates.

But let me tell you something else. This is a long-run chart. My friends on the other side have sort of ridiculed bringing these long-run charts to the floor.

Let me read from a document published by the Brookings Institution and the Heritage Foundation. Signed by experts, economists, from the Concord Coalition, the Brookings Institution, the Heritage Foundation, the New America Foundation, the Progressive Policy Institute and the Urban Institutes. Not exactly your bastion of right-wing think tanks.

They say on page 6, among their top recommendations, ''Congress and the President should enact explicit long-term budgets for Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid that are sustainable, that set limits on automatic spending growth that require review every 5 years.'' More importantly, they say the long-run cost of these programs should be visible in the budget at all times and considered when decisions are made.

What are they saying? Let's think about the future when we're voting on these budgets. Let's think about what we're doing to the next generation.

The President himself said this is the most transformative budget we've seen in a generation. We haven't seen the kinds of change that this budget proposes, the likes of which we haven't seen since the New Deal.

So let's consider the ramifications of that. Let's think about what we're doing and the fiscal consequences of it.

And so here's what the picture tells you.

Spending. This budget puts us on a path of ever-higher spending to the point where my three children, who are 4, 5 and 7 years old, will see a government that is double the size of the one we have today, double the size of one we've ever had in this country.

The Republican budget gets us back on track to keep the size of our government where it has always been so we can maximize freedom.

What about debt?

This is the tidal wave of red ink that all of the experts are telling us about. The General Accountability Office, the Congressional Budget Office, left and right economists from all around. The point is we shouldn't be looking down the road 5 years, 10 years.

You know what? I have a mom. She is 75 years old. I have got my kids. I just told you how old they were. I'm in the X generation. What we do here affects all of those people. And so when we pass these bills, they have consequences for everybody in America. And when you see that this budget—which, by the way, is being generous to the Obama-Spratt mark—this budget underestimates the fiscal damage their budget will do. It is an island of red ink. It is a future of a banana republic of borrowing. And we say let's not do that.

And you know what? If you start now, these reforms are compassionate. The reforms we're seeing over the next 10 years are, instead of growing mandatory spending at 5.3 percent, let's grow it at 3.9 percent. It's more than double the rate of inflation right now. We're saying for discretionary spending we gave all of these government agencies giant increases in just the last couple of years. They are fat. Let's put them on a diet for a little while. Let's freeze spending, prioritize spending and then have modest increases after that so we can save our country, save our fiscal future.

That's what we're saying. Let's not get in this vicious spiral, as the Obama budget does, of chasing ever-higher spending with ever-higher taxes that never quite catch that spending and gives us ever-higher debt.

It's wrong. It's unconscionable. It's going to hurt our economy. It's going to bankrupt our country. It's going to give our children a lower standard of living.

At the end of the day, it comes down to this. I asked the Congressional Budget Office, well, what about the standard of living of future Americans? What will the standard of living look like on the current pathway we are on in America? Not the Obama budget but just the current pathway before you would pass this big government budget. And they said this: Inferior standards of living. That's the red line.

We are basically consigning the next generation quantifiably, irrefutably to a lower standard of living. That severs the tie between our generations. That breaks the bond in this country, the legacy, that says each generation takes on its responsibilities, fixes its problems so that the next generation is better off.

You know, my dad told me a number of things when I was a young guy, and he passed away when I was a kid. But I remember a couple of things he always told me. Number one, don't just be part of the problem, be part of the solution. So we're offering a solution. Number two, the great thing about this country is each generation makes it better off for the next, and you better do that when you're my age.

Our budget, according to the Congressional Budget Office, says that the standard of living of Americans in the future currently and consistently goes upwards. We are putting, in this budget, people on the path for prosperity so that we can leave the next generation better off.

□ 1745

And we are offering an economic plan for right now to get jobs back in this economy. We're offering an economic plan that shows we're going to create more jobs.

The answers all don't flow out of Washington. The answers come from individual Americans. That's the power of this country. That's the idea of this country. The nucleus of our country, of our society, of our economy, the genius of it are the American people themselves, not Washington bureaucrats,

not the idea that we have to take more money and more power away from the people and spend it on their behalf and exercise it on their behalf.

Unfortunately, that is the arrogant, paternalistic notion that is being brought to the floor here by the budget that the American people are being asked to swallow. I think it's wrong. I think it's dead wrong, and we're following the advice of all the fiscal experts from the left and from the right who are saying think about the consequences, think about the future, think about what your actions are doing.

That's what we are doing, and that is why I argue for our budget, a sensible budget, a commonsense budget, a budget that says to senior citizens, we can protect your benefits right now if we act to save them for the future. Here's the problem. These programs themselves grow themselves right into extinction. If we don't reform these programs, we can't protect those who are in and near retirement from those cuts. If you act now, we can protect people who are in and near retirement. If we don't act now, we can't.

That's what's wrong about the politics of demagoguery of taking on these challenges, and that is why we need to be grownups and adults and tackle these fiscal challenges before they tackle us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. This substitute budget is a shortsighted attempt to short-circuit essential investments in our economic recovery and long-term growth. It takes back resources for long overdue investments in education and health care and in energy.

A $29 billion cut to income security programs over 10 years, $25 billion of which comes from critical nutrition program increases. The kind of investments that conservative economists tell us have the most powerful stimulative impact, $1.73 in economic growth created for every dollar spent, if only it were allowed to reach families in need.

But it does not end there. This Republican substitute budget creates even more dramatic reductions in nutrition programs by requiring the Agriculture Committee to cut $38 billion over 10 years. This is cutting food programs for hungry kids. We know what the devastating effects of unemployment, the cutoff of benefits for health care, that people today are going to food pantries who never thought in their lives they would have to do that.

A gentleman who says I have to take care of my kids, I never thought I would go to a food pantry, I was humiliated, and I felt like a lowlife, but my kids need to eat. That's what this budget would cut, nutrition programs.

To be sure, the committee could reach a target here by reducing farm price supports, but the gentleman from Wisconsin has said that he will not open the farm bill. That means that the nutrition programs are the only place to do their cutting, leaving millions of families, seniors, women, and children to pay the price.

Our opponents have just trotted out the failed programs of the past, and they are dealing with $3.3 trillion in tax cuts over 10 years.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield the gentlelady 30 additional seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. They simply ignore urgent challenges that we face as a Nation. They pour $3.3 trillion into tax cuts over 10 years, most of it going to the wealthiest Americans.

This budget is the last thing our economy needs now or down the road: the kind of drastic cuts to essential services that will raise costs, which will destroy our ability to compete and to grow. It's a relic of 8 long years of a failed economic policy of the Bush administration. The American public rejected it. I urge my colleagues to think realistically about our national challenge and to oppose this substitute budget.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Chairman, if you ever wonder what a third Bush term would look like, this is it. This is a budget plan that maintains the tax breaks for the wealthiest people in America, pays for it by giving people 55 and under a voucher to go fend for themselves in the insurance market instead of Medicare, which I think would pay maybe 80 percent of what it costs.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Would the gentleman care to yield on that point?

Mr. ANDREWS. I only have 1 minute. If you give me some of your time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Would you yield for a correction?

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, I tell you what, when you get your time, I'll answer your question.

It would privatize Social Security. It would squeeze money out of the Social Security system.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. There's no privatization of Social Security in this bill. Can you show me where that is in this bill, please?

The CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. ANDREWS. May I continue?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has the time.

Mr. ANDREWS. It continues the enormously successful policy of deregulation that has brought us to the brink of financial disaster. It doesn't work. It doesn't work. For every one job this approach has created, our approach has created 108.

We shouldn't go back to a sequel for a movie that was so bad to begin with.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 10 seconds to say, show me where Social Security is privatized. Show me where there is deregulation. There's not even the word ''deregulation'' in this bill, and all we're saying on Medicare for younger people, so we can save the program, why don't we let them have a program like the one we have in Congress. We have a good health care program. I think it's worthy of theirs.

With that, Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the chairman of the House Republican Conference.

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

Mr. PENCE. The budget brought by the majority to the floor today spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much, and the American people know it.

The Democrat budget will double the national debt in 5 years, triple it in 10. 2010 spending: $3 trillion. More than $1 trillion in tax increases in a recession, and deficits of nearly $1 trillion a year for the next 10 years.

Truth is the Democrat majority has brought to this floor the most fiscally irresponsible budget in American history.

While every American family and every small business is answering these challenging times of sacrifice and frugality, the majority in this Congress continues to believe that we can borrow and spend and bail our way back to a growing economy. But not Republicans.

Thanks to the bold and innovative leadership of the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Congressman PAUL RYAN, Republicans have a better solution. In stark contrast to the Democratic budget, the Republican budget alternative puts America on a path to prosperity, spends nearly $5 trillion less than the Democrats' budget over 10 years, brings debt under control, borrowing nearly $4 trillion less than the Democrat budget over 10, and it does not raise taxes.

Creating 2.1 million more jobs than the Democrat budget, this Republican alternative puts its faith in individuals and businesses and private sector. Suspending capital gains taxes, reforming the tax code, reducing the corporate tax rate so we can keep American jobs here.

And even while we do so, we fund our national priorities, increasing defense, increasing veterans, providing for healthy retirement security, and touching not one cent of the Social Security program and trust fund.

I urge my Democrats to do the unexpected, as Daniel Webster says on the wall just before us, Let us do something in this generation. Let us perform something worthy to be remembered.

Embrace bipartisanship today. Embrace fiscal discipline, tax relief, and reform. I say to my Democratic colleagues with the deepest respect, say ''yes'' to the American people. Vote ''yes'' on the Republican budget alternative.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield myself 3 minutes.

The gentleman from Wisconsin and I are good friends. We work together collegially and cordially, and I don't lightly disagree with him, but I have to take profound exception here, because the budget he proposes before us would lay out draconian cuts in spending, $2.4 trillion. We're talking about real money over 10 years. These are made in the name of deficit reduction, and they cover the spectrum.

Eleven committees are reconciled with instructions to make enormous spending reduction: Energy and Commerce, $666 billion; Ways and Means, $695 billion; Financial Services, that's housing, $28 billion. All together $1.380 trillion in spending cuts is reconciled to 11 committees, and on top of that, it appears that Medicaid and CHIP would be block granted.

This is serious stuff. And I've only begun, because this just applies to mandatory spending. More is in store when you go to discretionary spending. There's $1 trillion of cost reductions there, achieved by imposing a freeze for five straight years on all discretionary programs except defense and veterans. That's education, that's infrastructure, that's science, NIH, NSF, public health, food safety. The list goes on, frozen for five straight years.

For all the havoc and hurt that's wreaked by this draconian plan, what do we gain? Very little on the bottom line. That's because the $2.4 trillion in spending cuts is more than offset by $3.6 trillion in tax cuts.

Under the guise of deficit reduction, more tax cuts are provided for the upper brackets. According to the Citizens for Tax Justice, 25 percent of all Americans would face a tax increase under this budget proposal. The wealthiest 1 percent would get $100,000 or more. Those are not my numbers but theirs.

This is not the way to go. This is not the way to go to a deficit reduction plan. This is not the way to go if we have any respect for the values that are embodied in this budget. This is something we should all vote down.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, may I inquire about the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will wait to let them get caught up.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Madam Chairman, Mr. RYAN said earlier that this vote is ''all about freedom,'' and I agree.

Almost 70 years ago, President Franklin Roosevelt stood in this chamber to report on the State of the Union. He called for a world founded on four essential freedoms: freedom of expression; freedom of religion; freedom of fear; and freedom from want. He explained that freedom from want means securing a healthy, peacetime life for all of our people.

In that same address, President Roosevelt called for ending the special privileges for the few, a wider and constantly rising standard of living, and widening the opportunities for adequate medical care.

By those measures, tens of millions of Americans are less free now than their parents were, and they worry that their children will be less free still.

This Republican budget drastically reduces, even more than they have been reduced in recent years, the taxes on the richest Americans, including those whose heedless greed created the economic crisis that we now face. That, our colleagues in the minority proclaim, is what freedom means.

Their budget again cheats education, health care, energy. The majority budget invests in education, health care, in energy, investments that are long overdue. The majority budget creates opportunities and provides a liberating hope for middle-class families that they can climb out of desperate debt and enjoy a widening prosperity.

Vote for freedom from want. Vote for the majority budget. Vote against this Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I thank very much the gentleman from South Carolina.

Let me just be very, very brief. I want to take a moment to point out the fallacies in the Republicans' plan.

First of all, the Republicans' plan is based on the weakest effort to try to deal with an economy that is receding. It is of little value to base your plan on tax cuts at a time when the economy is in recession, at a time when the economy is, in many cases, in a depression.

□ 1800

We are losing, on average, 620,000 jobs every month, Madam Chair. That's 21,000 every day. How in the world are we going to make an economic policy based upon tax cuts, which are based upon income, when the income levels of our country is going down?

There's a reason why this country supports what the Democrats are doing under this Democrat President by over 60 percent. And that is because we understand what this economy needs now is growth—and the best way to get this economy to grow is to invest in the American people. And when you invest in the American people, the best way to do that is in education—to get our people educated and strong, to be able to get them retrained to get the kind of jobs that we will need in a new, restructured economy.

In terms of health care—not only to provide it in terms of lowering the cost, but to create jobs in the health care area. Nowhere is that need any greater in terms of jobs than in energy dependence.

That's why the American people are supporting the Democratic initiatives on this, and I urge a positive vote for this budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, how much time remains on this side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield myself 4 minutes.

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

Mr. SPRATT. As we near the end of this long debate, I want to speak to those who are still weighing their vote and to any who are still wavering. To them—in fact, everybody—let me say that with respect to our resolution, if you want to vote for bold initiatives, like health care for the millions who don't have insurance, our resolution lays out the framework for helping that to happen, and for funding it so that the net cost is not added to the deficit.

If you want to say to the next child you meet in a classroom, ''You can go to college. Yes, you can go to college. Yes, you can. You can go because Pell Grants will help pay the way if you do your studies and work hard.'' If you want to look that child in the eye and say just that, our resolution is the resolution you should vote for.

If you want to vote for tax reduction, this resolution supports $1.7 trillion in net tax reduction over 10 years, including all the middle-income tax cuts that we passed in 2001 and 2003. And that's not my contention; that's CBO's conclusion after reviewing this budget.

If you want to vote for deficit reduction, our resolution reduces this year's deficit of $1.8 trillion—an unwelcome inheritance from the last administration—our resolution reduces that deficit by two-thirds, down to $586 billion by the year 2013, when it would be 3.5 percent of GDP—roughly the growth rate that year.

If you want to be sure in voting for the deficit reduction that the deficit will actually be reduced, our party is the party that balanced this budget in 1998; our party is the party that paid off $400 billion in Treasury debt; and our party is the party that left President Bush a surplus of $236 billion the year before he came—$5.6 trillion over the next 10 years of his administration.

We wiped out the deficit. They wiped out the surplus. Not only did they wipe out the surplus, they ran up more than $5 trillion in debt and left us a tab of $1.752 trillion in deficit, which we're struggling with right now in the well of this House, and will be for years to come. So when it comes to deficit reduction, we rest our case on the record.

If you want to show where cost savings have been achieved because of the budget you vote for, this resolution saves significant sums by converting

guaranteed student loans to direct DOE loans; we save billions more by funding agencies like the IRS, HHS, Labor, and SSA, to wipe out waste, fraud, and abuse; and we save $176 billion over 10 years by competing Medicare Advantage plans. If you want reasons why you should vote, we've got them.

Finally, if you're still swayed by the other side's rhetoric, let me offer in evidence exhibit A on this poster right beside me. This chart is a simple side-by-side that shows what Democrats accomplished in the 1980s compared to what Republicans have accomplished since 2001.

Average monthly job growth. This is really dramatic. The Clinton administration, Democrats in the 1990s, 217,000 jobs every month in job creation. Republicans, 2,000, as opposed to 271,000. This is a matter of record.

Net job creation, 22.7 million jobs. That's the net accomplishment of the Clinton administration. The Bush administration's net accomplishment, 1.9 million. Percentage of Americans living in poverty during the Clinton administration, 3.8 percent reduction. During the Bush administration, eight-tenths of a percentage point increase.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

Americans without health care or health coverage dropped from 15.3 percent to 13.7 percent in the Clinton years, then went back up to 15.3 in the Bush years.

These facts speak louder than anything I can say. The difference between us is profound. If you want to know whom you can believe, trust, and put your faith in with respect to economic planning, just remember what we did in the 1990s, and what we can do in the period we have now with the President we have and the program we're trying to devise.

Vote for the base resolution—the House Democratic resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, at this time I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

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

Mr. SHADEGG. What we just heard was something rather amazing—it is that you can get something for nothing. But as Americans know, that simply isn't true. Indeed, what you get for spending is debt or higher taxes. And there are some facts in this debate.

We spent a lot of time discussing today whether or not the cap-and-trade program is a tax. The majority side said, ''Oh, no, no, it's not a tax.'' But in the Obama budget it produces $647 billion for the government. That's an additional weight on every single American—not just taxpayers—but every single American. That's higher energy costs, that's higher costs for everything we buy.

Now let's talk about some of the facts.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHADEGG. I will yield like you yielded earlier.

The largest tax increase in our history—$1.4 trillion over 10 years. It contains the largest deficit—$1.8 trillion in 2009. Four times larger than the previous record of $407 billion, the largest deficit as a percentage of the Gross Domestic Product since World War II, and the largest national debt.

I would suggest to you there are facts in this debate. Those facts include that the Republican budget which was put together by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) spends $4.8 trillion less than the Democrat budget, and it borrows $3.6 trillion less than the Obama budget.

So what does that mean? What it means is that if we pass the Democrat budget, we are rapidly going on the path of becoming—not the greatest generation, which is what our parents and grandparents created, and gave us the defeat of fascism, the advancement of freedom, and putting America on a course to a level of prosperity we have never before seen.

What we are going to give our children, what we are going to give our grandchildren, is the most reckless generation—a generation that is driving itself deeper and deeper and deeper into debt.

It stuns me that the other side was so concerned when my Republican colleagues were overspending, but not concerned today. Well, this budget that the Democrats have proposed will double the national debt in 5 years, triple it in 10. The facts are there.

We cannot do this to the greatest generation or to the next generation. Let's not become the reckless generation.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican substitute, and thank the gentleman for yielding.

Among its many shortcomings, this proposal slashes funding for the international affairs budget 20 percent below the President's request, and 10 percent below this year's spending level. This may be a politically appealing thing to do, but it is as short-sighted and irresponsible and harmful as any other aspect of this proposal—harmful to our national security, harmful to our national interests.

For far too long we have failed to invest adequate resources in our civilian foreign affairs agencies. The State Department has been so starved for funds that a full 11 percent of its overseas diplomatic posts remain unfilled. The U.S. Agency for International Development now relies on only five engineers to oversee hundreds of infrastructure projects around the world.

This glaring void in our civilian capacity is increasingly being filled by the military. Our brave men and women in uniform follow orders and do the best they can, but they are trained to be warfighters, not development and reconstruction professionals.

That's why Defense Secretary Gates called, according to the newspapers, Senate Budget Committee Chairman CONRAD last week to plead for more money—not for the Pentagon, but for the international affairs budget.

The draconian cuts proposed in this substitute could have a direct impact on the success of our efforts to stabilize Afghanistan. President Obama has correctly recognized that the fight against al Qaeda and the Taliban cannot be won by military means alone.

In addition to 21,000 additional troops, he's proposed sending hundreds of agriculture and development specialists to help that war-torn country get back on its feet. This budget would make that possible because there's no way they could absorb the additional cuts and still do that mission.

I would suggest that the President's number, and not the Republican proposal and not the Ryan substitute, is the fiscally conservative position in this debate.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this substitute.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, the gentleman is correct. We don't have the President's request to increase the State Department's budget by 51 percent. We are guilty as charged.

With that I would like to yield 2 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. First of all, Madam Chair, the American people are looking at us today to see if there is actually going to be a real connection between what this place is about and what people are going through every single day in the communities across this country.

Job number one for us is to get the economy back on track. And the way we do that is to promote job creation. There is, without a doubt, an attack on the job creators on the part of the budget being brought forward by the majority.

How in the world do we expect small businesses to create jobs if we're taxing small businesses? In fact, 50 percent of those individuals who receive a tax hike on the majority's budget are small businesses. And if you've got more employees, you've got higher taxes. That doesn't make sense.

Some of the other accusations are, How do you think you can bring the economy back by lowering taxes? Well, you know, how are we going to bring the economy back by just cranking up government spending? At best, what we do in government spending is redistribute wealth.

We need to get back to creating wealth, creating prosperity.

Madam Chair, there are two divergent views in this House today, there is no question about it. One, the majority's budget is about preserving the status quo, it is about investing in Washington. The other, in Mr. RYAN's budget, our alternative, is about promoting opportunity. It is about promoting what is best for small businesses and working families in this country.

America has always been more about opportunity. Yes, we want to promote security—financial security. But the way we do that is to promote opportunity.

I hear so many of the old, tired scare tactics coming from the majority: The Republicans—all they will do is ruin Social Security.

We have provisions in our document which say we hold Social Security harmless. The seniors are protected.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

□ 1815

Mr. CANTOR. I hear from the other side that somehow we are cutting real money out of the budget. Well, you are darn right we are cutting real money out of the budget. What do you think the working families of this country are having to do every single day? They are having to tighten their belts. They are having to see about how they are actually going to make it through the month and pay the mortgage and pay the bills.

So, yes, our budget alternative reduces the borrowing that goes on, that borrows the money that we don't have. It reduces it by 21 percent. It lessens the spending by almost $5 trillion.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is high time that we become responsible stewards of taxpayer dollars. As the gentleman from Wisconsin said, we owe it to the people that we represent. We owe it to the working families, to the small business people, to the single working moms out there who are worried about their jobs and the fact that investors are on the sidelines. We owe it to them to try and reinstill the confidence. We have got to set the example. The way we set the example is to be responsible. We have got to lay a path for the future and show that we are good fiscal stewards of the taxpayer dollars.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

My friends on the other side of the aisle—and I attempted to claim the attention of my friend from Arizona when not once but twice today he talked about somehow a $600 billion tax on the American people. I was trying to get his attention to refer to the reserve funds on page 53 for him to look at to find where that number is. Where is that number in the budget proposal before us?

Mr. SHADEGG. On page 30. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The reserve fund has no number. It is on page 53.

Mr. SHADEGG. First of all——

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I only have a few seconds.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The point is, the people ought to look at the budget, at the reserve fund.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. And find that it is deficit-neutral, and that the opportunity is here for us to address the climate change. I strongly urge that people refer to it.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We have no more speakers. So if the chairman would finish his round of speakers, then that would be great with us. I understand the gentleman reserves the right to close, and I would just like to know when his last speaker is up.

Mr. SPRATT. We have the right to close, I believe. We have one more speaker, and we will close with that speaker.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The next speaker was quoted a couple years ago as saying about our Republican budget when we had a deficit of $248 billion, ''This constitutes nothing less than fiscal child abuse, because they will morally force our children and grandchildren to pay our bills.''

I couldn't have said it better myself, Madam Chair. That is exactly what is happening. But the budget deficit is not $248 billion, it is $1.8 trillion. We don't even get close to $248 billion under these budgets.

Yes, we have a tough fiscal situation. We have inherited it. I guess you could say so. The question is, what are we doing about it? Are we make it better, or are we making it worse?

The President's budget, which is here on the floor, makes it so much worse. It doubles the debt in 5½ years and triples it in 10. Massive tax increases in the middle of a recession, on everyone, and chases ever-higher spending with ever-higher taxes forever.

We have different ideas. We have differences. Nowhere else is it more clear about the differences between our two parties than it is today.

The gentleman has spent the last 20 minutes criticizing us for cutting spending. Guilty as charged. Yes, we need to cut spending. Wow. I said it. Holy cow. In Washington. A novel idea.

You know what? We spend too much money in this government. We have got to prioritize spending.

The American people, guess what, this is their money. We don't just make it up. Well, actually, they are printing a lot of it down at the Federal Reserve now, more than they should. This comes from the American people. It is their money. If you keep taking it away from them, do you know what happens at the end of the day, Madam Chair? They don't have as much freedom. They don't have the ability to put groceries on the table. They don't have the ability to pay their mortgage, which might be underwater.

The engine of the economy of this country is not its government, it is its people, and we believe that we need to get serious about our fiscal situation. Don't raise taxes in a recession. Don't borrow and spend your way to prosperity. It never worked in any other country. Why would it work here?

Let's get our fiscal house in order. Let's get our deficit down. Let's get our borrowing down. Let's get our taxes down. Let's get more jobs and more freedom in this economy. That is exactly what our budget does. It is responsible, it is serious, and it gives me the ability to go home on the airplane tomorrow and look my three kids in the eyes when I hug them and kiss them and tell them, ''I just made right by you because I just went to work to make your future better.'' I am going to go home with a clear conscience. I hope you can say the same.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of our time to our distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Chair, and I thank the chairman for yielding, and I rise with great respect for the quality of character and the quality of intellect that he brings to his job, one of the most important jobs we have in this Congress.

I also rise with great respect for the ranking member, Mr. RYAN. I like Mr. RYAN. I think Mr. RYAN is a very bright, able, conscientious, honest Representative.

By the way, as an aside I will tell the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) who called our attention to page 30, page 30 is a blank page.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. He was talking about the text of the resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. RYAN gave my quote. I believed that then and I believe it now. I believe we've pursued for too long policies of fiscal irresponsibility, a concept that we need not pay for what we bought. I believe it was called supply side economics, which to me meant that if you do less, you get more. Nothing I have done in my life instructs me that if I do less, I get more.

But because the gentleman used a quote of mine, I thought it might be nice to use a quote of his. May 4, 2003, the Journal Sentinel:

''Is the deficit a concern?'' This is a quote. ''Absolutely. But Congress should not constrain economic growth and keep people out of work to pay down the deficit. Coping with the deficit requires getting the economy growing at a more robust rate and getting people back to work. More people with jobs means more tax revenue being generated. This will help us pay down the deficit more quickly and address the financial challenges facing

Social Security and Medicare as the baby boom generation retires.'' My, my, my.

Mr. RYAN, you don't seem to feel that way now. The fact of the matter is the Obama administration handed us an inheritance.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will my friend yield for a moment on that?

Mr. HOYER. Certainly.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The deficit went down after that comment, down to $162 billion, which was the last year when we had control. $162 billion. So it actually went down because jobs went up.

Mr. HOYER. You mean the deficit was lower.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. No. The deficit was higher in 2003 and it went down in 2006 to $162 billion because of higher economic growth. And that is what we were trying to advocate for, getting the deficit down, keeping taxes low, getting people into work.

And you know what—we should have done a better job on spending, and on that you are right.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I am glad the gentleman went there.

The gentleman knows that under President Clinton we had a $5.6 trillion surplus projected. Not by Clinton, but by George Bush. When he took office in March of 2001, he said, ''I have inherited a $5.6 trillion surplus.'' And, indeed, in the year before the Bush administration came to office, I tell my friend from Wisconsin, we created in that last year 1.9 million new jobs.

Mr. SPRATT spoke of the average 217,000 jobs per month. You need about 100,000 new jobs per month to stay even. Two hundred thirty thousand jobs per month were created, on average. Some months were a lot higher.

Two million new jobs in the last year of the Clinton administration. And what happened in the last year of the Bush administration? After 8 years of the economic policies that you pursued and for 6 years had total hegemony, total control, what happened? You heard the figures of unemployment, but you doubled the deficit from $5 trillion to $10 trillion—the debt, not the deficit. That was the result of your economic policy.

I heard the former chairman of the RSC—I was constrained to come to the floor, but my staff tied me down—who said, ladies and gentlemen, that we have been in office for 50 days and look what has happened to the country. Nobody in America thought that was a credible statement. Nobody.

The policies of the last 8 years have led to the worst economy that we have seen in this country in over a half a century. Some of us stood on this floor and said that is what would happen. We did it because we were fiscally irresponsible and because we were regulatorily negligent. We took the referees off the field. We pretended that the private sector would referee itself, that they would manage risk responsibly. They did not.

And the gentleman from Texas to whom I am referring said we didn't care about his children. That is not right. If he loses his job, we provided as our first bill that his children will have the availability of health care. But we want to provide his children, my children, my grandchildren, and, yes, my great granddaughter, with a fiscally sound Nation. It is not there now, and it will not be next year, and it won't be the year after, because the hole we have dug is so extraordinarily deep that it will take years and years of discipline to get us back to where we were on January 19, 2001. I think everybody in this House wants to do that, but we have different views of how you do that.

I have served in this House, as the gentleman has heard me say before, now 29 years. Eight of those years have been under a Democratic President, Bill Clinton; 20 of those years under Republicans. Every single year of a Republican Presidency since 1981 has run deep deficits, every one, without failure.

Now what is the significance of that, you might say? It is that a President alone can stop spending. The only one that can stop spending. I can vote against spending, my friend Mr. RYAN can vote against spending, but we need 217 other people to do the same. Only the President of the United States by vetoing spending can say ''no.'' President Bush signed bills and presided over an economy that resulted in the doubling of the national debt.

And so, my friends, we come to a responsible budget, but not the budget any of us would like. Why? Because, as they lament on the Republican side of the aisle, the deficits are too high. They are right. I agree with that. I don't like these deficits. I prefer to vote for balanced budgets. I voted for a balanced budget amendment. And, very frankly, had we had a balanced budget amendment, we would be in much better shape today, because you couldn't have enacted your tax cuts because you would have had to have paid for them.

□ 1830

Because you would have had to pay for them, and while you were very prepared to give the wealthiest in America big tax cuts, you were not prepared to pay for them, perhaps because of the logic that you expressed in that article of 2003.

My friends, we have an important decision to make. That decision is whether or not our investments in the future will continue by the adoption of this budget. We adopted, under the Bush administration, the Troubled Assets Relief Program. There was disagreement on that, not between Mr. RYAN and myself. We believed that was necessary. We didn't like it, too much money, too much debt and too much borrowing. But we thought it essential to bring this economy back and to stabilize it and to try to keep jobs. It hasn't yet succeeded. And we have lost far too many jobs. Too much pain in America, too many people without a job, too many families who aren't sure where their next meal is coming from or how they are going to pay their mortgage payment or how they are going to send their kids to school. There are too many Americans in pain.

Now we can, in my view, deeply cut those items which are there to help people in pain and trouble, as I believe your budget does. Or we can do what Mr. SPRATT has recommended, bring the deficit down, not to where we would like it, but bring it down substantially, about 3.5 percent of the gross domestic product by 2015 as opposed to 10.5 now. Is that too high? It is. Would I like it lower? I would.

But I tell my friends that this is a responsible budget, not just for today but for the long term, because although we had a Recovery and Reinvestment Act, that was to staunch the decline, the fiscal crisis and the economic crisis and the job crisis and the health care crisis that we inherited from the Bush administration.

That is why I'm going to vote for this budget. That is why I urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote for this budget, because it invests in the health care of our people. It invests in the energy independence, and therefore the national security of our people. And yes, it provides for the national security. There are two wars that are going on. This budget provides that we will respond to them and keep our people safe. But it also responds to the need to keep people safe right here at home. That is why I will vote for this budget. That is why I urge each and every one of you to support this budget, not because it does what we would like it to do, as so many of my Republican colleagues have urged us, but those same colleagues indicated to me that their budgets would balance the budget and would cut spending.

Because there has been so much talk of spending on your side of the aisle, Mr. RYAN, I remind you that under the Clinton administration, discretionary spending rose at a rate of 3.5 percent. However, with you totally in control, it rose 7 percent. You doubled spending. So it rings hollow to say that it is spending we ought to cut. You cut taxes, and you increased spending.

This is a tough budget. It is tougher than a lot of people would like. It is tougher than Mr. BERMAN would like. Because he knows there are children all over this world that we are helping stay healthy, kept alive by feeding. And allies kept on our side when we confront terrorists. This is a tough budget. The Budget Committee made tough decisions, but they were right decisions, right for our country and right for our people.

Support the Spratt budget. Make America better.

Madam Chair, today, with the passage of this budget resolution, the House has the opportunity to set America's priorities for years to come and build a sustainable, widely shared recovery.

Along with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, this budget is a key part of our return to prosperity; it provides the long-term investments that will make prosperity last.

Today we have a chance to begin bringing down the cost of healthcare; breaking our addiction to foreign oil; creating the best-prepared workforce in the world; and returning America to fiscal health.

On healthcare, it is clear that rising costs are straining American families and crippling American businesses.

Family premiums have more than doubled since 2000, and over the past five years, our total healthcare spending has increased at more than twice the rate of inflation, consuming more of our economy and our budget each year.

This budget is the start of efforts to reverse that disastrous trend. It makes a significant down-payment on reform, taking steps to lower healthcare costs, improve quality, and expand access.

Healthcare reform is also key to entitlement reform, because we will never be able to control the growth in Medicare and Medicaid spending as long as healthcare costs continue to increase at more than twice the rate of inflation.

On energy, this budget increases support for energy independence programs by 18 percent. That includes incentives for the development of new technology and clean energy jobs; support for cutting-edge research; funding to start on an energy-efficient, money-saving national smart grid; and programs to help Government from the Federal to the local level save energy and money.

On education, this budget builds upon the investments made in President Obama's recovery plan with additional support for early childhood education, elementary and secondary school students, and efforts to help more Americans obtain a college degree.

It expands access to early childhood programs, makes college more affordable with increased Pell grants, and promotes job-training and significant education reform.

A lasting recovery isn't simply about ending the turmoil in our financial markets—it's about having workers who are prepared to compete in the 21st-century economy with anyone in the world.

Finally, this budget reverses the irresponsible Republican policies that turned record surpluses into record deficits and puts us back on a fiscally sustainable path.

That begins with an honest accounting of where we are—an assessment that takes into account the cost of two wars.

From that honest foundation, the budget cuts the deficit from 10.5 percent of GDP in 2009 to 3.5 percent of GDP in 2013. In other words, we cut the deficit by nearly two-thirds.

We do so by restraining spending, investing in oversight that saves taxpayer money, and, most importantly, reinstating the pay-as-you-go rule in law and requiring that new initiatives be paid for.

Our Government must pay for what it buys.

Republicans, by contrast, would abandon that discipline in favor of a $3.6 trillion tax cut, which the non-partisan tax policy center calls "by far, the largest tax cut in history"—one that goes almost exclusively to the richest Americans.

Paying for tax breaks like those, as Mr. RYAN proposes to do, would require deep cuts to vital services. So taking the massive tax breaks to their logical conclusion, Republicans support cutting Medicare, Medicaid, and a host of other essential programs that are critical to our economic recovery.

As the Washington Post notes today, the Ryan substitute would "freeze most Government spending for five years, halt spending approved in the economic stimulus package, and slash federal health programs for the poor and elderly."

When Republicans claim their budget will create jobs, they conveniently ignore the impact that the deep spending cuts in their plan would have on jobs.

Virtually all economists, including conservatives such as Milton Friedman, agree that Government spending during a recession creates jobs.

In fact, when we use the model of the conservative Heritage Foundation and take into account both tax cuts and spending cuts, we find that the Republican plan destroys jobs.

Of course, Republicans have another option to finance their tax breaks—increasing our deficit and piling up our debt even higher. That would be in keeping with the fiscal ideology that has dominated among Republicans as long as I have served in this House, the dogma summed up by Vice President Cheney: "Reagan proved deficits don't matter."

Our country has come to see the foolishness of that belief—and I think it has also come to see that only one party has a track record of responsibly reducing deficits. Chairman SPRATT put it well: "Republicans turn surpluses into deficits. Democrats turn deficits into surpluses."

The Republican case on substance is truly weak—and their argument on process is weaker.

Republicans have repeatedly decried this budget's use of the reconciliation process to provide for a majority, up-or-down vote on health care and education if Congress has not reached agreement on these issues so critical to our economic recovery.

But the truth is that both parties have used reconciliation to implement the policies assumed in budget resolutions.

Under President Bush, it was the Republican option of first resort to pass irresponsible tax cuts; under this budget, it is simply a fallback if partisanship blocks progress.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this budget—one of the most important votes they will take in this Congress.

This is our chance to build the foundation for recovery and plan wisely for the long term. We cannot miss it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, may I just ask unanimous consent for the purpose of thanking some staff?

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from South Carolina each will control 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, we, on both sides of the aisle, have very hardworking budget staffers. And I just wanted to take a moment to thank them for all of their late nights and all of their hard work, starting with Austin Smythe staff director, Chauncey Goss, Tim Flynn, John Gray, Jim Herz, Matt Hoffmann, Charlotte Ivancic, Patrick L. Knudsen, Angela Kuck, Ted McCann, Stephen McMillin, Courtney Reinhard, Paul Restuccia, Jonathon Romito, Stephen Sepp, Conor Sweeney, Sarah Ulrich and Dana Wade; as well as our interns, who gave us the greatest free labor we ever get around here. And I want them to know that they should double whatever we are paying them. Jacquie Adams, Krysta Carlson, Michael Koutnik, Nicole Marquart, David Rabe, Kyle Roskam and Abigail Weinshel. Thank you, staff, for your hard work.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, this has been a compressed period for producing a budget. An enormous amount of work has gone into the effort that is manifest on the floor here for the last couple of days. It never would have come to this fruition without their superior assistance. I want to recognize Tom Kahn, our staff director, my longstanding legislative aid and staff director, Sarah Abernathy, Ellen Balis, Arthur Burris, Linda Bywaters, Adam Carasso, Marsha Douglas, Stephen Elmore, Chuck Fant, Jason Freihage, Christen Green, Jose Guillen, Jennifer Hanson-Kilbride, Sheila McDowell, Dick Magee, Diana Meredith, Gail Millar, Morna Miller, Kimberly Overbeek, Scott Russell, Marcus Stephens, Naomi Stern, Lisa Venus, Greg Waring and Andrea Weathers; as well as Adam Brunelle and Andrew Fieldhouse.

I also want to recognize the indispensable work done for both of us by Bob Weinhagen of the Office of Legislative Counsel and the staff of the Congressional Budget Office.

This is a testament to what staff means to us and the kind of work they pull together in a short period of time. They make us look good. We couldn't do without them. They deserve our praises.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, this week the Majority Party, through this budget, has declared that they stand for bigger government, more taxes, and higher debt.

How does the Democratic budget spend on such high levels over the next ten years? Two words: tax increases. The budget includes a complicated cap-and-trade energy tax that will cost the average American household up to $3,128 annually, a new tax on charitable giving that will cost American charities as much as $16 billion per year, increased taxes on businesses and families that make over $250,000 per year, and the resurrection of the death tax which will punish family-owned businesses and farms.

The theme seems to be that the government knows best and the people should fall in line.

Fortunately, there are some of us on Capitol Hill who will not fall in line. Republicans have offered an alternative that reflects commonsense economics: when in debt, stop spending.

The Republican alternative places a priority on national defense and veterans' health and temporarily freezes other discretionary spending for five years. It would halve the President's deficit projection for 2019.

It would make the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts permanent, cap the capital gains and dividends tax at 15 percent and give families and individuals options for a simplified tax code. To foster entrepreneurship and small businesses, it would cut the corporate tax rate—the second highest in the world—from 35 percent to 25 percent.

Unlike my friends on the other side of the aisle, I do not think the way forward is through increased government interference, funded by our wallets and our children's piggybanks. I urge members to reject the proposed Democrat budget and vote for the Ryan Budget.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Chair, it seems that every day brings news of another large government program, intervention, mandate, or tax.

Sometimes the expansion is subtle. Sometimes it's more direct.

Just months into this Congress, this Majority has pushed an additional $350 billion in TARP funds out the door without additional oversight, passed a $410 billion spending bill full of wasteful pet projects, and handed our children and grandchildren the tab for the largest single spending bill our nation has ever seen in the form of a $1.2 trillion so-called stimulus bill.

Today, their budget calls for taxpayers to commit another $3.6 trillion more of their hard-earned money without transparency or adequate oversight. This budget spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. It expands government control on a scale that we have never seen before, not even during the New Deal.

If you had told me a month ago that Congress wanted to increase the tax burden on charitable contributions, I would have said it's an April Fool's joke. But the fact is that if donations to charities go down, the government will say it has to step in. But there will be a big difference. It will be the government choosing what it wants to support and how. It can support groups like ACORN instead of my local church or local charity. Instead of allowing people to support their own causes and make their own choices about their charitable contributions, the government will expand into what will obviously and clearly be a restriction on private charities as their funds are restricted. Unfortunately, it wasn't an April Fool's Day joke and that is what is being proposed this very week, restricting private contributions.

The higher taxes on energy will cost the average American household more than $3000. As a heavy user of coal, Alabama will be especially hard hit by the cap and trade tax. Electricity costs per capita in Alabama could go up by more than $1500, among the highest in any state. Our families and manufacturers can't afford that, especially in this economy.

But I wanted to know what my constituents thought about this budget and in just a few' days I received more than 600 responses. Here are quotes from their letters.

From Barbara in Clanton: "As a small business, we cannot afford to pay any more taxes right now. I don't think our employees can cope with higher fuel prices. I am very concerned about the exploding federal budget deficit."

From Danielle in Pelham: "My goal is to become a small business owner and I'm concerned that any higher taxes on small business will squash my chances of making this goal a reality."

From Randy in Pell City: "I don't want any more energy increases. Our electric, propane, and gas bills have gone up far more than my husband's wages."

We are witnessing a relentless expansion of the federal government, and I, for one, am worried. So are the American people. That's why Republicans offered solutions in our budget aimed at creating jobs and economic growth, not more government and not more unaffordable debt.

The American people understand that this generational theft must end. The Republican budget reflects their priorities, and moves the country in the right direction towards economic recovery.

Mr. FORBES. Madam Chair, today I will vote in favor of the Ryan amendment to H. Con. Res 85. I support this amendment because it recognizes the importance of maintaining a strong national defense and taking care of our veterans. I do not support everything in this budget alternative. However, given the choice between this amendment, which provides more robust funding for our Nation's defense, or the budget priorities of the underlying legislation, I will vote for the Ryan amendment so that the House will have the opportunity for an extended and vigorous debate on the importance of defense spending in our national priorities. At the same time, I have strong reservations about the proposals to reform Medicare as described in the Ryan amendment. Before embarking on any change to Medicare to ensure that this program exists for my children's generation and my grandchildren's generation, I expect the House to engage in a thorough, earnest debate that we have not yet had.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 293, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

AYES—137

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Ehlers
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)

NOES—293

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
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
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff

Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Costa
Franks (AZ)
Hinojosa
Miller, Gary
Norton
Sablan
Westmoreland

□ 1859

Ms. McCOLLUM, Messrs. DELAHUNT, HOLT, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. HOEKSTRA, FORBES and BACHUS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 191, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Chair 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. 85) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 and 2011 through 2014, pursuant to House Resolution 316, she 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.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 196, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—233

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
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
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (MA)
Massa
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
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
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
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)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—196

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Perriello
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—3

Hinojosa
Miller, Gary
Westmoreland

The SPEAKER (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1916

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HONORING ROBERT FAY ROCKWELL, JR.

(Mr. MASSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MASSA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Robert Fay Rockwell, Jr., a close friend of myself and of our community in New York.

Bob Rockwell was born on November 8 of 1911 in Bradford, Pennsylvania. He attended Whittier College in a far-off land in California where he became friends with a fellow student, Richard Nixon. He moved to Corning, New York, in 1933, to run the local department store, the Rockwell Company, owned by his grandfather.

Soon after, he, like so many of the Greatest Generation, departed to serve overseas in World War II and joined the 70th Construction Battalion of the great Seabees in World War II. He was stationed in North Africa and later in California.

Upon his return to Corning, he became close friends with Frederick Carder, founder of the world famous Steuben Glass Works. He amassed the world's largest collection of Frederick Carder's Steuben glass, priceless in its volume.

His liking of aesthetics in art was not limited to only glass. Bob became the largest collector of Western art, including Remingtons and Russells, and in the early 1960s, opened a display of

that collection in his department store. He later donated most of these collections to what was then called—and now is world famous—the Rockwell Museum. This museum got its first home in 1976 in an old hotel in downtown Corning.

During that time, he became president of both Corning Chamber of Commerce and Corning Rotary Club and forever left his mark on both organizations. In 1983, the Rockwell Museum of Western Art opened in Corning's refurbished old City Hall building. It's become a popular local and national icon.

The multimillion dollar value of Bob's donated art and glass is a testament to his generosity, but is only one of such testaments. His legacy is further enhanced by his compassion and help to his fellow man.

And let me close by saying, from the heart to Bob and to his family and from all of us in Corning, New York, and in western New York State, Bob, we are always in your debt for your tremendous contributions to our community.

IMAGINE IF A REPUBLICAN WERE PRESIDENT

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, in a recent Investors Business Daily op-ed, radio host Larry Elder wondered how the media's reporting would be different if a Republican were President.

Of a potential Republican President, Elder wrote, ''Imagine if his Secretary of Treasury had not paid taxes, he granted two dozen waivers to his no-lobbyists-in-government rule and he had promised bipartisanship but only got three across-the-aisle votes for his 'stimulus' package. Or if he tripled the projected annual deficit and intended, within a short period, to double the national debt.''

Elder's point is clear. The national media's double standard has meant a free pass for President Obama and the Democrats' budget.

The American people should insist on fair news coverage without regard to political party.

WELCOME TO NEW COMMANDERS AT FORT POLK AND BARKSDALE

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, tomorrow, the 94th Brigade Support Battalion, part of the 10th Mountain Division's 4th Brigade Combat Team, will welcome Lieutenant Colonel Anthony Coston as its new commander at Fort Polk in Louisiana.

Lieutenant Colonel Coston most recently served as a joint logistics staff officer in Washington, D.C. He is a well-decorated and well-respected soldier, and I congratulate him on his new command at Fort Polk.

At the other military installation in my district, Barksdale Air Force Base, Colonel Steven Basham assumed command of the 2nd Bomb Wing earlier this week. And may I add that Barksdale was selected today for Global Strike Command.

Colonel Basham is a command pilot with more than 3,300 flying hours and served as director of operations for the first combat deployment of the B–2 bomber during Operation Iraqi Freedom. His leadership has been commended throughout his career, and I am confident he will be an exemplary leader for the airmen under his command at Barksdale.

I welcome both officers to my district and thank them for their dedication to the defense of this Nation.

□ 1930

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CASSIDY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DEMOCRAT SPENDING SINCE TARP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, this has been a historic day. We just passed a huge bill, cost the American taxpayers $3.5 trillion. It increased taxes at a time when we shouldn't be increasing taxes, and I won't restate everything that's been said here today because I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle expressed their positions very well.

But what I would like to say—and I'm not going to take the whole 5 minutes—is that in October we passed the TARP bill, October of last year, $700 billion. In January, we passed the State Children's Health Insurance Reauthorization, $73 billion. In February, on the 9th, we passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the stimulus bill, for $820 billion plus the interest it will incur, which is about $348 billion. That's $1.16 trillion. On February 9, we consolidated the appropriations for fiscal year 2009 in the omnibus bill, $410 billion plus $250 billion in interest. That's $625 billion in total. And then you add to that the budget which we passed today for $3.5 trillion.

We are in the process of bankrupting this country. We are printing so much money and incurring so much debt that our kids and grandkids, I don't know how they're going to be able to live with it.

I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle applauding when we passed this budget today. Those of us on this side of the aisle who have been around here for a while, we were doing anything but applauding. We were thinking about what we've done to this country.

You know, China has about $700 billion of our debt. Japan has about $600 billion of our debt. And they don't want to buy any more of our debt. The only reason they're doing it I think is because this is the only game in town, but there is a limit to how much these other countries in the world will spend purchasing our debt.

And so what's going to happen? It's already happening. We're increasing the money supply. Up until just recently, we had increased the money supply by almost 300 percent. That means that we've increased the money supply three times in just recent years. And when that money gets into circulation, along with the money we're going to be printing because of all these expenditures I just enumerated, we're going to have a tremendous amount of dollars chasing fewer and fewer goods and services. More dollars, less production, and that means we're going to have inflation.

So I'd just like to say to my colleagues tonight, you may be celebrating this great budget that you passed, but it's going to end up costing our kids and our grandkids more in taxes and inflation, and they're going to look back on this day and on what we're doing and they're going to say, why in the world did you do this to us, why did you do it to us?

And I hope I and my colleagues are alive to look back and remember what happened today and what's been happening in recent days, weeks and months. It's a tragedy, and I'm very depressed over it. I hope that something will change the way things are going. I hope people will see the light and will start cutting taxes instead of increasing taxes and spending, but I doubt that's going to happen.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2009

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today on a motion offered pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Monday, April 6, 2009, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 93, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WE NEED TO FIX THE TAX CODE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, perhaps the most dreaded day of the year for taxpayers will soon be upon us, April 15. We're all at home with paper and pen, with stacks of receipts and books, strewn upon our kitchen table, and as tax day approaches, I come before the House of Representatives to share Kansans' many frustrations and to call upon Congress to fix the Tax Code.

Our country desperately needs a better tax system. The United States Tax Code is complex, confusing, and terribly burdensome to taxpayers, and it impedes our Nation's economic growth. The IRS has estimated that individual taxpayers and businesses spend 7.6 billion hours each year filling out their taxes. To put that number in perspective, that's 3.8 million employees working full time for the entire year.

It's obvious, certainly to anyone filling out their tax return this year, that an overhaul of the Federal Tax Code is required. The Fair Tax Act, which I support, H.R. 25, is a direction we should go and contains many meritorious ideas which would start the process. The fair tax would repeal income, payroll, and a multitude of other taxes. And those taxes would be replaced by a national sales or consumption tax on retail purchases.

But no matter what system we agree upon, what we model our tax reform around, the fact remains: America deserves an easier, commonsense, and less convoluted tax system than we currently have in place. We need a tax system that promotes personal freedom. Decisions should be made based upon what's good for us individually, what's good for our families, and what's good for our businesses. It shouldn't be all about what's good for the tax man.

But instead of tax simplification and tax relief, Americans this year will be facing the same broken system and a budget proposal that increases their taxes to pay for more spending. Many are angry at the reckless spending of this Congress, so much so that a national grassroots movement of tea parties has opened up this spring. On April 15, over 300 tax day tea parties are planned across the country, many of them in Kansas.

Kansans are tired of footing the bill for Wall Street bailouts and rewarding bad behavior in the housing market. They're frustrated with trillion dollar stimulus efforts that fund projects and programs that simply won't stimulate the economy. They're upset with massive government spending that increases our national debt at a time when most American families are forced to tighten their belts and make tough choices.

Americans are struggling, and we need to get the country moving, but increasing taxes to recklessly throw dollars at the problem is not the solution. I am one of only a few of the 435 Members of this House to vote against every stimulus and bailout plan. I'd like to say that there were more of us. Hopefully, this tax day will serve as a reminder for Congress and the administration to put the taxpayer first—spend a lot less and create a tax system that is fair and efficient and that promotes individual freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLAKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. REICHERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROGERS of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING MR. AND MRS. JAMES AILSHIE AND THE ''J4''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. and Mrs. James Ailshie, who are celebrating their 79th year of marriage. James Ailshie was born in 1912, and his lovely wife, Dussie, in 1914. The two are proud parents of six wonderful children, all of whom are residents of East Tennessee.

When asked how they have maintained such an incredible marriage, the couple always responds with, ''The secret of a long life together is a four letter word, love.'' In my opinion, the Ailshie marriage is a living testimony of what love truly is. Let theirs serve as an example to all of us, that love and dedication can truly last a lifetime.

However, their marriage is more than simply an affirmation of love. Across the years they have witnessed times of joy and times of hardship, yet their commitment has endured. The qualities of character that have enabled them to sustain their union and build their family are the same qualities that are fundamental to the strength of our Nation. May we continue to be blessed with Americans who cherish the values of our traditions.

Married in 1930, the Ailshies have shared many yesterdays together. It has been said that, ''An anniversary is a time to celebrate the joys of today, the memories of yesterday, and the hopes of tomorrow.'' It is my hope that they will go on and see many, many more tomorrows together.

Madam Speaker, I rise also today to congratulate Jessi, Jedediah, Josiah, and Josephine Smith, better known as ''J4,'' who were declared the winner of the CBS Early Show's Singing Family Face Off this week. The competition began months ago when roughly 700 videos of family bands performing were submitted by Early Show viewers.

The ''J4'' siblings performed the Mary Mary's song ''Shackles,'' on the Early Show, which advanced them to the finals. CBS said they were chosen as the winner based on votes through the network's Web site.

''J4'' is made up of four siblings, aged 7 to 15, all with names beginning with the letter ''J'' from the Smith family in Bluff City, Tennessee. The oldest two have played for a couple of years for services at the church across the street from their home where their dad, Mark, is pastor.

The Smith kids are the children of Mark and Lori Smith. They're homeschooled and very involved in music, including piano and violin.

Congratulations again to ''J4.'' They make East Tennessee proud.

THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, earlier today I recounted the calamity that we find ourselves in with the budget and the spending of money here in the United States. Frankly, of course, the budgets over the past 8 years and the enormous expenditure of funds created a huge and growing deficit.

I indicated earlier that we spent $667 billion for the Iraq war, high unemployment still ongoing, stories that you hear from constituents about mortgage foreclosures, inability to have their loans re-modified, and so you can see the importance of the debate today.

And I'm very proud that, of the number of budgets that I had the opportunity to participate in and to argue for and to suggest the direction that they should take, they all focused on restoring the humanity and dignity of the American people.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget focused on reducing the deficit by 58 percent in fiscal year 2012. In addition, it targeted waste, fraud, and abuse. It repealed the Bush tax cuts for the top 1 percent of taxpayers. Let me emphasize that, the top 1 percent of taxpayers. That means that 99 percent of the American people would not get a tax increase of any kind. In fact, alongside of that principle is the principle of the President's budget, the budget we passed finally that guaranteed middle-class Americans a tax cut.

The budget included in the Progressive budget health care for all, affordable, accessible health care so that there would be no tragedies such as young people, children needing transplants or transfusions, and they can't get it because their insurer denies it.

We add an additional $300 billion as an additional part of the economic stimulus package so that there can be added assistance for unemployment insurance, food stamps, infrastructure spending, housing assistance, job creation.

I come from the gulf region, where we are still suffering both from Hurricane Katrina and Rita and now Hurricane Ike. My neighbor to the south, the city of Galveston, the mayor and city manager and many of her constituents are still facing the calamity of trying to build housing, trying to restore the University of Texas medical branch, and we, as a Texas delegation, worked with the district Member to try to ensure that restoration.

The budgets that were put here today respect the fact that there will be disasters in America, calamities such as fires and floods and, of course, hurricanes, storms, volcanos, that are spilling out such as in the State of Washington, that create havoc if those issues occur. And so this is a time when we opted to opt on the side of the people of America.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget puts in place $18 billion more in health care, $17 billion more on education and job training. What happens to a person who is unemployed? They look for jobs or they look to steer themselves into another career. And what do you need to do that? You need job training, whether it's in the community college system like the Houston Community College, whether or not it is going into nursing school, going to become a truck driver, or going into IT, you need job training.

Eight billion dollars on infrastructure so that the roads and the potholes and the bridges and the tunnels can be fixed, but more importantly, people can be put to work as we make a new America; $5.5 billion on justice programs; and $4.5 billion on veterans benefits and services. And of all of these budgets, Madam Speaker, the Congressional Progressive Caucus and CBC and the President's budget all reinforce our commitment to veterans and our returning soldiers who put themselves and their families on the front lines.

□ 1945

Families and our soldiers are likewise on the front lines. So I'm very proud to stand here today to say that we did the right thing in voting on this budget. We did the right thing in focusing on health care reform—trying to fix the broken system of some 44 million to 47 million Americans who are still uninsured.

In that effort, we managed to save some $316 billion over 10 years; several provisions to improve quality and efficiency in health care. Then, as well, we made a significant down payment on health care reform by putting these savings, along with $317.8 billion from a tax policy change on upper-income taxpayers, into a $634 billion health reform reserve.

We're holding a spot, Madam Speaker, so we can fix this for the American people. I mentioned education and energy. That is going to bring about green jobs.

Madam Speaker, we did the right thing for the American people and I'm proud to be part of this Congress and go home to speak with my constituents on how we have helped to change their lives.

THE DIRECTION OF OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOOZMAN. As part of my commitment to the people of Arkansas' Third District, I hold mobile offices in all 12 counties so that I can hear their concerns and help them when I can. As part of that, I relay their troubles here.

For many of the people I saw in Fayetteville on Friday, their attendance at the mobile office was a first. Like so many other people that I hear from through phone calls, e-mails, they are scared with the direction of our country.

They've seen Democrats pass a massive stimulus bill that was full of pet projects but short on job creation, job protection, and protections for pension plans. They've seen President Obama tout an omnibus bill that increases government spending, but what they're looking for is how Washington is tightening its belt, just like so many of them are.

Last week, President Obama said, ''It's with a budget that leads to broad economic growth by moving from an era of borrow and spend to one where we save and invest.'' Unfortunately, President Obama isn't living up to those words with his budget proposal that spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much.

My constituents are upset—and they have every reason to be. ''No more Federal deficit spending, please. I beg you to stop the financial bleeding.'' This is from Leslie in Harrison. She e-mailed me last week, ''We cannot afford to continue spending for programs we don't need. What we need are legislators with the veracity and tenacity to stand up and cut the spending programs and pay off the national debt.''

Leslie, I hear you. I too have serious doubts. One reason is the proposed Federal budget would enact the largest tax increase in the history of the United States.

I also hear Rebecca from Wesley, who wrote, ''I'm 63 years old and have worked very hard. I pay my bills and do not want to pay the bills of others. I'm so furious with what is going on in Washington. No to all tax increases, no to any laws that will increase utility rates, no to government-run health care. I have no confidence that the government can run anything.''

We need to work to regain the confidence of the hardworking Americans like Leslie and Rebecca that they had in the past in our government, but no longer. This requires us to vote against budget proposals that include cap-and-trade and that hurt small businesses and discourage charitable giving.

We need a road to recovery that includes curbing wasteful spending, focusing on job creation and debt control. We need to do what is best for our country, and I'm committed to looking for alternative solutions and fighting for a capitalistic democracy.

FAMILY SMOKING PREVENTION AND TOBACCO CONTROL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, today this House passed H.R. 1256, which takes tobacco regulation to a whole new level and, at the same time, imposes onerous new fees that are going to be transferred to consumers as higher prices. The entire debate over the bill was over what method should be used to do so. Before we close today's proceedings, I'd like to offer a somewhat different perspective.

Many years ago, author and commentator Bruce Herschensohn made this point. He said, ''For every pleasure in life, there is a corresponding risk. I think that's a universal truth—for every pleasure in life, there is a corresponding risk.

And he pointed out that it's true that with enough taxes and laws and restrictions and regulations and penalties and lectures, government can produce a virtually risk-free society. But it will also be one of the most colorless, pleasureless, tedious, and miserable societies ever conceived by the mind of man. I believe that's the case.

The health risks of smoking are real and they are well-documented. Our schools rightly make a concerted effort to inform every child of the health risks of tobacco—and they do a good job of it. Our government warns every adult of the health risks of tobacco—and they do a good job of it, too.

As a result, I don't believe there's a single individual in the United States who doesn't well and fully comprehend the health risks of tobacco. But once those warnings are issued, how much farther should government go to make individual decisions for rational adults if they weigh the risks of smoking for themselves?

Ten years ago, after California had imposed yet another tax on tobacco products, I got a letter from a woman who said, ''I'm 81 years old. I have been smoking my entire life. If I have to quit now, I'm going to die.'' She then went on to meticulously calculate how much the new tax cost would cost her on her limited, fixed income, and asked if I could help.

Madam Speaker, in every society, in every part of the world, in every period of history there is always a large group of people who simply want to be left alone to live their lives according to their own best judgment. And there's always a smaller but more domineering group who believe they're so good at running their own lives that they're just naturally entitled to run everybody else's as well.

Rarely has that conflict between these two groups come into sharper focus than in the ongoing efforts to restrict and regulate and tax and harass and intimidate individuals who, after weighing all the risks, decide to smoke anyway.

Personally, I think they're making a very bad decision. But they probably think others are making a very bad decision when they decide to go skiing or bungee jumping or skydiving or thousands of other pleasures that incur corresponding and calculated risks.

I wonder tonight whatever happened to the notion of personal responsibility and whatever happened to the notion, as Jefferson put it, of ''a wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another but shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement.''

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 265

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, the gentlelady from Texas, who is still here on the floor, had inadvertently put me as one of the cosponsors on H.R. 265. I would ask unanimous consent to have my name removed from that particular bill.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING A PARADIGM SHIFT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. A few weeks ago, I was in my office and a respiratory therapist had come into the office. He was talking about one of the patients that he had who came up and asked him if she could have a stronger medicine because what she was using simply did not work for her.

So he said, Well, why don't you show me how you're using it. She showed him how she used it, and he said, Is that the way you always use it? The patient said, Yes. Then he said, Well, let's try it one more time—except this time why don't you take the cap off first.

Now, sometimes I think in the policies that we develop here in the United States we have the same process—we go through the motions but we simply don't flat out take the cap off first. One of the things we need to do to solve our problem is simply take the cap off.

We have had an energy policy in this country for the last 40 years. It's basically been, we develop nothing in the United States and we insist on living on cheap foreign oil. The problem is, doing nothing in the United States for 40 years has put us into a situation that is very tenable. The other problem is there is no longer cheap foreign oil.

We have just recently voted on this floor on a budget—a budget outline. A budget outline that, quite frankly, taxes too much and spends too much and borrows too much. We've all heard that before because, to be honest, whether you talk now about the budget itself or the phrases of taxing, spending, and borrowing, they're basically a redundancy. They are indeed the same thing.

What we have also done in this House is make a major paradigm shift. For the last 20 years, we have been functioning under the basic philosophy that the individual is significant and important. The individual has a worth that is divine. That once you empower that individual and give that individual options, you're ennobling that person.

Well, the budget we just passed changes that basic philosophy. It changed that basic philosophy to say instead of empowering individuals, it is now the role and function of the Federal Government to solve people's problems. The Federal Government must now be given the power because the Federal Government now becomes the sole solution to the issues and needs of individuals.

Those of us in the West, members of the Western Caucus, have a different point of view because we basically trust people. We recognize that one of the most important things that should be given to any individual is options and choices.

People of the United States must be given options and choices so they can make a decision on how they want their life to develop. States should be given options and choices, regions should be given options. Whenever we try to establish a one-size-fits-all system from Washington, what we do is limit the ability to empower individuals to make decisions for themselves and to change their own lives.

When I was growing up, the only kind of music you could buy were on vinyl records. If you wanted a particular song, you had to basically buy the entire record.

With new gadgets today, even though they have become much smaller than this one that I still have absolutely no idea how to use, with gadgets like these today you can actually download the one record you want. You have a choice. You have options.

And it seems one of the ironies of our life today is that in every facet of human life, options prevail. People have choices—except when it comes to

dealing with the government. When that takes place, there is only one choice given: it is the Federal Government's choice.

We are moving dangerously into an area where that becomes the predominant philosophy and the predominant result. Actually, the last bill upon which we voted today, that was exactly the philosophy behind that bill.

It resolves itself also in the way we look at our energy policy and our energy future. We could solve many of our problems if we just had a wiser energy policy. I recognize that there are many people that said the budget we just did is not specifics; it's just broad parameters and directions for the future and whatever. But the basic problem remains that when we talk about people and we insist that our policy as a government should be to give options to people, then we will come with an entirely different approach and a strong and intelligent and rational energy policy for the United States that can open up the opportunities for—I don't care whether we're talking about cap-and-trade or oil leases or oil shale or the energy war on the poor or the myth of green jobs—what we need in each of those areas is to have the government open up options for individuals.

One of the good things about my party is that in every one of these issues we are presenting alternative Republican options.

□ 2000

We are trying to take the cap off to try and solve problems by looking at the issue in a new way and, in a new degree, based on options.

One of those that has been introduced is the no-cost stimulus bill. A conservative estimate of the no-cost stimulus bill will say that this particular measure, whose goal is, once again, to increase the options that America has with its energy policy, would create at least 2 million new jobs and would introduce at least $10 trillion of economic growth into our economy. It would reduce the cost of living for individuals, and it would do it with absolutely no tax increase.

Now, I know we have had a lot of people talking in the last few weeks about the idea that the majority of Americans, if our future path goes true, would not face a tax increase. In fact, for many it would be the indications of a middle-class tax cut. I want you to know that I have an element of skepticism with that, because I clearly remember the last time a President and Congress promised me a middle-class tax cut, or at least no increases of middle-class taxes.

At that particular time I was a school teacher making less than $30,000 a year. And I guess I should have been grateful that the Federal Government in their wisdom would have classified me as one of the rich in America; because in that particular year, when I was offered the opportunity and the guarantee that there would be no increases but instead there would be a decrease in middle-class taxes, that is the year I faced the largest tax increase I have ever faced in my life. My wife had just taken a second job, and everything that she brought in that year was used simply to pay for the tax decrease that I had been promised.

I guess it goes back to the original concept of how income tax was developed. You know, when income taxes were first established, the idea was that somebody else would be taxed to pay for everything. The idea was that only .5 percent—so you know something has changed over the years; .5 percent of your income would be taxed, but the first $3,000 were excluded, which was meaning basically everybody in America who was a middle-class worker was excluded from taxes. This was going to be a tax on only those rich people.

Ironically enough, 80 percent of the people who would be impacted by the first time we instituted an income tax in this country actually lived in only four States. And, ironically enough, those representatives from those four States were the ones who voted against instituting an income tax. And, ironically enough, in the debate on the Senate on that installment or beginning of an income tax, the actual debate that took place was a Senator stood up and he said, once we have an income tax, the government will be more responsible for the way it handles other people's money.

I think you have seen some changes in that; which is, once again, why I am so insistent that the no-cost stimulus bill is one we should be considering, because there is zero tax increase to the taxpayer, as opposed to the other budgets we are looking about that simply tax too much, spend too much, and borrow too much.

The No-Cost Stimulus Act treats States fairly. It deals with increasing our net wealth in this country by the use of royalties. If that bill were put into effect, just in the Alaska coast alone there would be $95 billion of new corporate tax, not imposed on the company, but developed by the expansion of that company. There would be $114 billion in new royalties that would be coming in and used in this particular country. It would create, just in that one area of Alaska alone, 730,000 new jobs; versus the bill we just passed, which has a specific $80 billion tax on the oil industry alone, which creates no new jobs, which provides no new income. But that tax on that company is going to be passed on to middle-class taxpayers in this country.

Because, you see, we were talking to an oil executive the other day, and he simply said: It is obvious. If we tax a business, like this $80 billion tax on only the oil industry, they are going to pass it on to consumers. That is the way it will always be.

Sometimes we play games here in the District of Columbia where the idea is, we are not going to tax people, we will just tax the business; which business then passes that on to the people in the first place. And how is that going to come? I promise you, it is not going to be shown simply at the pump.

Of every barrel of gas and oil that is produced, not all of that goes for energy consumption. A barrel of oil produces exactly 44.68 gallons of product. Of those 44.68 gallons, 19 of them will eventually become gasoline running your cars; nine will be diesel, a fuel; three will be jet fuel. The rest goes to other kinds of products that people use all the time.

We think about oil and gas increases as something that only deals with transportation issues. But when I get on the next airplane, if I get a new Boeing 787 or any of the newer planes, you have to realize that one of reasons these planes are becoming more fuel efficient is because they are lighter weight, which means they are now using composite material. Over 50 percent of the entire airplane of the Boeing 787 will be composed of composites, and all of that composite is made from natural gas.

When you sit on an airplane, you are sitting on natural gas. If you go out to your farmer, or even in your back garden and you need to put some fertilizer on that, realize that fertilizer is a byproduct of natural gas. When we fail to develop natural gas in this country, we put farmers at a disadvantage to the point that even today we are importing fertilizer from Russia because we are not doing enough to help ourselves.

Five percent of the global natural gas consumption goes to ammonia, which is the basic product used in fertilizer.

Whenever you pick up one of those electronics that you play with, when your kids start playing with it, they are made of lightweight plastics. That is oil and a natural gas. All of those are developed that way. If you get tired of watching your kids play with those electronics, or you get tired of listening to me speak tonight and you decide to go take an aspirin, I hate to say that, but that is oil and natural gas. What you don't know is that aspirin is derived from hydrocarbons that are found in every barrel of oil.

If you want to have Kevlar to protect our soldiers or our police, you are going to make that stuff out of oil and natural gas. If you are walking around right now, you might look at your shoes and figure out that the stuff that holds them together comes from oil and a natural gas. If you are the tying them, the strings are a petrochemical compound. In fact, the soles are probably going to be imitation rubber, all of which comes out of a barrel of crude oil. Even the shoe polish you use comes from oil and natural gas. If you have a PVC pipe in your basement, that comes from petrocarbons. If you use a ballpoint pen to write a letter—in fact, I have in my hand a list of 84 examples of products that utilize oil and natural

gas as the basis of those products, everything from golf balls to pantyhose to perfume to dentures.

And how are the companies that are now being hit by an $80 billion oil tax going to recoup that? They are passing it on to anyone who uses golf balls or pantyhose or dentures or perfumes, or who writes with a pen or sits on plastic or who wears shoes or who flies in an airplane. That is a tax on all of us when we increase the cost of living.

And how do we solve that problem? Well, we need to look around and simply decide that, as a policy, we are going to take the cap off the medicine, we are going to think of new options, and use what we have to solve our problems, to make our life better, and to solve our budgetary problems, because we have the capacity to do it. We just are refusing to do it right now.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, if I may, I would like to yield some time to the gentleman from Louisiana, who has come up here and done such a great job in his first year as a Member of the House of Representatives. He also comes from an extremely significant energy region, which is going to be impacted not only by the budget we just passed but also by the energy policy decisions we make in the near future.

If I could yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. FLEMING, I would appreciate it.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, first of all, I thank the gentleman from Utah, Mr. BISHOP, for his leadership in this area, both on the budget as well as the discussion on petroleum. He was a leader and the one who took the initiative on this no-cost stimulus plan, which I also cosigned as well, along with Mr. VITTER on the other side of the House and I think one or two other Senators. So I thank Mr. BISHOP for his leadership and also allowing me to participate in the discussion tonight about the budget.

What has happened here this afternoon in passing this budget in the House of course yields three very bad things; that is, a budget that spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much.

It was only a few days ago that I spoke on the floor here about the fact that it is not just a matter of how much we spend, but it is a matter of where do we get this money from? And there is only two ways to get money that you don't have, and that is if you discount the Social Security Trust Fund, which we of course steal from daily. That is, either to borrow money, and you have to find people who have got the kind of dough that can lend that; or, you have got to print it out of thin air.

Well, who have we been borrowing money from? Well, we have been borrowing it from China. And the amount of spending that we are doing is now getting to an extent that even the Chinese, who seem to be flush with cash, can't seem to keep up and don't know how long that they are going to be able to lend us money before those interest rates begin going up.

Well, of course the other option is to print money. And we have been through that before. In fact, there is a number of precedence that we have seen over history, and the one that I point out that is the most poignant is pre-World War II Germany. And what happened there?

After World War I, the winning powers of the allies imposed a war reparation requirement on Germany. Germany couldn't afford this, and so in order to pay the money back, money they didn't have, they just simply printed it. And of course they had humongous inflationary rates to the point where, to buy a loaf of bread, you had to actually carry your currency in a wheelbarrow. Zimbabwe today is having a very similar situation.

We have also seen this precedence in our own economy. The spending spree that we went on in the sixties began to hit us in the seventies, along with, of course, the oil and gas problems that we had. And by the late seventies we had severe problems with inflation that was as high as 10, 12, 13 percent. And it was one of those things where, if you didn't get a raise every year, you were actually getting your pay cut. That ultimately led to terrifically high interest rates in the range of 20 percent, and of course we went into a severe recession in the early eighties.

It seems like that we in this body don't seem to learn the lessons. And the lessons are that any way you frame it, if you spend it, you are going to someday have to pay for it. And, you know, it is interesting in our own personal budgets, in our homes, in our cities, and in our States, we have to balance our budget. But for some crazy reason, we in the Federal Government are not required to balance our budgets.

Sometimes it makes sense to borrow money, just as a in your home you might want to borrow money to take out a mortgage to buy a home, perhaps that makes sense. But when it comes to running up tremendous credit card debt, spending today and paying tomorrow, then certainly it is a very difficult and dangerous way to live, and that is what we are doing today in America.

With this budget that has just been passed, we are seeing that deficits are now immediately exploding from a high of $500 billion a year to over $1 trillion a year. We are going to see a debt that already was growing pretty fast accelerate such that it doubles in 5 years and it triples in 10 years. But let me talk a little bit about the subject that my friend Mr. BISHOP was discussing, and that is energy.

This FY 2010 budget has a negative impact on energy, just as he suggested. For one thing, it removes over $30 billion in tax incentives for oil and gas businesses. Now, I am sure the Shells and the Chevrons can handle that just fine, but the vast majority of exploratory drillers out there are small family businesses. And, of course, drilling is a risky operation to begin with, and that is the whole reason for having tax incentives is to encourage businessmen to go out and take a risk. But now that the tax incentives have been removed, what is going to happen? There is going to be less risk taken, there will be less drilling. Of course, that is going to further our oil dependence. And in my State of Louisiana, which is a heavy petroleum dependent State, it is going to tremendously affect jobs, and that is good jobs.

□ 2015

We could, over time, lose as many as 70,000 jobs. And again, we are talking about independent oil drillers. We are not talking about the big ones. The loss of the depletion allowance and the loss of the write-off of intangible drilling costs will effectively shut down these businesses in many cases. It will broaden our dependence on foreign oil, as I mentioned, and result in increased threats to our national security as we have to search around the world to have energy sources to run our Nation.

I support exploring alternative energy resources such as, of course, solar and wind. But when do we expect that we will be pulling up next to a windmill and filling our car up with windmill fuel? It just isn't going to happen. Solar, we are not there yet. None of these technologies are coming on line. Yes, we see them in Europe, but they are subsidized by the governments. They have to stand on their own. We just went through a recent experience with this with ethanol where we were running the cost of feed through corn in order to create ethanol, and that was, of course, done with subsidies. And then in the meantime, it drove up the cost of chicken. And that severely impacted my district, where we have Pilgrims Pride, the chicken-producing farms, and almost created bankruptcy for over 200 chicken-producing families, not to mention the jobs that would have been lost. Hopefully we have saved that. But that came directly as a result of efforts to subsidize and encourage ethanol from corn, which is really a very inefficient use of corn.

Nonetheless, I do support research in these areas. And at some point when we can actually create electricity into our grid in a cost-effective way, I'm all in favor of it. I'm also in favor of the use of nuclear energy. It doesn't produce any carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. And certainly anyone who ''thinks green'' has got to think that nuclear energy is the way to go for electricity. And other countries have taken the lead on that, such as France, with about 80 percent of its electricity produced that way.

Well, let me discuss a little bit, and I hope the camera can pick this up, this, of course, is the ArkLaTex, this is Arkansas, northwest Louisiana and Texas. And in the crosshatch here is an

area called the Haynesville Shale. Now, shale is a rock formation in which certain petroleum products are found, sometimes oil, sometimes natural gas. In this case, it is natural gas. And we have known about these deposits for many years. However, we didn't know how to get to them. The technology was not there. And something was invented called ''horizontal drilling,'' where we can literally go down deep in the ground, turn horizontally, we can crack open the shale and we can take out the natural gas.

Now, what lesson does that teach us? Well, it teaches us that the more we advance technology, the more access to fossil fuels we have and the safer we make it. As far as safety, I will give you an example, and that is offshore drilling, OCS, where, for instance, with Hurricane Katrina, there were a number of rigs that were destroyed; however, there was not an appreciable leakage of any oil from these rigs. In fact, there is more oil in the ocean leaking today from the bottom naturally than ever from any rigs. So we know that technology, when put together with fossil fuels and with nuclear energy, is really the future until hopefully some day we can harness the power of the wind and the sun.

This Haynesville Shale is projected to contain over 200 trillion cubic feet of natural gas production, one of the, if not the, largest natural gas deposits in the world. Now, natural gas emits probably half the carbon in other products as other forms of energy such as oil, certainly much less than coal. So it is cleaner. And here in Washington, D.C., we see buses driving around, and on the side is printed ''this runs on natural gas.'' You don't detect any odor. You don't see any smoke coming out there. There is no question that that is a better way to go. But we don't have the infrastructure yet where you can pull your car, if it did run on natural gas, to the pump and get it filled. But we can do that. It is just a simple matter of taking the initiative, and that will come with time. So we can become, as a nation, far more independent by using natural gas than we can trying to develop oil. But we still can't ignore the opportunities for oil such as in ANWR and offshore and even on Federal lands.

I will also point out that beyond the 200 trillion cubic feet of natural gas production potential, we are already seeing 10 to 20 million cubic feet of natural gas production per day in the ArkLaTex. Lots of jobs are being produced. Money is flowing in the economy, and it is really helping out northwest Louisiana in these difficult times. In fact, our unemployment level is half what it is in some States. We don't have the real estate issues that others have. And certainly it is not just because of the Haynesville Shale, but it certainly is helping. It is injecting tremendous amounts of capital into our local economy and creating thousands of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just what to say that the issue with the budget is still problematic. We are, again, pushing this country way over into the leftist socialist realm. Even the leftist socialists from socialistic countries in Western Europe think we have lost our marbles. They think what we are doing is crazy. Even the ones that used to criticize us for being too conservative are now criticizing us for being too liberal. Just the other day, both France and Germany said ''no more stimulus packages.'' They think we are crazy if we want to move forward with another one. So enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. And this budget that passed the House today is way over the top. And I'm afraid that we are going to see even more coming down the pike.

So, in closing, I want to thank Mr. BISHOP, my friend from Utah, for giving me this opportunity to talk about this. And I await some more discussion about the petroleum industry and its impact through the budget.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate very much the gentleman from Louisiana taking some time here and going through and reminding us of options that we do have as a country, and how we should be developing those options. Gas is one of them. Oil is another one of those. We have a whole bunch. And I appreciate his leadership, as well, on a no-cost stimulus bill which has about half a hundred sponsors here in the House already.

One of the problems we do have, though, is we need to be realistic on how we are going to get from here to there. One of the options we always talk about is renewable energy. It is an important option to have. It needs to be developed. But we also have to be realistic on how we can actually get there. According to the Department of the Interior, the EIA, they have tried to estimate where we will need to be in the year 2030. And they estimate we will need about an 11 percent increase in the total amount of energy that we will be consuming by the year 2030. And if you look at where we were back in 1980 and where we need to go 50 years from that into the future of 2030, even if we were able to double the increase of biomass and renewables and double the percentage of nuclear that we are using, and making the assumption that we can actually squeeze a little bit more out of hydrogen power, this clearly shows you where we will be. The bottom three strata all are fossil-based fuel. We will not be able to turn ourselves over into that kind of alternative energy supply by ourselves. There needs to be some kind of impetus to do it. And as the gentleman from Louisiana easily said, if it is going to be a tax policy, that retards the ability because businesses will not be entering into the exploration and development. What we need to do is have a royalty policy, which simply means we are still going to be needing oil, gas and coal in the future, but if we use the royalties that are developed from the expansion of these areas and put them into a trust fund so the United States can use it to develop the alternative sources, we can dramatically change these strata coming in here, and we can do it in a logical and realistic way, which is, once again, what the no-cost stimulus bill tries to do.

What we need to do is simply say, look, there are easy ways for us to move into a better direction if we actually use the resources that we have at hand to help build our fossil-fuel resources to help pay for the renewable resources that we need to have. It is a simple process. We should be doing it. But we are not doing it right now, which is why the American people are probably saying, take the cap off, and use the medicine the way it was intended to be used.

We have one of those other problems that goes along, I will illustrate by being very parochial right now. My State of Utah has a whole lot of public land that has a whole lot of natural gas and oil developed. Recently, the Bureau of Land Management went through a 7-year review for land management policies in the State of Utah. I want to emphasize that again. Seven years of review to come up with a land management policy. What they came up with is actually less area developed that is usable for resources than they had 50 years ago when we first came up with this process of having land management policy plans.

They actually, in this recent one, took 3 million acres out of potential production. Yet there was a cry that took place that said maybe we are trying to drill for oil and gas too close to national parks. Now, I want you, if you have a chance, to see very carefully here, this is Arches National Park outlined in green. The areas in purple around that are what actually the BLM in their land management plan, that took 7 years to develop, took off the table so they could not have any kind of natural oil or gas exploration done in those areas. Now so, far so good. But when they decided to actually produce the other leases and put them out for bid so that private industry—especially as was mentioned before, we think of big oil companies like Exxon or Mobil. Ninety percent of all the oil and natural gas that is drilled in the United States comes from small companies, names that you don't know, people that have less than 500 employees. These are the people who are dealing with these particular lease issues. When those were presented, the Secretary of the Interior decided to remove 77 leases from the table from development with two arguments. Argument number one was we didn't spend enough time to study it. He claimed that there had been a rush to judgment. Now I find that difficult because it took 7 years for the local BLM to do their work and come up with a system that was not only signed off by the BLM but also signed off by the National Park Service and also was

signed off by the State of Utah. And I especially find it interesting when we passed a $1 trillion stimulus bill in this House even after we guaranteed that we would have 48 hours to look at it and we actually ended up having between 4 and 8 hours to look at it, that was okay. But 7 years was a rush to judgment.

The second thing he said is, well, these leases are too close to existing national parks. Now I pointed out where Arches is. And I pointed to the purple that were taken off. The stuff that is brown is existing leases right now. The stuff that is pink were leases that had been let, and the Secretary of the Interior decided to let them go through. The ones that are in red are the ones he said were too close to the national park. This one up here is in red. This all was allowed. The pink and the brown is in existence. And this is too close to the national park, even though the other leases are not. This one over here, once again, in red, was denied, taken off the table, even though this one was allowed and these are existing leases that take place.

If I were to say ''this is irrational,'' I don't think I would be too far off the point. If I were to say that the reason these red spots were taken off is because they were subject to a lawsuit instituted by a special interest group, I would be closer to the point. The bottom line is this was not a rush to judgment. This was a 7-year, carefully hatched plan that had been reviewed by everybody in hundreds of town meetings with thousands of comments. And they are not too close to the natural beauties of the national parks. They are, in fact, miles away from them with areas that are currently being leased and developed much closer to these who are.

What is the net result of this? The net result is the State of Utah lost $3 million last year to be put into their education system simply because those were off. And unfortunately, because of the State Trust Land system that we have in the West, many of these areas that are red have State Trust Lands abutting them that are also sterile now and not able to be used to develop funds that we need desperately in the State of Utah for our own kids.

Sometimes I'm amazed when we talk about how the impact of what we do with our oil and gas leasing and our land plans, and we don't take those ancillary effects into account. For example, this is a simple chart that compares the salaries of teachers in Montana and Wyoming.

□ 2030

Montana is the one at the bottom. Wyoming is the one at the top. And if you ask yourself, why is Wyoming starting their teachers at 20 grand a year more than Montana, it's because Wyoming is developing their resources.

There are other spin-off effects. If I want to have decent colleges, or a K–12 system in the State of Utah, I need to develop these resources and not have them capriciously taken off the table because it was a rush to judgment or they are too close to a national park.

Now, those are some of the problems that we simply face. Like, when I was first elected to the legislature in the State of Utah, that was clear back in 1978, we had a policy at that time called a recapture, which means if you put property tax on property in the State of Utah, whatever it raises, there is a minimum the State will guarantee. If your local district cannot raise the minimum school level by local property taxes, the State will subsidize it.

In the seventies, late seventies, when I started, and early eighties, when I started, one of the unique concerns was we had a recapture, which meant there were three school districts in Utah that not only could raise enough property tax revenue to meet the minimum school level, there was enough to be taken away and given to the other districts to help the State out, which meant that every taxpayer in the State of Utah benefited. And the reason we had recapture was because there was energy development. Since the early eighties there has never been a recapture. There is nothing even close to a recapture today. And if I wanted to do a recapture, I need to develop these resources, which the BLM, Bureau of Land Management, after a 7-year study, justified. And unfortunately, because of actions of this administration, they are now taken off the table, and we are still struggling.

And what is really sad is the next time, at a different location, there was a lease sale. It was the worst attended, the lowest productivity lease sale we have had in the history of those sales because, simply, business saw what happened in the State of Utah and realized they're not going to take the chance of developing and putting their resources in an area where the Federal Government simply might change their mind.

All we need to do to solve our problems is say, look, take the cap off the medicine. It'll solve the problem. Some people say, well, we're developing too much land.

I like this comparison. If you see how much land was developed in the Clinton administration, and how much was developed in the Bush administration, I would love to go back to the years of the Clinton administration when we were actually developing more land and developing more leases for energy resources to help us meet the needs of the country. We're actually decreasing in all those areas, not increasing at the same time.

And as you noticed, as I said, the reason these were taken off the table is they were subject to a lawsuit. One of the things we have also found is a significant problem is, simply, we have become litigious-happy in this country.

We are actually up, according to the Department of the Interior, 100 percent in the amount of permits to drill that have been applied. The wells that are completed are up 100 percent. But the environmental lawsuits are up 700 percent in the same area. That's why Utah lost those $3 million, a 700 percent increase from the year 2000 in the amount of lawsuits that are given.

In 2008, off the coast of Alaska there were 487 leases that were let, and there were 487 lawsuits that were filed immediately afterwards. 50 percent of all the leases for energy development in the inner mountain west are right now involved in some kind of lawsuit. We can never develop our energy independence and our domestic energy policy, which will help solve our problems, if we have to continue going through this process of having continuous lawsuit after continuous lawsuit.

And who are the people that are being hurt by it? Every American that will be paying more for their airplane tickets and their ball point pens and their shoes and their fertilizer, because we're adding more taxes on the oil industry, and every kid that goes to school in the West, because we cannot afford to fund the program because the money has been taken out because we simply have decided not to take the cap off and use the resources we have to help solve our problems. We can create jobs and we can stimulate this economy if we just do things in a logical and rational way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been joined here by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, another great new Member of the House of Representatives who is adding a great deal to the style of this body and the substance of our debate by his understanding of the issues. And even though Pennsylvania is considered an eastern State, we consider him a westerner because he faces the same issues in his part of Pennsylvania that we face in the State of Utah, maybe just with not quite as much public land, but the same issues.

I wish to yield time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I thank my good friend and colleague from Utah. You know, America does have an energy addiction. There's no doubt about it. But it's an energy addiction to foreign energy. And it's an addiction that's just absolutely unnecessary. We are facing a crisis in the fact that over 70 percent of our energy resources we obtain from foreign countries. Many of those countries are those that, frankly, don't like us very much, and they take our money willingly, but what they use it for could potentially easily do us harm in the future. And that's wrong. That's a threat to our economy.

And we know that we have been spending a lot of time in this body talking about the economy in the past 3 months since I came to Congress. And it's a threat to our national security.

So what are the—such a looming crisis that we're experiencing every day, and what's the solutions that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle,

our Democrat Party solution? Well, we saw that just a couple of hours ago with the budget that was proposed. That was cap-and-trade. That's how we address energy. We put a tax on everything. We put $1.8 trillion in taxes.

Now, The White House's budget showed somewhere around $630 billion of new taxes that we placed on. But I know that there was a briefing on the Senate side with somebody from, a White House staffer that was able to talk that actually the impact on the economy will be triple that. We're talking $1.8 trillion.

I've got to tell you, Mr. BISHOP, before I came to Congress I didn't know how many zeros were in a trillion. That's a new skill for me. Unfortunately, it's a sad skill to have to have and have to profess here.

We're looking at broken promises. The President promised that 95 percent of all Americans would have a decrease, see their taxes decrease. Well, that promise has been broken with cap-and-trade, because cap-and-trade puts a tax on just absolutely everything.

In Pennsylvania alone, it's estimated that our energy costs, the cost of turning on your electrical switch, is going to increase by 40 percent. And that's going to increase, and then you have the tax on everything, anything that's produced or consumed, if it's made with carbon or it's got a carbon footprint which is, you know, we took pride in that, that that advances our economy and our society, but today it's a bad word. But that, anything that uses that puts a tax today.

Well, that's going to impact everybody, businesses industries, families. But I've got to tell you, the people I feel—I'm scared most for are the people that are living, just barely getting by, paycheck to paycheck, those folks who are poor, those who are not making it today. And just the electricity costs alone are going up by 40 percent in Pennsylvania. Cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax, that's a war on the poor. And what that's going to do to people that are just living, just barely getting by today is, it's absolutely unacceptable. It's just not bad policy, frankly, it's harmful.

Now before I came to Congress, I worked 28 years in health care. I actually thought that I was going to retire in nonprofit community health care. And for me that meant that hopefully they'd have a nursing home bed for me when I got to the end of my career in nonprofit community health care.

But one of the things I learned first in my health care career was, do no harm. And I use that in my decision-making here on the House floor. The first thing in terms of any type of public policy is, do no harm. And that's something that would serve all of myself and my colleagues to remember in the public policy we're doing, especially on this energy debate, because cap-and-trade is harmful.

Now, we have great potential, I think, for moving towards and accomplishing energy independence. Let me talk a little bit about that, starting with domestic oil.

150 years ago this year, and actually, the third week in August, in Titusville, Pennsylvania, Colonel Drake drilled the first well ever in the history of the world and produced energy, produced oil. And that's something we take great pride in. And we have tremendous domestic oil resources today that we have not been utilizing, that we could be utilizing to not just be dependent on foreign sources, but what a great economic stimulus that would be to take that $700 billion that we send overseas every year and invest that in American energy-producing companies that hire American workers. That's the best stimulus that we could have done, and that's the stimulus that we need to do, and it will be the first stimulus that we do out of this Congress that will be effective in this congressional cycle.

Let me talk about natural gas. Credible, clean energy. And we have lots of it. The Outer Continental Shelf. We certainly have it throughout my district. We have the third largest natural gas play in the world that goes through Pennsylvania, 15 of my 17 counties, wonderful, clean, natural gas that's available. And we have at least two bus lines in my Congressional district that runs on compressed natural gas. It's clean, it's cheaper, and it's a good resource, and we need to be using more of that.

Nuclear. We haven't built a new nuclear plant in how long? Countries such as France are way ahead of us. Nuclear energy has come a long way since the days when we were concerned about accidents. It's clean, it's safe and the technology advancements are wonderful.

Coal. We have, my district, I'm proud of the fact that we have a tremendous amount of coal. We have a history of providing coal for the country. And, in fact, we've got great educational institutions in my facility, we have lots of them, but one in particular is doing some wonderful research on coal sequestration techniques. And that technology is being developed with the researchers that we have right in rural Pennsylvania where we have these vast coal resources to be able to use.

And then alternative energy. And I do believe in all of the above and support an all-of-the-above approach to addressing our energy independence. But if you take the alternative energies today, where we're at today with solar, with wind, we're looking at producing less than 1 percent, meeting less than 1 percent of our energy needs. So let's say we work real hard and we double that. All right. That's 2 percent. We're a long ways off from fulfilling and meeting the energy needs that our country has today.

We need to be able to use our domestic resources, oil, natural gas, coal, and continue the research and development of alternative energies.

I'm very proud of the higher education institutions that I do have in the district that are working also on developing these alternative energy sciences. But as I talk with those researchers on alternative energies, they tell me that the best hope for the future, to be able, at one point, to be able to replace the use of fossil fuels perhaps is solar at this point. But even with that, they tell me it is generations and generations away from being developed to the point where we can actually fill that gap.

So for us to be energy independent, to meet our economy needs, to provide good jobs for Americans, producing domestic energy and for our national security, we really need an all-of-the-above type solution to our energy.

So why are we dependent on foreign energy?

Well, the best way to do that is, let me illustrate with a bit of a riddle. My alma matter, I've talked about Penn State. We have a great winning football coach, Joe Paterno. How'd you like to be in your mid eighties and just get a 3-year extension on your contract? He's a great guy and he's got a great record.

So here's the riddle. What's the difference between Coach Paterno's winning record and America's energy policy? Well, actually Coach Paterno's winning record really is there, it really exists. We do not have, America has never had an energy policy. And, in fact, the biggest barrier we have to American energy independence, and American economic independence using our energy resources, has been the Federal Government. And it's time for that to stop.

And let me share with you a living example of how government gets in the way of using domestic resources, domestic energy resources. In my district, in the northern part, we have this wonderful four counties, it includes the Allegheny National Forest. It's 513,000 acres. It's a wonderful area. It was formed back in 1923. 85 years it has existed, and it was formed for the purpose of providing a sustainable timber supply for industry, and also to supply sustainable energy, specifically, oil to begin with, and now natural gas that is drilled in the forest.

And, in fact, the Federal Government, in its wisdom in 1923, when it secured all these lands to form this national forest, chose not to secure the private property subsurface rights, the mineral rights there. And the reason for that was because it felt that private property owners would be better able to access and to produce the energy that is contained in those minerals, the oil and the natural gas that is there today.

□ 2045

Well, that has worked well for us for approximately 85 years. Just about a little over 70 days ago, the Forest Service, who manages that, decides to no longer proceed with what's called ''notices to proceed.'' That's basically the

green light to be able to go after the oil and the natural gas that our country needs to fuel our needs. It's domestic energy.

Now, the impact of that in just 70 days has been, as you can imagine, on the businesses. First of all, it's an attack on those who own the private property rights, which is wrong. We respect private property rights in this country, but then there are the businesses, the drillers who go after the oil. We haven't had a new start on a well in over 70 days. You have the schools and the counties and the municipalities that rely on that, that being the big part of our economy in those four counties. Then you have the families, the families who depend on those jobs, and we have seen job loss, and we have seen people's hours being cut back across the board in many different industries. It's just not the drillers. They're the individuals who are involved with the small excavating companies, who come in to clear the access road. They're the folks who work in timbering, who remove the timber to be able to open up those areas for drilling.

You have to remember that this is something we have worked well together on with the Forest Service for 86 years. It has been a great partnership of making sure that we provide the resources that America needs. Then, all of a sudden, the Forest Service, because of lawsuits by environmentalists, has shut this process down. It has shut down the economy in the four counties, in the Allegheny National Forest and in those counties that depend on that economy around it. Well, that's wrong. That's absolutely wrong.

You know, America has the ingenuity. In terms of being energy independent and in using our resources, we've got the ingenuity. We've got the resources. We've got the American spirit. We've got people who work hard in those industries, I mean long days, days that a lot of Americans wouldn't want to put in, but they do that because that's what they enjoy; that's their passion, and they help to provide the energy resources that our country needs.

As I said before, the biggest barrier to accessing these domestic resources, to accessing America's energy resources for America's being energy independent, has been our own government. It's time for smart government energy policy.

Again, I propose that the best stimulus that we could ever do for our economy would be to access all of our domestic energy resources. That would be oil, natural gas, the building of nuclear plants, the use of coal, the development of the alternative energies at the same time, concurrently. As we do that, we put American energy-producing companies to work that are hiring American workers.

I thank my friend and colleague from Utah for the opportunity to join him this evening.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate Mr. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania for going through many of the significant issues that have to be addressed and that can help us solve our budgetary problems if we just provide people options and take the cap off and let them use the medicine.

He did mention one of those, which is cap-and-trade. Now, we did a great deal of talking this week about how we're not going to raise taxes on middle-income individuals, but we've already talked about how the $80 billion tax increase for the oil industry alone is going to be passed on. Cap-and-trade, which the gentleman also mentioned, has the same individual effort. It has been estimated that cap-and-trade will cost about $1.9 trillion, and that comes out to an average per household of just under $2,000 a year for the next 8 years.

For those people who are now going to have to come up with that under the cap-and-trade approach, they either have to make $2,000 a year more every year or find some way of cutting back. To help them out, the Bureau of Labor has come up with some statistics that show what the average family does spend.

For example, on all of their meat, their poultry, their fish, eggs, dairy products, and fruits and vegetables, the average family will spend about $1,700 a year. Well, that's not quite enough that they'd have to cut. For all furniture, appliances, carpets, and other furnishings, the average family spends about $1,700-plus a year. If you just do clothing, the average family spends $1,800 a year. For electricity and energy needs, the average family spends a little over $1,700. In property tax, the average family hits again $1,700.

Those are some ways that people could actually afford the cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax program because—I'm sorry—whether we say it's a tax increase or not, it's going to cost average Americans.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I'll yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Just a point on this:

For those who were watching the debate—and it went on all day yesterday on this issue and for hours long during today as well—there were assertions on the other side completely made over and over again. Any time we raised this issue as far as the tax on the American family and individuals as well and as to whether it's going to be $1,600 or $1,700—you said it's under $2,000—there was an assertion on the other side of the aisle that's it's not in there. That's not true.

Ranking Member RYAN, I think, had the definitive statement on it. It's not us making those statements. It's not even outside organizations making those statements. Although, outside organizations have, in fact, confirmed that that would be in place. In fact, it was our very own, nonpartisan CBO, Congressional Budget Office, that came up with that figure. So it is in there. It is relevant, and it has been documented.

I just wanted to reinforce that point.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey for pointing that out because, once again, we provide options for people. We take the cap off the medicine, and we can still solve all of our own problems. Let me talk very quickly about two final points:

One is the concept that we can change to green energy jobs. I call it the ''myth of green energy.'' This administration has praised Spain, and has said that they should be an example we should follow as a country who has achieved long-term growth, going down a massive subsidization of green energy jobs.

The only thing I worry about, according to their most recent studies of what has taken place in Spain, is that their green energy efforts simply have hindered their way out of their current economic crisis because, for every green energy job that was produced, it required a subsidy between $30,000 and $100,000. The total cost to Spain was $36 billion. The energy increase to Spain was a 31 percent increase for average people in Spain for their energy increases. I hate to say this, but for every energy job that allegedly was created, there were 2.2 jobs that were killed as a result of them. This is actually a job loss.

One of the problems we have in doing that is, simply, there is no definition of what is a ''green job.'' In reality, as we found once again in Spain, clerical work, bureaucratic work and administrative jobs are now considered green jobs. The net effect, though, still in Spain is, for every job they created, they lost 2.2 jobs.

Now I would like to just say in some conclusion to this—and we could go on and talk about a lot of other things—that there is the issue of offshore drilling in which the previous administration had a 60-day comment period. This administration has decided to put in an unprecedented 6-month comment period as if we don't know what we're doing already.

There is the issue of oil shale in my State, and once again, this administration has decided to stop the development of leases and the development of resources for oil shale. In conservative estimates, there is three times the amount of oil potential just in the States of Utah, Colorado and Wyoming than there is in Saudi Arabia.

But I want to remind people of why we're talking about this issue of energy as it relates to the budget at all. One of the things we as a government ought to do is try to avoid pain. I realize that there are some people who have said it's a shame to waste any crisis, but one of the things, maybe, that we should be trying to do is to prevent future crises.

I think some of us can remember back to last fall when gasoline was

over $4 a gallon and how terrible the situations and lifestyles were back then, which have now been placed on the back burner because it's not so frantic and not so necessarily needed, because we faced one of the unique phenomena that has happened only once in the world, which is that the entire world dropped their consumption of oil. We are now consuming 1.4 million barrels in the world less than we did last fall when it was $4 a gallon. Our experts tell us that that will probably continue through the year 2009, but come 2010, it's going to go right back up. Since the United States has yet to solve its energy production problems—not for the short term, not for the long term because we refuse to take the cap off the medicine and make options for people—we still import 40 percent of our energy from foreign countries. We are still bound and determined to do whatever Hugo Chavez wants in some particular way.

For whom are we fighting? Remember last fall for whom we were fighting—for the people in my State, for the kids who need their education, for the 1,100 airline employees who were laid off when 100 planes were taken out of one company's system, for the Ethiopian cab driver here in Washington, D.C. who told me that he had to drive 2 hours every day longer to make up because of the high cost of energy and that, for the first time in his life, he was not able to be home when his kid came home from school, for the father in Virginia who refrained from going to fathers' and sons' activities because he couldn't afford the cost of gas, or for the Wisconsin high school that tried to have a fashion show to show kids how they could dress warmly in fleeces and in zipped sweaters and try and compensate in that particular way, or for North Dakota where they cut their schools back to 4 days a week, or for a district in Iowa that decided the only kinds of trips they could go on were going to be athletic events—no more choir, no more field trips, no more junior high trips whatsoever, even for the American Defense Department, which saw its energy budget go from $3 billion to $13 billion a year just because of the increase of gas, or for the church in Vermont that found itself with a $10,000 increase in its electrical bill out of the blue, or for the nurse in Chicago who dropped cable television in an effort to try and solve her problems, or for the elderly people who no longer went on trips, or for the guy in St. Paul, Minnesota, who only went out if he were in his electric wheelchair because he could recharge it for free in his apartment.

In this country, when we talk about energy policies, we talk about them as if they were some ethereal concept that was out there, an abstract concept. It's not. When we talk about our energy policy, we are talking about how people cook their food and how they heat their homes, and we create jobs because of it. For every dollar that is spent on energy for those people who are in the most vulnerable situations, for those who are in the lowest half of our economic stratum, for every dollar they have to spend on high-energy costs, it was a dollar they couldn't spend on a luxury like Hamburger Helper.

It is energy that is the great social equalizer. It is energy that creates economic opportunities, and this country has more energy imprisoned than most countries have. All we need to do is to try to tap into that potential, for when prices increase—and they will again—jobs will be lost; income vanishes; social programs suffer; America suffers at the same time, and it hurts those who are on fixed incomes and those who are on the poverty level the most. That's 45 million people who are on fixed incomes. You see, if the social and economic elite of this country can easily solve this problem, if you're rich, the high cost of energy is nothing more than an inconvenience.

We had Presidential candidates who would fly around the country in three different jets one day, and it was okay. All they had to do was buy a carbon offset for it. We have a former political leader whose home consumes 20 times more energy in one day than an average family will consume in a year, and it's okay; he can just buy an offset. It's like going back to the medieval time period. An ancient duke or earl, if he did something wrong, could go out and buy an indulgence, and his life style would go on the same without any kind of impact.

If you're rich, that's what the energy crisis means to you, but if you're poor, that's when you hurt. That's when you have to decide whether you're going to pay for gas or for heating or simply for food. That's who gets hurt the most. Eleven percent of a rich person's income goes for energy consumption. For anyone at the poverty level, 50 percent goes for energy consumption.

This country has the ability of solving that problem. Think of all the great inventions this country has done. In 1784, we came up with bifocals; in 1805, refrigerators; in 1849, the safety pin; 1867 was a great year because this country came up with the typewriter, barbed wire and toilet paper all in one particular year. And we can't come up with a solution to this problem?

We can if we, once again, unlock the potential within every American and offer them options and then give them rewards for those options.

England had no idea in the 1700s of how to chart the ocean, so they asked for a competition, for somebody to come up with the answer. In 1714, a clock maker came up with the system of longitude and latitude that we are still using today. Napoleon didn't know how to feed his troops. He came up with a competition, and in 1810, the concept of vacuum packing that we use today was developed. Even Lindbergh, when he flew across the Atlantic, was responding to a competition established by a newspaper.

All we need to do is unlock the potential of Americans. We have the potential. We need to have options. We need simply to have the government take the cap off the medicine so America can grow. If we do that, we can solve our energy problems. We can have energy solutions into the future, and we can solve our budget problems all at the same time. They are interrelated, and this is where America simply needs to ask their government to take the cap off.

Let us grow. Let us succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your patience, and I appreciate the time. I yield back.

THE GREAT ECONOMIC HOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NYE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to address what is one of the major issues that is now confronting the country. We have the problem of digging out from under the great economic hole in which we find ourselves, not just here but worldwide, but as we do that, it is important that we take steps to make it much less likely that we'll be in such a difficult spot again. It's a hard thing to do simultaneously—to recover from a serious problem and also to prevent its occurrence.

□ 2100

I want to talk today about what we have to do to prevent its recurrence. Now, obviously, to prevent its recurrence, you need to have some sense of what caused the problems. There are two competing theories. The one that I believe, that the President believes, that he is in Europe today discussing—and which a wide variety of European thinkers somewhat inaccurately said today on the floor from the other side, It was the socialists in Europe who were pushing the President. Well, those socialists were primarily the conservative Christian democratic Chancellor of Germany and the conservative Gaullist President of France. They are the ones who were saying we have to come together and improve financial regulation.

In England, when I became the chairman-in-waiting in 2006 after that election, I was told that we in America should emulate Great Britain. I was told this by conservatives, by people in the financial industry. Great Britain, we were told, had the financial services authority that used the light touch when they regulated.

The head of the financial services authority recently announced the era of light touch, of soft touch regulation is over. That bastion of regulatory flexibility now says we erred with too little regulation. Unregulated credit default

swaps. Cauterized debt obligations. Financial entities largely unregulated taking on far more debt than they could pay is a major cause of the problem.

Now, how do we get there? There is to some extent agreement on one particular aspect of this. And that is that it was the proliferation of subprime mortgages to people who could not repay them that was at the root of the problem. The mortgage loans were made to people who couldn't repay them by people who did not expect to be repaid because they were selling that right. They were securitizing them.

And other sophisticated financial institutions then took these badly made loans and rocketed them around the world through sophisticated financial investments. And there is a great agreement that that is the root cause of the problem.

But what caused the cause is disputed.

Now, there is a conservative view that says, You know what happened? It was the liberals, the Democrats. There they went again trying to help poor people, and they forced these poor institutions, these vulnerable lenders, into making bad loans.

Now, we have seen a proliferation, a coordinated proliferation of that argument. It was trying to help poor people that did it. Some of the poor people were black and Hispanic, others—a majority of them, this being the United States with our ethnic composition—were white. But that's what's getting blamed, and it's in a coordinated way.

The talk show hosts, Vice President Cheney said that in his last interview, Mr. Rove has been arguing that. It is fairly coordinated.

Now, I do not argue that we are facing a vast right-wing conspiracy. What we are dealing with is something, however, equally troubling. It is crass right-wing mendacity. It is systematic dishonesty, lying, distortions, misrepresentations, bad history being promulgated.

Now, I speak as one of the Democrats who's learned our lesson. For too long we acted as if inherent implausibility was self-refuting. A man I admire greatly, John Kerry, a war hero, was victimized in 2004 because for too long he delayed fighting back the inherently implausible charge that he had not distinguished himself in battle. The Swift-boating of John Kerry was a terrible moment in American history, and his decency, his belief in fairness, held him back for a bit. He fought back, but it was later than it should have been.

We've had earlier examples of that. We're seeing it now. We are seeing a concerted right-wing effort to misrepresent the facts to avoid a result they don't want. The result is regulation. The result is that this country will do what it has done at least twice before.

We have a situation in which significant financial innovation in this country, beginning about 20 years ago or so, transformed mortgage lending. Mortgage lending used to be a matter of you going into your community bank—and by the way, among the victims of this whole operation have been the community banks. The community banks who have been no part of the problem but get the criticisms on an undifferentiated way and some of the burden. And we on the Financial Services Committee are determined to do everything we can to shelter them from that kind of unfair denunciation and excessive regulatory burden.

But what we had was a proliferation of lending now outside of the banks. Non-banks were able to lend because of liquidity in the world. You didn't have to go to depositors. If you get money from depositors, you're regulators. If you get money from pools of liquidity from Asia, from oil people in the Middle East, from elsewhere, you do not have to face that regulation.

The other thing, of course, that happened was securitization. Thirty years ago people who got a mortgage were getting it from someone who expected it to be repaid by the borrower, and they were careful about the borrower. Increasingly, loans were made by people who did not expect to be repaid by that borrower but who were going to package the loans and sell them to other people. And the discipline of a direct lender-borrower relationship eroded.

Then the sophisticated collateralized debt obligation derivatives and credit default swaps came in and took loans that should never have been made in the first place and sent them around.

The problem is that there were no regulations, insufficient regulation. In the lending process, virtually no regulation in the process by which the bad loans were packaged and sent around the world.

So our job today is to do what Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson did: address innovations in the private sector. And we are a private sector country fortunately, and it is the private sector that creates wealth. But in periods of great innovation by definition there are no rules, no regulations. So you get a great deal of productive activity and you get some abuses. And the job of a sensible public policy is try to restrain the abuses while getting the benefit of the innovation.

Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson did that. They did antitrust laws, they did the Federal Trade Commission. And the contemporary version of today's right-wing ideology said, Oh, my God. You're going to ruin everything. They were bitterly opposed to Theodore Roosevelt and his trust busting.

And when the stock market became important as a consequence of the large industrial enterprises becoming the basis of the economy to a great extent, Franklin Roosevelt did the same thing with the stock market. And if you want to read complaints similar to today's laments that regulation will ruin the economy and throttle competitiveness, go to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 1930s and read what they had to say about the Securities and Exchange Commission. That's our job today. That's what we want to do. We want to put rules in place that allow us to get the benefit of innovations, the benefit of securitization, but without the abuses.

The economic fundamentalists feel threatened by this. The consequences of their deregulatory policy—which had been successful in America for far too long—are devastating, and they understand that the American people are unhappy with that and plan to impose regulation. And they are as opposed today as they were against Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson and against Franklin Roosevelt who said, ''The economic royalists hate me, and I welcome their hate because they know I am a threat to them.''

We are a threat to the abusers, and by the way, Mr. Speaker, good rules are pro-market. Franklin Roosevelt made it possible for people to invest with confidence when he created the SEC. He created a situation in which you could have mutual funds with the Investment Company Act. We suffer today from people who will not invest because of their fears of abuse, and creating a set of rules that give comfort to investors will get this economy functioning again, get the credit markets functioning again.

All right, what do the conservatives say? First of all, you made us lend money to poor people. It was the Community Reinvestment Act. I will insert in the RECORD the article from October 12 from the McCarthy newspapers, Messrs. Goldstein and Hall about that myth. And we will do a Special Order later on it.

[From McClatchy Newspapers, Oct. 12, 2008]

PRIVATE SECTOR LOANS, NOT FANNIE OR FREDDIE, TRIGGERED CRISIS

(By David Goldstein and Kevin G. Hall)

Washington.—As the economy worsens and Election Day approaches, a conservative campaign that blames the global financial crisis on a government push to make housing more affordable to lower-class Americans has taken off on talk radio and e-mail.

Commentators say that's what triggered the stock market meltdown and the freeze on credit. They've specifically targeted the mortgage finance giants Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which the federal government seized on Sept. 6, contending that lending to poor and minority Americans caused Fannie's and Freddie's financial problems.

Federal housing data reveal that the charges aren't true, and that the private sector, not the government or government-backed companies, was behind the soaring subprime lending at the core of the crisis.

Subprime lending offered high-cost loans to the weakest borrowers during the housing boom that lasted from 2001 to 2007. Subprime lending was at its height from 2004 to 2006.

Federal Reserve Board data show that: More than 84 percent of the subprime mortgages in 2006 were issued by private lending institutions; private firms made nearly 83 percent of the subprime loans to low- and moderate-income borrowers that year; Only

one of the top 25 subprime lenders in 2006 was directly subject to the housing law that's being lambasted by conservative critics.

The ''turmoil in financial markets clearly was triggered by a dramatic weakening of underwriting standards for U.S. subprime mortgages, beginning in late 2004 and extending into 2007,'' the President's Working Group on Financial Markets reported Friday.

Conservative critics claim that the Clinton administration pushed Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to make home ownership more available to riskier borrowers with little concern for their ability to pay the mortgages.

''I don't remember a clarion call that said Fannie and Freddie are a disaster. Loaning to minorities and risky folks is a disaster,'' said Neil Cavuto of Fox News.

Fannie, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and Freddie, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp., don't lend money, to minorities or anyone else, however. They purchase loans from the private lenders who actually underwrite the loans.

It's a process called securitization, and by passing on the loans, banks have more capital on hand so they can lend even more.

This much is true. In an effort to promote affordable home ownership for minorities and rural whites, the Department of Housing and Urban Development set targets for Fannie and Freddie in 1992 to purchase low-income loans for sale into the secondary market that eventually reached this number: 52 percent of loans given to low-to moderate-income families.

To be sure, encouraging lower-income Americans to become homeowners gave unsophisticated borrowers and unscrupulous lenders and mortgage brokers more chances to turn dreams of homeownership into nightmares.

But these loans, and those to low- and moderate-income families represent a small portion of overall lending. And at the height of the housing boom in 2005 and 2006, Republicans and their party's standard bearer, President Bush, didn't criticize any sort of lending, frequently boasting that they were presiding over the highest-ever rates of U.S. homeownership.

Between 2004 and 2006, when subprime lending was exploding, Fannie and Freddie went from holding a high of 48 percent of the subprime loans that were sold into the secondary market to holding about 24 percent, according to data from Inside Mortgage Finance, a specialty publication. One reason is that Fannie and Freddie were subject to tougher standards than many of the unregulated players in the private sector who weakened lending standards, most of whom have gone bankrupt or are now in deep trouble.

During those same explosive three years, private investment banks—not Fannie and Freddie—dominated the mortgage loans that were packaged and sold into the secondary mortgage market. In 2005 and 2006, the private sector securitized almost two thirds of all U.S. mortgages, supplanting Fannie and Freddie, according to a number of specialty publications that track this data.

In 1999, the year many critics charge that the Clinton administration pressured Fannie and Freddie, the private sector sold into the secondary market just 18 percent of all mortgages.

Fueled by low interest rates and cheap credit, home prices between 2001 and 2007 galloped beyond anything ever seen, and that fueled demand for mortgage-backed securities, the technical term for mortgages that are sold to a company, usually an investment bank, which then pools and sells them into the secondary mortgage market.

About 70 percent of all U.S. mortgages are in this secondary mortgage market, according to the Federal Reserve.

Conservative critics also blame the subprime lending mess on the Community Reinvestment Act, a 31-year-old law aimed at freeing credit for underserved neighborhoods.

Congress created the CRA in 1977 to reverse years of redlining and other restrictive banking practices that locked the poor, and especially minorities, out of homeownership and the tax breaks and wealth creation it affords. The CRA requires federally regulated and insured financial institutions to show that they're lending and investing in their communities.

Conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer wrote recently that while the goal of the CRA was admirable, ''it led to tremendous pressure on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—who in turn pressured banks and other lenders—to extend mortgages to people who were borrowing over their heads. That's called subprime lending. It lies at the root of our current calamity.''

Fannie and Freddie, however, didn't pressure lenders to sell them more loans; they struggled to keep pace with their private sector competitors. In fact, their regulator, the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, imposed new restrictions in 2006 that led to Fannie and Freddie losing even more market share in the booming subprime market.

What's more, only commercial banks and thrifts must follow CRA rules. The investment banks don't, nor did the now-bankrupt non-bank lenders such as New Century Financial Corp. and Ameriquest that underwrote most of the subprime loans.

These private non-bank lenders enjoyed a regulatory gap, allowing them to be regulated by 5o different state banking supervisors instead of the federal government. And mortgage brokers, who also weren't subject to federal regulation or the CRA, originated most of the subprime loans.

In a speech last March, Janet Yellen, the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, debunked the notion that the push for affordable housing created today's problems.

''Most of the loans made by depository institutions examined under the CRA have not been higher-priced loans,'' she said. ''The CRA has increased the volume of responsible lending to low- and moderate-income households.''

In a book on the sub-prime lending collapse published in June 2007, the late Federal Reserve Governor Ed Gramlich wrote that only one-third of all CRA loans had interest rates high enough to be considered sub-prime and that to the pleasant surprise of commercial banks there were low default rates. Banks that participated in CRA lending had found, he wrote, ''that this new lending is good business.''

[From the Financial Times, Sept. 9, 2008]

OXLEY HITS BACK AT IDEOLOGUES

(By Greg Farrell in New York)

In the aftermath of the US Treasury's decision to seize control of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, critics have hit at lax oversight of the mortgage companies.

The dominant theme has been that Congress let the two government-sponsored enterprises morph into a creature that eventually threatened the US financial system. Mike Oxley will have none of it.

Instead, the Ohio Republican who headed the House financial services committee until his retirement after mid-term elections last year, blames the mess on ideologues within the White House as well as Alan Greenspan, former chairman of the Federal Reserve.

The critics have forgotten that the House passed a GSE reform bill in 2005 that could well have prevented the current crisis, says Mr Oxley, now vice-chairman of Nasdaq.

He fumes about the criticism of his House colleagues. ''All the handwringing and bedwetting is going on without remembering how the House stepped up on this,'' he says. ''What did we get from the White House? We got a one-finger salute.''

The House bill, the 2005 Federal Housing Finance Reform Act, would have created a stronger regulator with new powers to increase capital at Fannie and Freddie, to limit their portfolios and to deal with the possibility of receivership.

Mr Oxley reached out to Barney Frank, then the ranking Democrat on the committee and now its chairman, to secure support on the other side of the aisle. But after winning bipartisan support in the House, where the bill passed by 331 to 90 votes, the legislation lacked a champion in the Senate and faced hostility from the Bush administration.

Adamant that the only solution to the problems posed by Fannie and Freddie was their privatisation, the White House attacked the bill. Mr Greenspan also weighed in, saying that the House legislation was worse than no bill at all.

''We missed a golden opportunity that would have avoided a lot of the problems we're facing now, if we hadn't had such a firm ideological position at the White House and the Treasury and the Fed,'' Mr Oxley says.

When Hank Paulson joined the administration as Treasury secretary in 2006 he sent emissaries to Capitol Hill to explore the possibility of reaching a compromise, but to no avail.

Very simple. The Community Reinvestment Act covers banks, not mortgage finance companies, not all of these other entities, not Fannie Mae, not Freddie Mac, not Goldman Sacs, not Merrill Lynch, not the hedge funds. If mortgage loans had only been made by institutions covered by the Community Reinvestment Act, there would be no crisis. These are the community banks that do not deserve to be falsely blamed. They're not all crazy about the Community Reinvestment Act. But it is not, by any means, the source of this problem.

Most of the bad loans that were made were made by institutions not covered by the Community Reinvestment Act. The article I just quoted says only 1 of the top 25 subprime lenders in 2006 was directly subject to the CRA.

Well, then, they say okay—by the way, to their credit, every regulator in the Bush administration at the Federal Reserve, at the FDIC, at the controller of the currency, repudiates the notion that the Community Reinvestment Act caused this. Literally, no competent bank regulator believes that for a minute because they know, as regulators, they would not have allowed this.

Well, then, the next argument is it was Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And I will say I am personally involved here because my conservative colleagues have done me the compliment of impugning to me powers I never thought I had.

Now, here is the legislative record of the Republican Congress during the 12 years that this—the Republicans controlled Congress for 12 years. Here are

the legislative records of 12 years of Republican control. Legislation upon bad subprime lending: zero. This is a very energy-efficient chart. You can use the chart for both issues.

Legislation to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac passed while the Republicans were in power from 1995–2006: zero. Now, one of the arguments—okay, they can't deny the facts.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will someone tell the gentleman from Iowa I will begin yielding after a certain amount of time. I want to get the complete argument out. I will yield some time and I will say more than that.

I look forward to when we return to debate—these things get too one-sided. Let's each take out an hour and we will share the hours and go back and forth in debates.

But that's irrefutable. Zero. Republicans in control of Congress, no legislation adopted to ban subprime lending or to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Now why is that the case? Well, one argument is that I wouldn't let them do that. Newt Gingrich and Tom DeLay apparently had a secret passion to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, but my secret hold kept them from doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I knew that. If I knew I could have stopped them from doing things, I wouldn't have let them impeach Bill Clinton.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I told the gentleman that I would not yield.

Mr. Speaker, will you please instruct the gentleman from Iowa, who I thought would have known better, that he has to be yielded to.

Mr. KING of Iowa. It's misstated facts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts controls the time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Please instruct the gentleman from Iowa if he asks me to yield and I say ''no,'' he's not allowed further to speak. Those are the basic rules of the House.

I said to the gentleman after a certain amount of time, I will yield. I am sorry he is upset by the fact that the Republican Party, of which he is a member, had a zero record of accomplishment during those 12 years in which they controlled it. I will allow debate and yielding later. People have spoken for hours on this without any interruption. I am going to speak for at least 40 minutes without interruption and I will then yield.

So I will instruct the gentleman the rules of the House do not allow him to interrupt without permission. I do not interrupt people without permission, neither may he.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I hope the people will stick around, and I will yield to the gentleman when I have the time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will you please instruct the gentleman of the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts controls the time and does not wish to yield at this time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. As I said before the gentleman from Iowa tried to divert attention from it, zero legislation adopted by the Republican.

The argument again is Newt Gingrich and Tom DeLay wanted to do it. They overcame my objection to have a war in Iraq—that I thought was a terrible mistake—to cut taxes to very wealthy people, to intervene in the Terry Shiavo case, to do other things that I thought were unwise.

But I kept them from regulating Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Well, I wish I did have that power. I was the minority member of the Committee on Financial Services who had jurisdiction. It was then called the Committee on Banking. In 2003, I did become the senior member, the minority leader.

In the Republican House, the minority leader did not have a great deal of power. The Republicans had the power.

And so here's what happened. It is true that in 2003, the chairman of the committee, Mr. Oxley, decided to try to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. He scheduled a vote on the bill, the Republican chairman on the committee, Mr. Oxley. Let me read from a CBS report October 7, 2003.

□ 2115

Strong opposition by the Bush administration forced a top Republican Congressman to delay a vote on the bill that would create a new regulation for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Let me quote from the Washington Post on October 8. The Bush administration is at odds with the Republican-controlled House Financial Services Committee over legislation to impose tougher oversight over Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The dispute dims prospects for quick passage of the bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, apparently I not only had the power to stop the Republican Party; I had a secret power over the minds of men, as the old radio serial used to say, and I managed to get Bush and the Republicans in the Congress to fight with each other. Boy, I wish I'd have known that at the time. There was a lot of damage I could have avoided. So the bill did not pass that year because the Bush administration stopped it because Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Abernathy denounced the Republican bill.

Now, it is true in 2003 I did say at a hearing that I did not think Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac faced a crisis. I did not think they did at the time. I didn't think Wachovia did at the time. I didn't think Merrill Lynch faced one at the time, or AIG or a number of other financial institutions that have failed even more spectacularly than Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. That didn't mean I wasn't for some regulation. I didn't think they faced a crisis.

But I changed my mind a year later because, in 2004, as is made clear in an excellent book by Mark Zandi—Mr. Zandi is one of our best economists. He's level-headed. He's advised President Obama. He's advised JOHN MCCAIN. He wrote a book called ''Financial Shock: A Look at the Sub-Prime Mortgage Implosion.''

And here's what he said happened. He said, Clinton started on homeownership for low-income people. President Bush readily took up the baton at the start of his administration. Owning a home became one pillar of his ownership society. To reinforce this effort, the Bush administration—once again, it's my secret power at work—put substantial pressure on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to increase their funding of mortgage loans to lower income groups.

So, yes, I didn't think they were in crisis in 2003. In 2004, the Bush administration, according to Mr. Zandi's book, put pressure on them to increase this.

OFHEO, the Bush-controlled regulator, set aggressive goals for the two giant institutions. By the time of the subprime financial shock, both had become sizeable buyers of these securities.

Now, I didn't think that was a good idea. Let me quote from the Bloomberg News Service, Mr. James Tyson. He used to cover financial news. This is from 2004, June 17. As Mr. Zandi noted, it was the Bush administration that pushed Fannie and Freddie, a year after I said they weren't in crisis.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would suffer financially under a Bush administration requirement that they channel more mortgage financing to people with low incomes, said the senior Democrat on the congressional panel that sets regulations. That was me. I was by then the senior Democrat, still in the minority. The rule compelled the companies to put 57 percent of their financing towards homes for people with incomes no greater than the median income. The White House could do some harm if you don't refine the goals, said Representative BARNEY FRANK. FRANK'S comments echo concerns that the new goals will undermine profits and put new homeowners into dwellings they can't afford.

Yes, I thought this was a bad idea. I didn't think giving people loans that they couldn't pay back was a good idea. It wasn't we, Democrats and liberals, who were pushing loans to low-income people. It was, as Mr. Zandi said, as Bloomberg said, the Bush administration because they wanted homeownership. By the way, that was part of an overall policy in which they cut funding for affordable rental housing.

And throughout, my difference with them has been I wanted affordable rental housing. Yes, in that 2003 quote I said I was worried that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would cut back on affordable housing, and in our language that we use in the housing area, affordable housing is rental housing. I tried

to get Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac not to buy bad subprime mortgages but, if they had profits, to put some of them into affordable rental housing.

So, yes, in 2004, I got worried that they were, as Mr. Zandi said, as the Bloomberg News said, putting people into low-income housing. Around that time, I had a discussion with Alphonso Jackson, the Bush Secretary of HUD. He said he wanted to cut people off the rental housing assistance program after 5 years, the section 8 program whereby you help people rent housing. He said, What do you think? I said, Well, if you can stop them from being poor after 5 years that would be perfectly sensible. He said, No, no, be serious. Why aren't you for it? I said, Mr. Secretary, what will happen to some of these people who can't afford to rent if you cut off their rent supplement after 5 years? He said, I will help them become homeowners.

This was the Bush social policy. This was their compassionate conservatism. They were the ones pushing this, not CRA because it wasn't the banks doing it. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were doing it at the orders of the Bush administration.

So, in 2005, I did agree now, given this, that it was time to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and I joined Mr. Oxley, the chairman of the committee who tried to do it in 2003 and was stopped by the Bush administration, and in 2005, Mr. Oxley began again a bill to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

It passed the Committee on Financial Services, of which I was the senior Democrat still, by 65–5. That was the bill Mr. Oxley put out. Five Republicans voted against it. They were on the Bush side; it didn't go far enough. But 28 Republicans voted for it, with all the Democrats. So 65–5. The bill passed the House in 2005 to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. It's been argued that, oh, yeah, but the bill was too weak because at the markup session, the committee vote, Democrats blocked good amendments.

Let me be very clear. Let me check the record. I have the record here. I'm going to put it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No amendment at that session on the committee vote which received a majority of Republican votes was defeated. Some Republicans were defeated, but they had a minority of Republican votes. A majority of Republicans carried the day on every vote.

There were two efforts to try and tighten it. They were both defeated against the chairman's wishes, with a majority of Republicans against them on both sides.

I'll yield later on. I will put that in there. I will yield to the gentleman to clarify that.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I would like to ask you about that. I'm listening to what you are saying, if I could.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman may—I will yield briefly.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I'm thinking back. If you're referencing the time when—actually, I think I had one of those amendments, if I'm not mistaken. I know one of the amendments I made and I withdrew, and then I made some other amendments, and I think ED ROYCE and I'm trying to think. There was a whole series of amendments.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I have the amendments. I'll read them. I'm sorry, I'm not going to waste time. I'm sorry, we don't have time, but I'm not going to give up my scarce time while the gentleman wanders through memory lane. I am sorry, I take back my time. I'll read the amendment. I'll look for the amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT.

An amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. GARRETT, number 1R, was withdrawn. We go down. An amendment was offered by Mr. PAUL. It was defeated 14–56. There were 37 Republicans on the committee. An amendment was offered by Mr. ROYCE. It was defeated, 17–53, 20 beat 17. Then we have the only one I see by Mr. GARRETT, who's asked me to yield, it was withdrawn. So Mr. GARRETT offered one amendment at that markup, and it was withdrawn.

I will put the record in there. I don't have further time to yield. If the gentleman wants to see if the record was incorrect, and at one point I quoted something about the gentleman that was incorrect and I apologize, but this one I have double-checked. So Mr. GARRETT offered one amendment, and it was withdrawn.

Amendments to strengthen the bill, to put some spine in Mr. Oxley, who the Republican administration thought too weak, the author of Sarbanes-Oxley, the coauthor, two Republican amendments taken a roll call, both defeated. A majority of Republicans defeated them, and then we went to the floor of the House on this—and I voted for the bill.

We went to floor of the House. We came to the Rules Committee, and Republicans then in the Rules Committee did something outrageously procedurally. We had in there a provision that said some of the money from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac profits would go, if they had the profits, to rental housing, not subprime mortgages, to rental housing, and it would go through organizations. Conservative Republicans said, oh, no, some of these organizations are nefarious, you can't be giving money to some of these organizations; you better give only to housing groups; if you give it to a multipurpose organization, bad things will happen.

So they put an amendment in that had not been offered in committee and did not allow a vote on it on the floor. It was a self-executing rule as they call it. A self-executing rule is what you call it when you jam it in and don't let people vote on it. This was the Republicans in the Rules Committee. Mr. Oxley was not in favor of it, but he had to be a good soldier.

It said no organization could get any money to build this rental housing if housing wasn't their prime goal, and we heard from some of those radical organizations who were upset. I remember particularly the Catholic Church, which does a very good job of building affordable housing. I work very closely with the Catholic Church and they do excellent work in the Archdiocese of Boston, the Diocese of Fall River, Arlene McMame and Lisa Alberghini, two wonderful women working under our cardinal and our bishop in this regard.

And the Catholic Church said, you know, it says we can't get any money unless housing is our main purpose. Now, we care a lot about housing, but God has to be our main purpose. So the Catholic Church apologized for the fact that they could not claim for the purpose of getting money that their main purpose was to build housing. They would have been excluded. I was angry about that, and so when the bill passed the House I voted against it. I still wanted the bill to be passed without that.

But the point is this. 2003, Republicans in power, no bill is offered. So it's apparently my fault that the Republicans, since they were fighting each other, wouldn't offer the bill.

In 2005, it is offered, and unlike the gentleman from New Jersey, I joined the chairman of the committee and a great majority of the Republicans, 32 of the 37 Republicans, to bring the bill to the floor. I didn't vote for it on the floor because I didn't like the housing piece, but it got 300 votes on the floor of the House, and it was about to go to the Senate.

At that point, according to Mr. Oxley, once again the Bush administration intervened to kill it. And Mr. Oxley said—I hope it's late enough in some parts of the country for me to quote Mr. Oxley—in his interview in the Financial Times, he said the ideologues at the White House blocked this regulatory bill that would have improved regulation that was voted on by 300 Members of the House, by a 10:1 ratio in the committee, by an overwhelming majority of Republicans in both bodies. He said the administration ideologues gave him the one-finger salute, which I will not illustrate on the floor of the House given propriety.

So, once again, it was blocked by them. I was supportive of Oxley in committee. I wanted a bill that created the housing thing. It got 300 votes on the floor. Did I stop it?

What happened was, it went to the Senate, and then the Republican free-for-all multiplied. It went to the Senate, and the Republican Senate voted the bill out by one vote, but it never went to the floor, and you had a three-way dispute: the Senate Republican chairman, Mr. SHELBY; the House Republican chairman, Mr. Oxley; the President of the United States. The Secretary of the Treasury actually sided with Mr. Oxley, he said.

That's why we got no Fannie Mae bill. That's the history. By now the clock runs out on them. We passed the bill in 2005 in the House. I voted ''no,'' but I was prepared to vote for it with an amendment that did not affect the regulatory structure. Goes to the Senate and dies. The Republicans killed it.

I certainly don't think I had the power to stop anything from happening in a Republican House, but the notion that I have a secret power over the Republican Senate is bizarre even by the standards of the myth-makers who have gotten into this effort.

2007 comes, and I'm told, oh, I'm responsible. In fact, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN)—and I checked the record by the way, and Mr. AKIN, there is zero record of Mr. AKIN showing any interest in Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac, filing a bill, making a statement, until the Democrats took power. So my Republican friends, it's kind of like in the bar, the guy who's all ready for the fight as long as the other guy isn't there. When the other guy was there, they were very meek and mild.

Mr. AKIN said, Well, I was chairman of the committee when the collapse came; do I take any responsibility? No, not for that, because I tried to work with Mr. Oxley in 2005 to pass a bill over what he called the Bush ideologues who blocked him. And in 2007, I became chairman of the committee on January 31.

On March 28, the committee passed a bill that improved the regulation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in a way that was tougher than the Oxley bill of 2005. In fact, the Bush administration that thought that the Oxley bill was too weak approved our bill. They said it was the right way to do it. It was the right form of regulation.

In fact, Richard Baker, who unlike many of the Republicans who now are full of fight, was a leader in an effort to restrain Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, was quoted at the time as saying Mr. Baker had been the leader in this and here's what he had to say, talking about the bill. Here's a quote from Politico: BARNEY FRANK had witnessed Baker's battles as ranking member of the House Financial Services Committee. When he became chairman this year, he moved swiftly and pushed the bill through the Chamber in May with a 314–104 vote. The Frank legislation is significantly tougher than the one Fannie and Freddie fought so bitterly in 2000, an irony that pleases Baker. And the gentleman, our former colleague says, With every iteration—it, the bill I sponsored—it got stronger. It's to the point where I didn't know what else there was to put in it.

And then there's a group called FM Focus. They were formed to be a critical block that sought regulation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Here's what they said in Congressional Quarterly. The chief lobbyist was asked, were any other Democrats helpful? Here it is.

□ 2130

Here's what the chief lobbyist for the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac group said: ''The Senate Banking Committee passed a very good bill in 2004.'' It never got to the Senate floor. That was under the Republicans. There I go again stopping the Senate Republicans from bringing their own bill to the floor.

The Senate Republicans had a bill. Never came to the floor of the Senate when I was in the Democratic minority in the House. Then the House introduced a bill, which it passed, but we couldn't get it to the floor of the Senate.

''Then, after the 2006 election, when everyone thought FM policy focus issues would be tough sledding with Democrats in the majority, Barney Frank as the new chairman of the House Financial Services Committee stepped up and said, 'I'm convinced we need to do something. He sat down with Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson and, frankly, upset people in the Senate and Republicans in the House.'' Because they wanted an issue to complain about. They didn't want to see a solution.

''They came up with a bill that was excellent—and it was the bill that largely becomes law, and they were able to be phased out.''

So let me just summarize on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The Republicans do nothing to pass a bill in their 12 years in power. 2003, Mike Oxley tries to pass one. The Bush administration called it off by pressuring him.

2005, he gets one passed in the House. The Bush administration denounces, he denounces them, and the Senate doesn't pass it. 2007, when I became chairman, we passed it. So I don't think I apologize for this.

Unfortunately, Senate deadlock again occurred this time with the Democrats in a 2-vote majority, but it has a happier ending because the Democrats in the Senate ultimately did pass the bill.

In January of 2008, worried that the Bush policy of pushing them into too many subprime loans, which I document starting in 2004, I appealed to Secretary Paulson, who will acknowledge this, when we did the economic stimulus bill, and said, please, would you put the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac regulatory bill which you like into the stimulus. It also had an affordable housing trust fund.

So the right wing didn't like it. They didn't like the idea of helping build affordable rental housing. But building affordable rental housing avoided the problem of bad subprime mortgages. That was the solution I always worked for. And Mr. Paulson basically said, I'd like to do it, but I've got conservatives here who won't let me.

So we could have had that in the stimulus in 2008. It didn't finally pass until July of 2008. By that time, it was too late to avoid the disaster with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. But if I had been successful, we would have passed it in 2005, myself, working as a junior member of a coalition with Mike Oxley. We would have passed it in 2007 if the Senate had been able to do it. So that's the story of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

So it is the Republicans' fault because they ran the House and the Senate and the Presidency that we didn't get passage of a Fannie Mae-Freddie Mac bill until the Democrats came back to power. It's indisputable. Republican President, Republican House, Republican Senate. No bill.

Democrats take over. We get a bill through the House in 1 year. Unfortunately, a year later we have to wait before we get it through the Senate.

But when my Republican friends think about it, I don't want them to feel too bad—on this issue—because while they were clearly the ones who were responsible for no regulation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, I don't think it had as much negative impact as they think. I think the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac collapse was as much an effect as a cause of the subprime crisis. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac did not originate mortgages. That's not their goal. They bought mortgages made by other people. If people hadn't made those bad mortgages in the first place, there wouldn't have been any. So were a lot of others in the private sector.

And that's where the real blame lies. Blame lies with Republican policies that resisted our efforts to restrict inappropriate subprime loans. This is the crux of it. Bad subprime loans were the root of this—and there could not be a clear partisan divide on the issue. Again, I would urge people to read Mark Zandi's book.

In 1994, the last time the Democrats had a majority before 2007, my predecessor, an excellent consumer fighter from the State of New York, helped pass a bill called HOEPA, Home Ownership Equity Protection Act. It said to the Federal Reserve: Regulate subprime loans. Remember, the problem I mentioned before is that we got a new form of lending that went outside the banks and went to the mortgage finance companies and they weren't regulated.

So the Democratic Congress said: Mr. Greenspan, regulate them. Mr. Greenspan said explicitly: No. In fact, Mr. Zandi, a man who's been an advisor to John McCain, headlines on page 152 of his book on the Financial Shock, a subchapter headlined: Greenspan's Regulatory Failure.

Mr. Greenspan acknowledges much before the Government Reform Committee this year. By the way, another one of those who has said that we were secretly behind this, who was a member of the Republican Party and did nothing in the House to stop this was the gentleman from California, Mr. ISSA. He was a member of the Government Reform Committee for many of these years. They did nothing about

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac until Mr. WAXMAN took over and got into it during the first Congress among Democrats.

But Mr. Greenspan refused to do that in 1994. Many pressed him to do it. He refused. In 2004, when the Bush administration began pushing harder for subprime loans, many of us became concerned.

Here's what Mr. Zandi says again. ''A group in North Carolina was particularly concerned about that,'' the Committee for Responsible Lending, ''working with two of their very effective and thoughtful members''—members of our Financial Services Committee, Mr. WATT and Mr. MILLER—''they sought to get legislation enacted that would prevent this sort of abuse.''

We began conversations. I was then the senior Democrat still on the committee. The Republican chair of the committee that had jurisdiction on Housing was the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BACHUS, now the ranking member, the minority member.

And I will do him a favor—I will not impute to him the secret powers imputed to me. I don't blame Mr. BACHUS for what we do or don't do. We're the majority and we will take the responsibility. It's the Republicans who won't take the responsibility for their zero batting average for 12 years when we were in the minority.

But we sought, as Mr. Zandi documents, to pass legislation to restrict subprime lending. Alan Greenspan would use his authority, so we tried to do it. And the problem is that the Republican philosophy that ruled of no regulation knocked it out of the box.

I think Mr. BACHUS was serious. Mr. DeLay was even more serious. He didn't want it. We were in negotiations. Now the gentleman from Alabama was chair of the subcommittee. He could have, any time, called a markup, brought a bill out. We thought his bill would have been strong enough. He could have outvoted us. Republicans often did that when they were in the majority, as we often do today.

But here is what Mr. Zandi said: ''Democrats in Congress were worried about increasing evidence of predatory lending. The Bush administration and most Democrats wanted a Federal equivalent to the North Carolina law to cover all lenders, not just the banks. The Bush administration and most Republicans in Congress,'' who were in the majority, ''were opposed, believing legislation would overly restrict lending and thus slow the march of home ownership.

''The last attempt to pass antipredatory lending legislation occurred in 2005, but it was also stymied by the Republican leadership.''

So here's where the Republicans failure is. They pushed for greater home ownership among low-income people—not CRA, the Republicans, because this was their philosophy. This was their social program as opposed to rental housing, much more appropriate for low-income people. And then they blocked our efforts to regulate it.

Once again, we had to wait until 2007. In 2007, when the Democrats became the majority, we did pass legislation to block inappropriate subprime lending, predator lending. We got the bill through the House. This time, we weren't able to get it through the Senate but we did have some success because the Federal Reserve under Mr. Bernanke has been a much more responsive institution to these kind of problems than Mr. Greenspan. I thought Mr. Greenspan did a good job in macroeconomic policy. But he was lousy because of his ideological opposition to any kind of regulation.

Mr. Bernanke used the authority in 2007—after we even moved on our legislation—he used the authority Mr. Greenspan wouldn't use and promulgated rules to ban subprime lending. I don't think they go quite far enough, and they should be statutory.

So we will get a test, Mr. Speaker, because when we return from the break, the Committee on Financial Services will bring out a tough bill to put rules on all subprime lending. Essentially, we're going to use our community banks as a model—these well-run institutions. We're going to take the rules they have long used and apply them to all loans to prevent the bad subprime loans.

The last time we did that, two-thirds of the Republicans voted against it. In fact, we were opposed by the Wall Street Journal.

I do think the Wall Street Journal's role here deserves some coverage. The Wall Street Journal has been one of those in this dishonest, anti-historical efforts to blame the Democrats. In particular, they had an editorial recently which said I was pushing for people to get subprime loans. Exactly the opposite is the case. And I wrote a letter, by the way, documenting that, and it could not be printed.

I have to say this. I respect the press, but the people who write the Wall Street Journal editorials in this, Mr. Paul Gigot and Mr. Stephen Moore, are cowards and liars. They print stuff that they know is wrong and will not give me the access to reprint. Fortunately, I have this access, and I'm going to put into the RECORD the letter I sent refuting it.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC, December 5, 2008.

EDITOR: I am used to having my views severely distorted by the Wall Street Journal Editorial Board—in contrast to the accurate representation that its reporters present. But the opening of the editorial on December 3rd doesn't distort—it gets the truth absolutely backwards. In short, the Journal's assertion that I have ''spent [my] career encouraging mortgage loans to people who can't repay them,'' is not only entirely inaccurate; it blames me for policies that the Journal has itself defended.

I have consistently argued that the push for homeownership that existed in the Clinton administration, but was significantly upgraded in the Bush administration, made the mistake of assuming that virtually all people could be homeowners. In contrast, I argued that the majority of low-income people should be aided by policies that promoted affordable rental housing.

For example, on February 18, 2002, at a hearing on the budget I said ''I am in favor of trying to help lower-income people get the advantages of homeownership . . . but almost by definition, the large majority of poor people are going to need rental housing.'' On March 6, 2004, the National Journal reported that ''When the FHA's plan to insure subprime loans was included in a Senate-passed appropriations bill, Frank . . . a staunch supporter of low-income housing, wrote a highly critical letter urging that the measure not be included . . . Not only had the House committee not examined . . . the proposal he said then, but the measure also offered no protection against lenders inappropriately steering people towards these high-cost loans. Nor did it offer safeguards to ensure that participants 'were fully suitable for homeownership.'

That same year, when the Bush administration insisted that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac raise the percentage of below-median income homeowner mortgages they bought, I was correctly quoted in a Bloomberg article on June 17th as saying that this would ''do some harm,'' and the writer noted that ''Frank's comments echo concerns . . . that the new goals will undermine profits and put new homeowners into dwellings they can't afford.''

It was a consistent series of statements like that on my part, and efforts to act on them—although these were often unsuccessful when I was in the minority—that led frequent Republican economic appointee and Wall Street Journal contributor Larry Lindsey to write in April of this year that ''Barney Frank is the only politician I know who has argued that we needed tighter rules that intentionally produce fewer homeowners and more renters. Politicians usually believe that homeownership rates should—must—go ever higher.''

In fact, I was one of the supporters in 1994 of the legislation that directed the Federal Reserve to restrict inappropriate mortgages at the subprime level, and I also lamented Alan Greenspan's refusal to implement this—a refusal which he in a forthright manner acknowledged recently was a grave error. When he refused to do this, I and others in Congress, mostly but not only Democrats, pushed for legislation to restrict subprime mortgages.

As Mark Zandi notes in his recent excellent study of the financial crisis, when ''the Bush administration put substantial pressure on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to increase their funding of mortgage loans to lower-income groups,'' I and other Democrats stepped up our efforts to pass legislation that banned the inappropriate loans that have led to the current crisis. In Zandi's words, ''Democrats in Congress worried about increasing evidence of predatory lending . . . and the Democrats wanted a federal (law) that would cover all lenders nationwide. The Bush administration and most Republicans in Congress were opposed, believing legislation would overly restrict lending and thus slow the march of homeownership . . . the last attempt to pass any predatory lending legislation occurred in 2005 but it was also stymied.''

In other words, I was consistently arguing against efforts to extend homeownership to people who could not afford it, and instead sought to increase rental housing. Indeed, as the Journal knows, one of their criticisms of my attitude towards Fannie and Freddie has

been my ultimately successful effort to create an affordable housing trust fund that takes money from Fannie and Freddie and puts it into rental housing.

In fact, Zandi's comment that the last effort to pass any predatory lending legislation was 2005 is correct as it applies to those years from 1995 until 2006 when the Republicans controlled Congress. However, when the Democrats achieved a majority in 2007, and I became Chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the first major piece of legislation the committee approved was a bill adopting the regulatory upgrade for Fannie and Freddie that had been strongly advocated by the Bush administration, but which it had been unable to get the Republican Congress to pass. Next, we moved on to anti-predatory lending legislation and succeeded later in 2007 in passing a bill that, had it been law earlier—when we were in the minority and unable to enact it—would have prevented most of the bad loans.

But, while the predatory lending bill passed by a large majority in the House, there were staunchly conservative advocates of unlimited homeownership who were critical. One prominent conservative voice lamented in November 2007 that I planned ''to hold a committee vote on the Mortgage Reform and Anti-predatory Lending Act that would impose new rules and financial penalties on subprime lenders while providing new lawsuit opportunities for distressed borrowers.'' In objecting to this legislation, this commentator defended the record of subprime lending, although conceding that there had been some ''lending excesses.'' Decrying the attacks on subprime lending, this statement said that ''For all the demonizing, about eighty percent of even subprime loans are being repaid on time and another ten percent are only thirty days behind. Most of these new homeowners are low-income families, often minorities, who would otherwise not have qualified for a mortgage. In the name of consumer protection, Mr. Frank's legislation will ensure that far fewer of these loans are issued in the future.''

Exactly. That was my intention then, and it was my intention years earlier when Republicans blocked it and carried out the spirit of these comments to allow fairly unregulated subprime lending. And of course the statement I have been quoting here is the Wall Street Journal Editorial of November 6, 2007.

BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman.

By the way, one response to their argument—this is my letter—that I was pushing for subprime loans—they said that I was the one who was always trying to push subprime loans. Here's a quote from Larry Lindsey. Mr. Lindsey was an advisor to Ronald Reagan and to both Presidents Bush. He was fired by the most recent President Bush because he predicted that the war in Iraq would cost $100 billion, and he was told that was wrong. He was wrong. It was way too low. That's not why they fired him.

Here's what Larry Lindsey wrote in the Wall Street Journal, all places, on April 2, 2008, talking about regulation. ''In fact, Representative Barney Frank is the only politician I know who has argued that we need tighter rules that intentionally produce fewer homeowners and more renters. Politicians usually believe that homeownership rates should—must—go even higher. The rarity of Mr. Frank's thinking is a reminder that when markets are committing excesses, we should not except Washington actors to check on them.''

The Wall Street Journal, as I said, lies about this. In fact, in 2007, when we passed a bill over the objection of most Republicans, although we had the support of the then ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, although I understand he got in a lot of trouble with his right wing over this and promised maybe never to do it again. We'll see when this comes up.

But here's what the Wall Street Journal editorial said when we passed a bill to stop abusive subprime lending. ''For all the demonizing of subprime lending''—2007, they said we were demonizing subprime lending, the Wall Street Journal editorial—''about 80 percent of even subprime loans are being repaid on time, and another 10 percent are only 30 days behind.''

Isn't that wonderful? Only 10 percent are more than a month behind. Ten percent default and 30 days another 10 percent? Only the Wall Street Journal in this ideological fantasy world would think an 80 percent repayment rate of mortgages to low-income people is a good thing.

But here's what they said. ''Most of these new homeowners and low-income families are often minorities''—so apparently it the Wall Street Journal who's pushing to get minority loans which are going to get a default at a rate up to 20 percent—''who would not otherwise qualify for a mortgage. In the name of consumer protection, Mr. FRANK's legislation will ensure that far fewer of these loans are issued in the future. I hope so, exactly.

It was our goal, our intention, our mission to have far fewer of those loans. And if we had gotten the bill passed in 2007, we still would have had a crisis. It wouldn't have been as bad today. It was stopped by Republican opposition in the Senate.

So that's where we are. Republicans are in power. They do nothing to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. They do not only nothing to regulate, they push more subprime loans through the Bush administration and they block our efforts to legislate about them.

We now have an agenda to go forward, and I am going to outline that briefly. But I will at this point—I have about 17 minutes left—I will yield 4 of my 17 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for reaching his conclusion and allowing a yield. I sat and listened to this. One thing I think the chairman would agree to as just a minor correction to one of the posters that references Mr. Paulson as Frank Paulson rather than Henry Paulson. Small little correction. It wasn't the reason I asked to yield.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. What poster mentions Frank Paulson?

Mr. KING of Iowa. That's what the poster said. Frank Paulson.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for that profound correction. I will see that the typist is severely chastised.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I know that the gentleman is very interested in making sure the RECORD is correct. Having been corrected myself by the chairman, I would also offer that correction.

But my point was this, if the gentleman would yield to a question, and that is I'm listening to this this evening and I'm thinking of an evening that my recollection tells me was a debate on this floor on October 26, 2005, and it had to do with regulation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. It was an amendment offered by the former chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. Leach of Iowa, that, in essence—and I can't quote it to the gentleman from memory—but, in essence, it would have regulated Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in the same categories—very similar to the same categories of that of other lending institutions.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. Does the gentleman remember how many votes that got on the floor of the House in a Republican House?

□ 2145

Mr. KING of Iowa. I think there were around 35 to 38 votes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Thirty-six. The gentleman has a very good memory, 36; 30 were Republicans, 6 were Democrats.

So it is true, the former chairman of the committee offered an amendment to tighten this up, and then the House, with about 230 Republicans, 30 voted with him and 200 Republicans voted against him. Was that my fault?

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman would further yield, a recollection from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would have been that the gentleman, who is now chairman of the Financial Services Committee, had made the statement in that debate that he wasn't concerned about Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's viability, and that it wasn't necessary to increase the regulation or the capitalization of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And, that if anyone was investing in Fannie's and Freddie's shares, they shouldn't be confident that the gentleman from Massachusetts would support a bailout of Fannie and Freddie.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And today, we have the nationalization of Fannie and Freddie.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will take back my time and say it is exactly the opposite. Throughout the debate, I said to people that they should not consider that there was a guarantee, that they should not consider there was an implicit guarantee. I consistently said that. They benefited from people's perception when in fact, the share holders—I'm sorry, I haven't yielded again. I have consistently said that.

When there was an intervention that Mr. Hank Paulson asked for, it did refer to the bondholders, as we often do. The shareholders were wiped out, including the preferred shareholders.

So, in fact, when I was chairman of the committee and we responded to Mr. Paulson, we wiped out the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac shareholders, as I had always warned that they could be. I did think at the time we passed the bill, at Mr. Paulson's urging, or that we were about to, that it would be helpful. It turned out things were worse than I thought. But he did mention Mr. Leach, so let me give the voting record. And I was neglectful of this.

The bill came to the floor of the House, the bill the Bush administration thought was too weak. Now, the Republican Rules Committee allowed nine amendments. By the way, when the bill came to the floor when I was the chairman, we had 24 amendments, because I do believe, I think, in a more open process. We had the manager's amendment was one of them, a couple by voice vote. Mr. Leach sought to put in minimum capital levels. He lost 378–36. This is in the Republican House.

Again, the argument is, who did it? This is part of your zero. I should have had a footnote. The one time you did try, Mr. Leach, who thought Mr. Oxley was being too weak, he got 30 Republicans with him and 200 against him. Now, Mr. ROYCE also had an amendment; Mr. ROYCE, another critic. He did better than Mr. Leach. He got 73 votes versus 346. So in both cases, the two amendments that were allowed—oh, I take it back. Mr. PAUL had an amendment, too. And I guess this is a sign of the state of the Republican Party.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I am sorry, the gentleman has raised a point and I am going to respond to it.

The point is this: Mr. PAUL also—there were three amendments offered to toughen the bill in 2005. Mr. PAUL got 47 votes. Well, that is the Republican Party; Mr. PAUL gets more votes than Mr. Leach.

But here are three amendments offered to toughen it, all three defeated by an overwhelming majority of Republicans.

The point is, I supported Mr. Oxley. I thought we had a good bill.

I would also note that by 2007—and, by the way, in 2005, I was hoping that we would regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac but also restrict subprime loans. As it became clear to me that Republican opposition would prevent us from blocking subprime loans, I did become convinced of a need for tougher regulation. That is why Mr. Baker, your former colleague, said the bill we brought out in 2007 was as tough as it could be.

Now I will yield again.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And I appreciate the chairman yielding. But is it also true that you opposed those amendments that would have regulated Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes. I will——

Mr. KING of Iowa. The policy underlying—regardless of how the Republican votes came out, did the gentleman oppose those regulatory amendments that came to the floor?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes. I am taking back my time to say yes.

My point is that it was not my fault that 200 Republicans voted against it. I did vote with the overwhelming majority of Republicans. The question is, who is responsible?

But I would also say this. You know, when you are in the minority you can't always shape things. Sometimes you have to make unpleasant choices. When I became the chairman of the committee on January 31, 2007, I was able then to combine tough regulation, knowing that we were going to be able to restrict subprime, and with help for rental housing.

So the fact is that when I was in power, not forced to choose among Republican alternatives but in the majority, I helped pass a bill that was tough enough, tougher than the bill in 2005, that was acceptable to the Bush administration, acceptable to the leading critical group, acceptable to Mr. Baker.

So, yes, I voted with the great majority of Republicans. So I guess that is what I am responsible for: I voted with the overwhelming majority of House Republicans to report out a bill that the Republicans thought would work.

I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I want to just thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, I yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I am happy to thank the gentleman, and compliment him on his diminishment of his own persuasive powers, and be happy to yield back.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, I agree—the gentleman says my persuasive powers. That is the joke of it all. That is, frankly, the gap between the propaganda and the reality.

The Republicans are in control; they pass the bill. In fact, they cut out the affordable housing part I wanted. I did at the time hope that we could combine moderate regulation of the sort Mr. Oxley wanted and the overwhelming majority of Republicans wanted with an affordable housing program and with restrictions on subprime. When we were not able to get the subprime bill through and things had deteriorated, I then said, okay, and I was for tougher regulation.

So, by the way, at that point the gentleman from Iowa I believe voted against it. I know the gentleman from New Jersey did. Do you know why? I will tell people, Mr. Speaker. Because I, in the chairmanship that I had, was able to get a bill that toughened the regulation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

But what about the Catholic Church getting money to build rental housing, and allowing nonhousing groups like the Catholic Church, and others, to build rental housing? They opposed it.

So, yes, a majority of Republicans voted for the bill in 2005 that the Bush administration was too weak, and a majority of the Republicans opposed the bill in 2007 that the Bush administration was strong enough, because their opposition to rental housing for low-income people overcame that. But that is the story.

Now I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Just two quick points. And I appreciate the gentleman yielding. One, as an individual who was one of the few in those numbers who voted ''no'' on those amendments——

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. And ''no'' in committee.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Right. And ''no'' in committee. Obviously, I saw some of the problems and had concerns early on.

Secondly, I will make a suggestion to you as to why you get the accusations, if you will, or the statements about you, as you will. I didn't see the program. I heard you were on Lou Dobbs and other things like that the other night where those statements are often made. I will make the suggestion as to why that may be, if you will.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yielded to the gentleman. He may do what he wishes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. When I came here in 2002, in that election and that year and joined the committee, I immediately became somewhat involved in this issue, although I had never been involved in it before.

I saw in our committee, between both parties, that one person stood out, in my mind, and a lot of other people's mind, as the person who was always trying to fight to rein in the GSEs. And that person, who is no longer with us, is Richard Baker. He was articulate, he was eloquent. He was always on the facts and what have you. He was always pounding, pounding, pounding at every opportunity. So I and other people saw him as being on that side.

And, quite candidly, when we had those debates, when some of those amendments as you referred to before—and I think there were other ones in the later months that I and others made from the conservative point of view; a number of us saw the champion on the other side of that issue out of both parties, out of both Republicans and Democrats; and I agree that there were some Republicans who were vociferous as far as letting Fannie and Freddie do——

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will take back my time to say a majority of the Republicans at every turn. Don't say—not some Republicans. A majority of Republicans in the committee, a majority of Republicans on the floor. Not some Republicans. But every time the

issue arose, a majority of Republicans were on the side of Mr. Oxley and myself.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. What I am saying is not how the votes were going. I was saying as to which Members actually stood up and were most vociferous on this issues. Not all the Republicans were vociferous on it; there were one or two or three that were vociferous, as Richard Baker was on this side.

And on those other issues, maybe because you were ranking member in the minority years, but otherwise you were very vociferous on opposing those bills.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I take back my time. Now I guess I am guilty. Yes, I was the senior Democrat, and I spoke out. I wish that I had that effect elsewhere. You would not have been able to kill the affordable housing trust fund.

While I was the ranking minority member, when I was the senior Democrat of the Housing Subcommittee and then on the full committee, the Republican majority killed virtually every affordable rental housing production program we had. They beat up public housing unmercifully, to the great distress of lower-income people.

I wish I was as persuasive as the gentleman now, I must say, less than convincingly tries to argue. And in fact, no, I do not think I charmed the majority of Republicans. And, by the way, it was Mr. Baker whom the gentleman correctly identified as the leading opponent of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, who said in 2007, when I became chairman and was able to put together the right ingredients in the bill, quote, ''With every iteration, it got stronger. It is to the point where I didn't know what else there was to put in there.'' So I appreciate Mr. Baker's endorsement of the bill which I helped pass.

Now, I do want to address one issue as he closes, and I may expand on this. There was one other point—and we have had a legitimate debate.

But in an article in a publication called Investors Business Daily, to my great dismay circulated by the Republican staff of the Financial Services Committee, I was accused of betraying my oath and my obligation because of a relationship I had with a man who worked at Fannie Mae. And I want to address that scurrilous piece of defamation right now and express my disappointment that people I have worked with on the Financial Services Committee, that their staff, presumably with the approval of somebody, would have circulated such a scurrilous lie.

As we know, there are members in this body who have spouses and partners who are variously employed, and it has never been the rule that you couldn't do anything because your partner is employed. We have a Member of the Republican Party who very conscientiously has been voting ''present'' recently on some measures because of his wife's position. And the article falsely said that I was having a relationship with a senior executive at Fannie Mae, and that is why I did it.

Now, obviously the fact that it is a gay relationship adds to a certain piquancy with the right wing when they circulate this sort of vicious defamation.

The fact is that the man with whom I had a relationship graduated from business school in 1990. He was a new MBA. He then went to work in an entry-level position at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. He was never a senior executive. He had a working position at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

After eight years, we ended the relationship. He left town. I was by that time a lower ranking member of the committee. The events we are talking about happened many years later after we had separated, when he had, to my knowledge, no financial interest, and he was 3,000 miles away.

No, I have to say to the gentleman from New Jersey, I reject the suggestion that I was so persuasive that the only one issue on which I could prevent a right-wing rampage on the part of his party on the Financial Services Committee, in which I was unable to get decent regulation, in which I was unable to get good subprime lending, or I was unable to protect affordable housing—the only thing I was able to do was to stop them from regulating Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And that is why a majority of them never took that position and we never got a good bill until I became chairman. No, I think it is something else.

I think it is the fear of the right wing that regulation is coming; that unregulated credit default swaps are going to be no longer the case; that we will have rules that will prevent irresponsible subprime lending. As Mr. Zandi, a great thinker on this, notes in his closing passage: Regulators didn't create the subprime financial shock, but they did nothing to prevent it.

In other words, no, it wasn't the CRA that did it; it was the lack of regulation that did it. This was the result of first policymakers' distrust of regulation in general, their enduring belief that markets and financial institutions could effectively police themselves; and, second, of the Nation's antiquated regulatory framework. The institutions guiding the Nation's financial system were fashioned during the Great Depression; and, as finance evolved rapidly, they remained largely unchanged, and overhaul was indisputably overdue.

I happen to be chairman of the committee that is going to have a major play in this overhaul, and there are right-wing forces that don't want that to happen. So I accept the fact that I am the target. I don't think it is me, personally. I am not that paranoid. It is that if they can go after me and blame me, and, unfairly, Senator DODD—who wasn't even the senior Democrat when this was happening. It is particularly far-fetched to blame Senator DODD. He wasn't even the senior Democrat. The notion that he was as the second ranking Democrat he was running the Senate I would have thought was too implausible. But, again, we have learned from Swift Boating and elsewhere that vicious right-wing propaganda cannot be allowed to go unrebutted.

The fact is that, yes, there is this concerted effort, there is this fear that we won't have unregulated subprime mortgages. And we will see this when we bring the bill up, that we won't have any more unlimited credit default swaps and collateralized debt obligations.

It is the fear of regulation that Franklin Roosevelt confronted, that Theodore Roosevelt confronted. It is the fear that the disastrous results of the policy of deregulation have led the American people to understand that the time has come, once again, in our history to adopt a good set of regulations.

I believe that is why there are these lies, distortions, and smears about my record, why I am being held accountable for the 0–12 record of the Republican Party. And the time has come to have that debate, because we have learned, I think, that if we wait too long, the lies will stick. And not only will that be bad for reputations; even worse, it will be bad for the public policy we need to prevent a retention.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2200

LENDING REGULATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. And I want to say, at the departure of the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, I appreciate his yielding to each of us who have differing opinions on his presentation this evening. And that is something that I'm prepared to do should the gentleman raise an issue with statements I make. I know that Mr. FRANK is competitive and very willing to engage in debate. And I know that he had a lot of things he wanted to get off his chest tonight. I was here to listen to it all. And I heard every word.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman yield? Yes, I think it would be a very good idea if instead of—and I thought it was catch-up time for me. But when we come back, I would like to have, and we can do 2 hours, we can have one D and one R, and have 5 minutes each. We can have a fair debate thing. I look forward to debating these. So I thank the gentleman for that. And when we return, I'm going to ask my staff to start getting some hours and we can work with Members on the other side. Let's have some genuine debates on these issues.

And I thank the gentleman for the spirit in which he said that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman, and I will say into the RECORD tonight, that is a request that I would be happy to meet with, and I will be looking forward to the time when we come back on the other side of Easter. I appreciate it.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I listened to the statements made on the part of the chairman of the Financial Services Committee tonight. And it occurs to me that a man who has the full attention of the entire committee on any day he decides to choose to hold a hearing or a markup, a man who has full attention of the floor when he decides to speak here, it seems to me that since we have been through 2 days of budget debate, Mr. Speaker, that there must have been a lot of things that the chairman of the Financial Services needed to get off of his chest. And I heard a lot of them tonight. It occurs to me, though, that there is a high degree of sensitivity. And where I come from, when you throw a rock into the pigpen, the one that squeals is the one that you hit.

So I think what I heard is a rejection of the concept that the gentleman from Massachusetts and many of the Democrats that followed him in his leadership on these financial services issues, a rejection that he resisted the idea of regulating Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, resisted the idea that the Community Reinvestment Act was a component of the financial meltdown that we had. And I heard the gentleman say to us that there were three Republican amendments on the legislation that would have and could have regulated Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. I raised the issue of one. And I do remember the day. It was October 26, 2005. It was an amendment that was offered by Mr. Leach of Iowa that would have regulated Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac down the same lines as the regular lending institutions who are providing mortgage loans and real estate. I think that would have been a good thing to do. And I recall that debate. And it was a compelling argument made on the part of Mr. Leach that Fannie and Freddie were underregulated and undercapitalized, and they needed to be capitalized more and regulated more. Now I have just heard the gentleman from Massachusetts say that Republicans are afraid of regulation. In fact, it is the ''fear of regulation,'' he has said, that drives Republicans to reject changes in the control of the financial institutions in this country.

I would submit that we are for regulation. We are for the kind of smart, responsible regulation that ensures that we have viable lending institutions. In fact, we came to this floor and supported amendments that would have capitalized and regulated Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. I have introduced legislation that would repeal the Community Reinvestment Act. And I have introduced legislation that would capitalize Fannie and Freddie Mac like the other lending institutions and move them towards privatization. I recall the debate that evening on October 26, 2005, when the gentleman who is now the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, and I don't disagree with his characterization here, it is a matter of emphasis, it is not a matter of accuracy, at least the disagreement on the accuracy, but I recall that. And it was that he would not support a bailout of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac because he didn't believe that they were undercapitalized, underregulated or in trouble.

Well, it turns out that was October of 2005, and easily, by the late fall of 2008, we can all see that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were in trouble. In fact, they have been nationalized. And the risk and the liability that comes to the American taxpayers was calculated at the time to be about $5.5 trillion. Now the taxpayers own Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. And regardless of whether there was a majority of Republicans that supported or opposed the amendment that would have regulated and capitalized Fannie and Freddie, it is true that the chairman of the Financial Services Committee opposed those amendments. And I think he underestimates has own persuasive powers. In fact, he must have gotten here for some reason. I think persuasive powers are part of it. I compliment him on that. I think he is an engaging fellow who has a very nimble ability to engage in this debate. And I look forward to those kind of debates, and I know I will be tested. But it remains a fact that some of us wanted to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Some of us wanted to move them towards privatization. Some of us wanted to capitalize them more. Some of us wanted to regulate them more. I am among those people. The voting record and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates something else on the part of the current chair of the Financial Services Committee. I don't think the Republicans have been opposed at all to regulations of our financial institutions. We have been in favor of smart regulations of our financial institutions, to essentially fix this problem ourselves.

So there is not a fear of the right wing that regulation is coming. There is a fear that we had an underregulation, and that is why we brought those amendments and brought that legislation. That is why the gentleman from New Jersey brings up the issue of Mr. Baker from Louisiana.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. To the gentleman from Iowa, I appreciate your organizing this hour on the floor. And I came here ostensibly to talk about the issue affecting the American public today, and that you touch on it at the end there as far as the regulation of our financial system. But inasmuch as the chairman of the Financial Services just did spend the last hour addressing the sub issue of that is whether the charges against him, whether they were legitimate, was the basis of his discussion for the last 55 minutes whether it is legitimate as some on this floor and outside in the media as well and other groups and what have you and have accused him of being primarily or ostensibly responsible for some of the problems that we now find ourselves in.

I will just spend a minute, even though he spent 55 minutes, on that. As I said before, in Congress there have been various champions on either side of this issue. Richard Baker, when I came to Congress and you came at the same time, was a champion of trying to rein in the excesses that were in the GSEs, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. There were other people on the outside, as well, actually in the Bush administration. He chastised the Bush administration for not pushing this legislation and putting other impediments of going forward with it. The truth of the matter is that the Bush administration in the form of the Secretary of the Treasury, I believe it was both Snow and Paulson, who came to the Financial Services committee while I was there, and said, there are problems in the GSEs. There are problems in the Fannie Mae. There are problems in Freddie Mac. And they were ones that the Bush administration was, in fact, pushing for some sort of control, some sort of limitation, some sort of reining in of the GSE. So the Bush administration was doing that.

Richard Baker, who was always sitting up in the top row way above me since I was a freshman and a sophomore at the time, was championing that cause as well to say how do we rein them in? And I became involved with it, and I put in some amendments myself, and one was to direct the new regulator to establish limits on the GSE's portfolios in case there were any issues of safety and soundness or possible systemic risk, a word that we discuss now.

Representative PAUL offered amendments to cut off Fannie and Freddie's $2 billion line of treasury which would have been one of the key aspects of sending a message to the private markets as to whether they can believe or not, whether the Federal Government were to stand behind them. I know the chairman just said, and he said repeatedly, ''to those investors who believe that when they are investing in the GSEs that the full faith and credit of the United States Government would stand behind them, I'm telling them right now it is not the case. Well, that, of course, was the case. It was an implicit guaranty. It became explicit, however, when things began to fall apart in the last year, and now you and I know what has been the cost to the American taxpayer, literally hundreds of billions of dollars.

But the chairman did say, as far back I think it was, as in the year 2000 which before I was even there, when the Bush

administration was pushing these issues saying there are some problems here, he said he did not see, the chairman said, actually he would have been the ranking member at that time, he did not see the need for the further regulations because he said ''there are no problems here.'' And he did it again I guess in 2003, saying, again, he did not see a problem with those, either one of those companies. I know later on he did say that, probably in 2003, any one of us would have said the same thing with regard to other banks, the Bank of Scotland or some other banks what have you, there wasn't any problems there, and now, of course, we know—I shouldn't have mentioned this particular bank that he had said—but other banks back in 2003, a lot of us would not have said there were problems in those banks. But we are talking about a different level of problems with that situation.

Today we are having problems with those banks, with their investments. With the GSEs, the argument that a number of us on our side of the aisle was making, that President Bush's administration was making as well, was a systemic risk, that by allowing basically unfettered lending by these institutions and by the implicit guaranty that the Federal Government placed behind them by the $2 billion line of credit, you place a systemic risk. And by putting no limitations on either one of those organizations, you allow them to borrow and borrow and borrow with no limitations on their portfolio, which is something I and others were pushing strongly to try and rein them in, you create a systemic risk. So, yes, there was obviously a systemic risk both in 2003 and 2000 as well, until it finally exploded to what we have today.

So I think that is where the outside groups, maybe some Members in this Congress, try to say, that some Members were pushing for tighter regulations, others were leading the fight saying there wasn't any problem, that you didn't need it, so that in 2005 the facts were some of us were actually going to committee, and I don't have them all here, but I was going to committee and saying, here are some other bills, yes, he is right, a lot of Republicans voted against those bills as well, but he was obviously the ranking member and saying that there was no need for those.

And I will yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman. Reclaiming my time, as I listen to that, and you lived in the middle of the Financial Services Committee for these years into the seventh year, and that is background and experience that hardly anybody in America has shared with you, Mr. GARRETT, and so I just ask you if you could, in the middle of this, throughout those, beginning into the seventh year at least, characterize the general philosophy that you gathered with regard to the thrust now of the committee and the majority within the committee as to whether before this financial meltdown, this economic crisis that we have, did you sense that there was any initiative on the part of the Democrats in the Financial Services Committee to regulate Fannie and Freddie, to capitalize Fannie and Freddie and move them towards any kind of privatization, or would it have been more or less business as usual with Fannie and Freddie? Which way was that line going from the Democrat side on the Financial Services Committee? And I yield.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I guess it would be a fair generalization that from the other side of the aisle that the push was, the emphasis was for the GSEs to focus on their public housing program, in other words, that they should be created, although that was actually a change in their original mission, as you know, but that new changed mission was to say, how can they be used to advance the cause of affordable housing? And so that was always the posture from the other side of the aisle. And that is why there was constant pushback when Ed Royce or other Members on our side said, well, maybe we should put some limitations on one of my amendments, on the portfolio, rather the conforming loan limits, to say that it shouldn't be too high. Well, no, they want to have no limitations, or the portfolio limits, no, there should be no limitation. So it is always clear they were in one direction and we were slightly in a different. I yield.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming, from the gentleman, if he would further examine this question, I understand their response that the Bush administration was very much focused on increasing the percentage of homeownership. And I recall a State of the Union address made by President Bush here in this Chamber one of those Januarys that made the statement that we had the highest homeownership of a free country in the world, or at least the United States, that 68 percent of the people in America lived in a home that was owned by themselves or one of the people that lived in the home with them. It does sound like it is a laudable goal. And it is certainly a goal that would be reached for, that was reached for by the Bush administration. It would be something that would be reached for I think by all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike.

But from the restraint side of this, from those who were lending a voice of caution, that were saying Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the secondary market for mortgages, are getting out of control, they are undercapitalized. They are underregulated, and we need to rein them in before we have a problem that is far bigger than the one that is apparent today. If you had to give credit or blame to Republicans or Democrats in the Financial Services Committee, Mr. GARRETT, where was the predominant voice for caution? Where was the predominant voice for capitalization? Where was the predominant voice for regulation? Where was the predominant voice for privatization of Fannie and Freddie during those years before the crisis was evident to all of us?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Well, my dad always said give credit where credit is due. And the chairman was correct to say that those of us who were really strongly pushing these issues didn't get as much support as we would have liked to from our colleagues on this side of the aisle. But as I look at some of the other amendments I put in, I got almost virtually no support from the other side of the aisle for some of our amendments which would have put in limitations. For example, I put in an amendment that would require the GSEs to hold only mortgages and mortgage-backed securities that exclusively support affordable housing.

Now there is an idea if you think about it, if the idea behind the GSEs, one of the functions is to support affordable housing, then if you put that amendment in, it should fall in line with what the other side of the aisle was advocating. And they should support it. But there is another side benefit to allowing them to expand and grow outside of the area of affordable housing and that basically helps their balance sheet and also helps the remuneration to the people at the top of the organizations, to their CEOs, because if their balance sheet is good and their profits are based just like AIG, these bonuses and what have you, it benefits them as well.

□ 2215

But we got no votes, well, from the chairman, I'm certain of, but basically from everyone from the other side of the aisle.

My good friend, I'll explain one other amendment. The portfolio limitation, Representative PRICE offered that amendment as well. Same thing, to reduce the amount of the GSEs portfolios again. I do recall that the chairman was opposed to that, and I believe that just generally speaking, no support from the other side of the aisle.

So I think that's the underlying message that's probably out in the media and outside of this House as well, as to where the two parties stood on it. Maybe we didn't have as much support as you and I would have liked from our side, but clearly it was a one-sided push for a long time of seeing that there was a systemic problem and trying to do something about it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And reclaiming my time from the gentleman from New Jersey, and I thank him for his historical rendition of what's taken place within the committee. And I would take this a little further and ask this question, and that would be, did the subject of reform of the Community Reinvestment Act or the repeal of the Community Reinvestment Act come up in the Financial Services Committee in the years prior to the financial crisis that emerged here in this Congress, I

am going to pick a date, September 19 of last year? Was there discussion dialogue in the committee, and did it take place in a way that would have illuminated the circumstances we have today, and does the gentleman from New Jersey accept the premise that was delivered by the Chair of the Financial Services Committee that only 1 out of 25 lenders were affected by restraints in Community Reinvestment Act? Does that seem to be a balanced delivery, or would there be a particularly different viewpoint that the gentleman would like to discuss?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Well, I'm certainly not going to question the statistics of the chairman because I believe he was holding a paper or had some other statistics before him. Since I don't have them, I'd certainly take the chairman at his word.

I think though that you have to see the larger issues that came out of that. And the message that the government was sending, whether through that or through other mechanisms, did have a profound impact upon the rest of the marketplace, not only in the low-income area but otherwise, not only through that program, but through the Federal Reserve regulations, the Boston Fed issuing certain guidelines, if you will, as far as lending practices, and that had profound impact, not only on those institutions as the chairman made reference that may come under their auspices or their control or their authority, but through the rest of the marketplace as well.

In other words, once you sort of get the ball rolling as far as what the new underwriting standards, and this is really what was being created during this time, in one segment of the market, that ball was just continued right across the rest of the marketplace as well. Some of us, as I said before, seeing that as just the beginning piecemeal of this was rolling out we said there may be a problem as that ball goes along and grows, gains weight and what have you and has impact elsewhere, and eventually we saw that it was picked up by the rest of Wall Street.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman. Reclaiming, I think this might be a good time for me to lay out how I think the sequence of events took place with the economic crisis that we are in. And I'd ask the gentleman's indulgence and analysis of whether he would agree with this particular analysis.

But I would take us back, Mr. Speaker, to 1978, to the inception of the Community Reinvestment Act. The Community Reinvestment Act, I think, was passed for the right motivations, and the idea was that we had lenders that were redlining districts. They were drawing a red line around districts in particular cities and refusing to loan for real estate in those districts because the value of that real estate was not being sustained, and it was declining. That was maybe the right kind of motive to do that. But as we moved on from 1978 until the nineties, when the Community Reinvestment Act was refreshed under the Clinton administration, and it got a little tighter, it essentially said this, that if you're going to be a lending institution that will—that is inclined to want to expand, you're going to have to make loans into these neighborhoods that were heretofore redlined. And we're going to need you to have a certain percentage of the loan portfolios go into these communities that were red-lined around them and provide those loans to lower-income people. So the bottom line was, the Community Reinvestment Act was a regulation that put an incentive in place to give loans to people that didn't have a record of being able to pay it back and provided a merit for the lenders to do that if they were going to expand. So it was a perverse incentive. It essentially was an incentive that said to lending institutions, if you want to grow, you're going to have to make bad loans. That was the Community Reinvestment Act. Fresh, new 1978, refreshed in the early nineties, about 1993 or 1994 under Bill Clinton. And that became a foundational piece of legislation that didn't seem to be a very big problem except for a couple of things. One of them was, during the last years of the Clinton administration, Mr. Speaker, the technology that we've developed, the ability to store and transfer information more efficiently than ever before created the dot-com bubble. That existed because investors understood this ability to store and transfer information more effectively and more efficiently than ever before. And they invested in that ability. And they didn't make the corrections for the necessity that that ability to store and transfer information needed to translate into more efficiency in our economy, the ability to produce goods and services or deliver them more effectively. That was, Mr. Speaker, the dot-com bubble. So the dot-com bubble came about because of technological success, and let me call it an irrational exuberant optimism about the benefits that would come from that ability to store and transfer information more effectively than ever before. So we had a dot com bubble through the second half the Clinton administration. Part of the reason there was a balanced budget in this Congress was because, 1, the Republican majority here was determined to slow down and shut down spending and the growth in Federal Government, and they did that effectively. The new revolutionaries that arrived here, elected in 1994 and sworn in in January of 1995, were determined to produce a balanced budget, and they did. Part of it was out of fiscal conservatism, and part of it was out of resistance to the Clinton administration. But whatever those proportions were, we had a budget surplus for a number of those years. And we had a dot com bubble in the market that was not adjusted to rationality. And when the lawsuit was brought against Microsoft, that was the needle that penetrated the dot-com bubble until it burst. And when it did, we had a declining economy. A declining economy because of the aftermath of the collapse of the dot-com bubble, translated into the beginning of the George W. Bush administration, the first administration of his, when he was elected in 2000. And Mr. Speaker, when that took place, we needed to do some adjustments to recover this economy and we had Alan Greenspan look at this and concluded, I believe, and by reports that I've read, not characterizing his inner thoughts necessarily, that we needed to stimulate the economy. That brought about decisions made that resulted in unnaturally low interest rates, especially on mortgage lending, which created an unnaturally exuberant housing economy. This unnaturally exuberant housing economy that came about from unusually low interest rates was something that helped bring us out of the decline in our economy that resulted in the burst of the dot-com bubble, Mr. Speaker. And as that was finding its place in this economy, we were attacked on September 11, 2001. Our financial centers literally collapsed. We lost 3,000 American lives all in the matter of a few hours. And we needed to do something to stimulate the economy.

And so the President of the United States, George Bush, this Congress came together and decided to quickly enact some tax cuts and a stimulus policy. That was 2001. That bridged a small gap, and they weren't all that particularly effective.

But on May 28 of 2003, the real Bush tax cuts were enacted, and they were the reduction in capital gains, the reduction in interest and dividend income, and that resulted in a real economic growth. But as this economic growth came from the Bush tax cuts, we also had economic growth that came from the unnaturally low interest rates and this housing market that was created by those low interest rates, and we found our way through to this point now where the foundation of our economic difficulty, rooted in the Community Reinvestment Act, flowing through from, as I didn't mention, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, a refusal of this Congress to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, even though we had legislation that was brought before the Financial Services Committee, as Mr. GARRETT has described, even though there were amendments brought to this floor, which I actively worked for and supported, that would have capitalized Fannie and Freddie, and regulated Fannie and Freddie, those things were resisted by the current leadership, the people that say it wasn't their fault, it was somebody's else fault, seems to be always Republicans fault. But this is a historical document. It can all be read. It all flows through.

In the end, we got to this point where not only was there a dot-com bubble

that burst that I think stimulated the unnaturally low interest rates that put us in the place where we had the housing bubble that burst, but the housing bubble was created not just because of unnaturally low interest rates, but because lending institutions were given an incentive under the Community Reinvestment Act to give bad loans in bad neighborhoods, and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were undercapitalized and under-regulated, and there was a perverse incentive for them to pick up these secondary market loans and tranche those and roll them on up the chain.

And while that was going on, we had mark to market accounting, which is a good process when you have a market that's going up, and if you have a market that's going down, it accelerates the decline. It was a brutal and horrible self-inflicted wound, the mark to market accounting component of this.

While this was going on, additionally, we had a Congress that again refused to regulate Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and you had AIG that was insuring these mortgage-backed securities and these bundles of securities, and they had such a large market share there was nobody in the country that could look over their shoulder and pass judgment upon their evaluation of the risk.

And so we had a market that was under-regulated, a market that wasn't indexed back to the real estate value that underlined the bundles of toxic debt that we call it today, the mortgage-backed securities. That's how we got here.

There were many people that made mistakes along the way. And there was a failure to be clairvoyant on the part of all of us. But the voices that I have heard, there's been many voices that said, from my side of the aisle, capitalize Fannie and Freddie, regulate Fannie and Freddie. The Community Reinvestment Act is a perverse incentive, and mark to market accounting was a self-inflicted wound, a hideous self-inflicted wound on this country.

All of those things, put together, none of us are without fault in this. But there is no one that laid out the clarity of this in the beginning that can look back to the record and say, I got it all right; you just wouldn't listen to me. Some did. Some got parts of it right and we've talked to some them of them tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas, my friend, Mr. GOHMERT, East Texas I might say, and an ''Aggie.''

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Iowa yielding, and I appreciate his discussions here on the floor tonight.

And if I may seek indulgence in the last 5 minutes, I'm hoping to pay tribute to one of my constituents that won a—not won, but earned a Silver Star, if I might be allowed to do that at the end of the hour.

But what had concerned me, you know, we all have these meetings and hearings and it goes on all day long and often, around 11, 12, midnight, I sit down and I can catch up on some news. I can catch up on replays, sometimes on C–SPAN. But anyway, C–SPAN does help because, you know, we can see things from our office that we weren't able to get to the floor because of other things going on.

But I had seen on C–SPAN debate with the chairman with whom my friend from Iowa was engaging earlier, and I had seen him engaging with my friend from Texas, Mr. CULBERSON.

□ 2230

And I became very disturbed. As we know, there are rules of decorum here on the floor that we're not to insult another Member of Congress, that we're not to insult a Senator or the President, and so I became intrigued and very concerned as I heard Chairman FRANK making statements. I've gotten the RECORD since then. The comment was made about my friend Mr. CULBERSON by Chairman BARNEY FRANK.

''I've never seen people, Mr. Chairman, so attached to something they hate. This is presumably a psychological disorder which I'm not equipped to diagnose.''

Well, that caught my attention. He's accusing Mr. CULBERSON of having a psychological disorder, and so it seemed—well, in Shakespearean words, ''Me thinks he doth protest too much.'' So I began to listen more. He went on and continued speaking, and this is a quote from Chairman BARNEY FRANK.

''Speaking about being undone, my Republican colleagues are being undone by the loss of their whipping boy.''

So I'm wondering this is a gentleman who is getting very sensitive and who is lashing out with what seemed to be inappropriate, perhaps not skirting over the rule, but there were other comments that certainly seemed inappropriate and unnecessary.

Chairman BARNEY FRANK said, ''The bill under consideration is 5½ pages. I believe even the gentleman from Texas could have read it by now, and if the gentleman from Texas had not been able to read this 5½-page bill, I will talk long. Even if you read it slow, you'll get it done.''

He went on and said, ''My colleagues on the other side are kind of like kids who have a toy bear or a blanket, and this security blanket means a lot to them. Their security blanket is being able to complain about something that happened before the break. This bill undoes what happened before the break and makes it a nullity. They at some point, Mr. Chairman, have to outgrow the security blanket.''

So he's calling people on this side of the aisle little children. Of course the debate that was going on was the concern from our side that, first of all, we had been promised by our new President and by the Speaker, and we'd even passed a bill in here that said we had to have 48 hours to review any bill that they rushed in here to the floor. We had to have that chance. Yet they came in and immediately filed a bill. I think it went up on the Internet at around 11:00 or 12:00, and at 9:00 or 10:00 the next morning, we were having a debate on it and a vote on it that day. There was no 24 hours, but we were told we had to do that. It was critical. It was a crisis. People were losing their jobs every minute that we didn't vote on it and pass it.

So they ran roughshod. They would not allow any Member of this body the time to read the bill. They ran roughshod over everybody. Nobody had a chance to read it. Then to come in and accuse people on this side of the aisle, who were concerned about that, of being kids wanting a security blanket, I'll tell you: It is a security blanket to me that we could be able to read bills before we cram them down the throats of Americans. So I'm hearing this on C–SPAN.

Here is another comment by Chairman FRANK: ''The gentleman from Texas has now had a chance to read the bill, and has a question for me about this bill.''

He goes on and says, ''He can have all the Special Orders he wants in order to beat that dead horse, because it is a dead horse. This bill that he does not want to debate the merits of, that he is probably prepared to vote against—that he didn't want to debate the merits of? That was uncalled for and was inappropriate. We were entirely prepared to try to debate the merits, but here again, it had to do with seeing a bill rushed through here without a chance for anybody to read it and then rushing in last week and saying, ''Here. Let's quickly vote on a 90 percent tax after the fact, ex post facto, a bill of attainder in all likelihood, due process issues, taking issues, equal protection issues, all kinds of questions about it.

Rush that in as a fix. Then here they come, rushing right back in, saying, ''Well, we've got another fix. This will even be better,'' and we wonder why people would want to question it. Well, you know, is this 5½-page bill any better than the one you rushed through last week? There were concerns.

Chairman FRANK also went on and said, ''Apparently, there are two alternative strategies that the minority has in discussing this bill: One, discuss a bill that was passed 6 weeks ago; two, ignore the rules of the House and just talk whenever they feel like it. Neither one seems, to me, to advance debate.''

So I'm hearing these things coming from Chairman FRANK. There was something amiss here.

He went on to also say, ''This is a revolt against King George, in effect, and it is—King George Bush.'' That is really unnecessary, slamming the former President. Talk about a whipping boy. They made former President Bush quite the whipping boy at every chance. They still are.

I mean, the Constitution makes very clear that Congress is the one that has

to appropriate money and pass spending bills. After the Democrats took the majority in 2007 and 2008 and passed these enormous spending bills, which only Congress can do, they still want to blame the President who had no power to legislate.

Chairman FRANK also went on and said, ''I wish I didn't have to listen to some of these speeches, particularly the repetitive ones about the bill 6 weeks ago.''

He also said, ''But when Members complain about something that might happen that won't happen, it is because they are against what is happening but don't have the confidence that, if they said it, people would believe it.'' This was also a slam at the motives of the people who had proper concerns about the rush repeatedly to pass something so it looked to people across America that something was being done.

As a former judge, when I hear people being that sensitive and lashing out at others, there is something here, so I had gone back and had pulled some quotes to see if, perhaps, this was the source of the sensitivity.

On September 25, 2003, at the hearing on H.R. 2575, The Secondary Mortgage Market Enterprises, Mr. FRANK said, ''There are people in the country who are prepared to lend money to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac at less interest rates than they might get elsewhere. I thank those people for doing that. I must tell them that I hope they are not doing that on the assumption that, if things go bad, I or my colleagues will bail them out. We will not.''

Also on page 4, ''I think it is clear that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are sufficiently secure, so they are in no great danger.''

Also on page 4, this again is Mr. FRANK. ''I don't think we face a crisis; I don't think that we have an impending disaster. We have a chance to improve regulation of two entities that I think are, on the whole, working well.'' Well, we know now they were not at all.

In debate on the floor here on H.R. 1461, to reform regulation of Fannie and Freddie, October 26 of 2005—this is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Mr. FRANK said, ''There are banks who complain that because Fannie and Freddie are perceived to have some backup from Congress—and let me say right now, if you are listening, if you are buying Fannie's or Freddie's paper because you think I am going to vote to bail you out, sell it and cash it in. I am not going to do that. I do not think there is a Federal guarantee.'' We know, apparently, he didn't mean what he said or he has changed his mind since then.

On July 19 of 2008—and this is Air America's 7 Days quoting Chairman FRANK—''It's really been a test of regulation . . . a conscious decision brought by Alan Greenspan, who is the arch de-regulator. Because in 1994, not coincidentally, the last time the Democrats had a congressional majority before this year, a bill was passed that was called the Homeowner Equity Protection Act, that said to the Federal Reserve, 'Look, we now have loans being made by non-regulated entities, so please pass some rules. We give you the statutory authority to pass the rules to contain their activity and make it more responsible.' Alan Greenspan said, 'Oh, no. That's interfering with the market. I can't do that.' He didn't do it; that's where the crisis came.'' Interesting place to blame.

In any event, on September 10 of 2003, there is one other quote from Mr. FRANK. ''The more people, in my judgment, who exaggerate a threat of safety and soundness, the more people conjure up the possibility of serious financial losses to the Treasury''—and these are Mr. FRANK's words—''which I do not see. I think we see entities that are fundamentally sound financially and withstand some of the disaster scenarios.'' That was from The Wall Street Journal on October 2, 2008, bringing back that quote from 2003.

So, as I look back—and I was looking for the justification of why such an intellectual man as Mr. FRANK would be lashing out, calling names, accusing people here on the floor of having psychological disorders—I began to get a picture, and it may have to do with what the gentleman from Iowa pointed out earlier about who ends up squealing. There was something there that did trigger, perhaps, more sensitivity than we might have thought necessary, but when you get to the bottom of it, there are quotes here that are a problem, that did help protect Fannie when they should have had some things done to shore them up and should have had a protection that prevented that from happening.

So I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Again, I go back. There was no need to lash out at Mr. CULBERSON and at others, but the more you look back at the quotes over the last 5 years, even into the nineties, you begin to see, maybe, why there is such sensitivity on these issues.

I appreciate my friend yielding. I yield back to him.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Texas for that measured response to, I think, the very long response that was delivered by the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I sat here for an hour and took notes on that because I thought it was important that I listen carefully to that presentation, as unusual as it is to have the Chair of the Financial Services Committee come and ask for a late hour after the adjournment, after the break for Easter recess, when most of the Members have gone and have caught flights for home. To have the chairman of the Financial Services Committee come to the floor and ask for an hour to be able to make his case to the American people after a budget is passed, after we've had this intensive 2 days of debate on the finances of this country, I think, is relatively unusual.

In my pages of notes that I took during that 55- or 60-minute period of time, as I scanned those notes after the fact. There seems, to me, to be a lot of things in these notes that are somewhat repetitive, and there are not a lot of significant points that can be raised out to be rebutted. The subject boils down to this, Mr. Speaker, and that is:

Who was in favor of the regulation of our financial industry and who was not? Who is on record as opposing the capitalization and regulation of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac? Who is on record of supporting the Community Reinvestment Act? Who is on record as advocating the irresponsible financial activities here in this country? Who seems to be, I think, unusually defensive about his position and consistently making the charge that Republicans have a fear of regulation?

Here is another one: ''the fear of the right wing that regulation is coming.'' Another statement would be: ''It was a lack of regulation that did it.''

There is an emphasis on fear of regulation when we have Members who have consistently supported wise and smart fundamental regulation. In fact, we want to see businesses that are able to operate, function, profit, and thrive within the tax and regulatory environment that we give them.

By the same token, Mr. Speaker, we're opposed to the idea that we should leave holes there that will be perverse incentives that would allow Fannie and Freddie to collapse and to put that entire liability on the backs of the American taxpayers—yes, maybe $100 billion for each of those entities, Fannie and Freddie, but $5.5 trillion of potential liability wrapped up in those two. Now it's a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Federal Government. Fannie and Freddie are nationalized, and that's a fact, Mr. Speaker, and they're nationalized because we didn't have the right kind of regulations which I supported and voted for on this floor and that others, who seemed to be very defensive, opposed directly. It's a matter of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It's a matter of the quotes that have been delivered by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas and those that I've pulled out of my memory in the dialogue with the chairman. That's just Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

If you go down through the rest of the list of these flaws that we have in our financial structure, where were these clairvoyant gurus in 2007 when mark-to-market accounting slid through without objection? It's something that didn't show up on very many radar screens. It's something that remains a foundation to the hideously self-inflicted wound that we have in our economy.

□ 2245

That's the regulation of mark-to-market accounting. Additionally, the

AIG, which I spoke of, AIG sitting there as a large insurance company, essentially a bonding company that laid out the premiums to guarantee bundles of mortgage-backed securities in their performance not based upon the value of the real estate that was the collateral that underlined those bundles of mortgages but based upon what their judgment was of the performance, the anticipated performance of these bundles of mortgage-backed securities. Based upon speculation but not oversight over the shoulder of AIG.

Another perverse incentive which was that AIG executives, the people who were actually the executives and the front-line people who were marketing these insurance policies that ensured the bundles of mortgage-backed securities were getting their commission out up front, Mr. Speaker. And so once they cashed their check, they didn't have any responsibility any longer or they didn't have any accountability to what would be the result of whether those loans were performed on or whether they were not.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Iowa yielding.

I have run across some quotes.

I was at the home of some friends of mine in Dallas, and they had a number of fantastic quotes from our history, and I think what we've seen today as this budget, this terrible, terrible budget was passed, just one of the quotes from Thomas Jefferson, this brilliant man, was, ''the natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground.'' And that's exactly what we saw today with this budget. Liberty was yielding, the government taking more and more control of everything. Thomas Jefferson knew it.

I mean, it's like Solomon said, There is nothing new under the sun. These things that people think are new and innovative, it is not new. It failed in the New Testament church, it failed the Pilgrims when half of them nearly starved the first winter. They came up with this grand idea, let's give everybody their own private property and make them responsible for producing on their own property—and they have access. It's theirs. They can borrow it, sell it, whatever. It's theirs. It was a great idea. And that carried over 150 years into the Constitution, this idea of private property and the government not trying to run everything.

But what I would humbly submit, the way it appears to me and why we're seeing so much government intervention, the more it does, the more it feels like it has to do.

But what we've seen like Madoff, things like Countrywide, some of the people there who shoved people into mortgages they couldn't afford, packaged them together and then sold them off without recourse, made their millions. You know, things like that, those are the things this Nation, this government of this Nation, are supposed to be looking for. We're supposed to make sure there is a level playing field. We're supposed to protect this Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic. We had some domestic enemies that were hurting people in this country.

But what happens is when we get so caught up in trying to run everything, telling Detroit exactly what kinds of cars you have got to make, telling the business people this is what you have got to do, we're so busy telling people how to run their lives, how to run their businesses, that we lost what we are supposed to be doing. We're supposed to provide these people with a defense from the crooks from the domestic and foreign enemies. But oh, no. We're too busy telling them what they are supposed to do.

I love what Abe Lincoln said. He said, ''We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven. We have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other Nation.'' He concluded, ''though but we have forgotten God. Because if you know that there is an ultimate Universal source of right and wrong, then you care more about doing right and trying to help others do right.'' And that's what this government is supposed to be doing. We're supposed to be catching cheaters, dishonest people hurting America, and we lose that grip when we try to run everything.

And I would also point out as you try to get your hands around this huge budget that increases the deficit—I mean, people—we got beat up in 2005 and 2006. My first years here, we were in the majority. We were beat up because we were spending too much money, and we were. But then turn around to 2007 and 2008, the Democrats have control of everything. They are not reigning in spending. It goes through the roof. And now it's gone even further.

So if you want to know the bottom-line secret of what this budget is about, I would submit to you it can be found in one action: that was in this administration sending Secretary of State Clinton to China to beg them to loan us more money. That's what this budget does. It makes us beg China for more money.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I very much thank the gentleman from Texas.

I am starting my seventh year here, and I have watched some sea changes politically. I have watched some things shift. I have watched the majority change. I have watched the Presidency change, and I have watched the majority change in the United States Senate. I don't think that I have worked within every possible configuration out of those three entities but a number of different ones.

And one of the things that I have observed is that the voice that I heard from the Democrats consistently over those first 4 years that I was here, and then to some degree over the next two, was especially, especially from the Blue Dogs, Mr. Speaker, that came to this floor and said, We've got to have PAYGO, pay-as-you-go accounting. We've got to have a balanced budget every year. We have to have a fiscally responsible government. And I would make the argument that they would want to tighten down the spending, that we were spending too much money. They always wanted to spend a little more money than we wanted to spend, but they thought we were spending too much in relation to the tax revenue that was coming in.

So their idea was hold down the Democrat spending idea and increase the taxes a little bit and get this thing to a pay-as-you-go equation. That's the mantra of the Blue Dogs. And we've gone through a long debate on this budget, Mr. Speaker, and it has been two intense days that this comes down to, but this debate has gone on several weeks now.

What I have noticed is the absence of the Blue Dogs. Where are they? Where is that voice of ''we must balance the budget''? Where is PAYGO? What has happened to the people that were the strongest advocates for fiscal responsibility among the Democrats? I heard the debate. I was impugned by your debate over these last 6 years. But where are you now?

Puts me in mind of Punxsutawney Phil. When he comes out of the hole up there in Pennsylvania, Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania, and the groundhog sees his shadow, he gets scared and goes back in the hole again for 6 more weeks of winter. I don't know that that's necessarily the case, but I think the Blue Dogs have become the groundhogs of politics. They have gone down in the hole, and they are going to stay in there until there is a little bit more favorable climate that comes out, maybe not quite so much bright light shining, not quite so much shadows that are cast by President Obama, NANCY PELOSI, HARRY REID, this troika that drives this irresponsible spending bill. But they feel compelled to support the President. But he's our President, too.

But I don't support an irresponsible budget, Mr. Speaker, and I would have been really regretful to come to this floor to see a President of the United States of my party that had offered the kind of spending that would double our debt in 5 years and triple it in 10 years. The kind of spending that grows this irresponsible socialization of America—we rejected for a long time the European socialization—the socialized economy of the Europeans, and now we have—the President's over in Europe and is being lobbied by the Germans and the French. They are saying, Get a grip, Mr. President. Don't be spending money so irresponsibly. The Germans are saying, Get a handle on this thing. We don't agree with you in this Keynesian, almost intoxicated Keynesian approach to spending. This is Keynesian.

And the President said to us on a day in early February that—well, he said to

America that spending is stimulus. And then he said that FDR's New Deal actually would have worked except FDR essentially lost his nerve and was concerned about spending too much money. And so what you had was, according to the President, was a recession within a depression. And if you look at the records, there was a little dip in the economy in the late 1930s, but he argued that along came the biggest stimulus plan ever, which was World War II, which brought us out of the Great Depression.

Mr. Speaker, I will argue that the New Deal wasn't a good deal. No amount of more government spending, more profligate spending was going to get us out of the Great Depression. If you look at the data, there is no Keynesian approach in free market history that you can demonstrate that prevailed or produced a positive result.

In fact, if you look at the New Deal in the 1930s, that Keynesian spending, which I think intoxicated FDR for the first half of that decade, doesn't show that the economy grew. It shows that it was flat and then it declined.

And if you look at the wild Keynesian spending that took place in Japan when they had their economic recession in the 1990s, the more money they spent, the deeper they went into debt and the less they had to show for it. That's odd. That's what Henry Morgenthau said back in the 1930s as well, Mr. Speaker.

So when you look at that data—and if the people on this side of the aisle and the people that are running this show out of the White House can't point to an economic time in history that their model, which is the New Deal, they can't point to a time in history when it works, the data is not there. It does not exist, Mr. Speaker. And yet the President was only critical of FDR to the extent that he lost his nerve and he should have spent more money in the 1930s.

Well, I can tell you this President has not lost his nerve. He is spending money hand-over-fist in a fashion that is unparalleled in American history and maybe unconceived by any world leader in American history. And the price that we are paying for this—we've said over and over again—goes into the next generations. And the best you can hope for with a New Deal, a new New Deal—because we had an old New Deal that was a failed New Deal—the best you can hope for with an uber new New Deal of President Obama's is it may diminish the depths to which we might otherwise decline.

But the price for it's a very, very long delayed recovery, Mr. Speaker. That's what we're faced with today.

This budget that's crossed the path of the floor of this House is an irresponsible budget. It's a budget that spends way beyond our means. It's a budget that doubles our deficit in 5 years and triples it in 10. It's a budget that's irresponsible. It's one that doesn't even meet the needs of the United States of America, and it's one that I don't want to see my children saddled with.

And I can tell you, it's one that my children—or now men—call me and send me e-mails on an almost daily basis and are saying, What are you letting happen to me? What is happening to me? And they are going to be paying the price. My grandchildren will be paying the price. And I fear, Mr. Speaker, that my great grandchildren, should I be blessed with any, will be paying the price.

The gentleman from Texas has a point to make before we adjourn. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. You know, many in this body think this Nation will go on forever. We know no nation will last forever. We are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights. But those rights are like any inheritance. You only get to have them if people are willing to fight and protect them, fighting government and then fight our enemies abroad.

Well, in the summer of 2008, media from around the country released reports on an attack on an American military outpost base in the Kunar province of Afghanistan near the Pakistani border. Accounts say that 45 U.S. paratroopers and 25 Afghan soldiers were assaulted by up to 500 Taliban and al Qaeda fighters, bombarding our soldiers with rocket-propelled grenades and mortars. Nine U.S. soldiers were killed, 15 injured, and it was called the deadliest attack on American forces in Afghanistan since 2005.

I am here today to honor these servicemembers for their incredible sacrifice and to especially recognize one in particular who I am so very proud and humbled to represent as his U.S. Congressman.

□ 2300

Army Specialist Aaron David Davis, from Kilgore, Texas, was serving as an anti-armor gunner of the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team and was sent in as reinforcement when insurgents assailed our soldiers on July 13, 2008.

In the rural town of Wanat, Afghanistan, Specialist Davis and his men were bombarded by enemy fire from all sides as insurgents took over homes and mosques in their attempts to seize the newly established American base there. Specialist Davis and his fellow soldiers were vastly outnumbered, but they continued to courageously fight. Specialist Davis saw many of his fellow soldiers killed in the midst of that chaotic combat and was wounded himself; yet he was not deterred from fiercely protecting the base and his friends.

An American military helicopter finally came to the rescue, but even after he was told to get on the helicopter that would surely be his ticket to safety, a wounded and hurting Davis was more concerned with the protection of others. With his own life in peril, he stayed and continued to fight.

Among his heroic actions, Specialist Davis crawled to the frontline to check on a fellow soldier, and then he helped save three fellow soldiers, putting them on gurneys and helping get them airlifted out of the ongoing battle. While fighting to protect these men, Davis was again wounded, receiving shrapnel in his left hand, left arm, and behind his right eye. He became so wounded he finally had to be lifted away from the fight himself.

There is so much more to the story, and I wish there were more time to elaborate on this young man's incredible selflessness. Aaron Davis spend many weeks recovering from his wounds at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, and he is now back on active duty at Fort Sam Houston, continuing to boldly serve his country while still further rehabilitating.

He was recently awarded the Purple Heart for the wounds he suffered, as well as the Silver Star, the third highest military decoration that can be awarded to a member of any branch of the United States Armed Forces, for his incredible courage and unwavering commitment to his country and his fellow soldiers. Specialist Aaron Davis deserves our thanks for his bold bravery and selfless sacrifice.

It is the courage and commitment of Aaron Davis and his fellow soldiers and those like them that allows us to continue to enjoy our freedom as U.S. citizens. We are manifestly proud and permanently grateful. To Specialist Aaron Davis, may God bless Aaron Davis and he and all he has done for this Nation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will let that be the concluding word this evening.

HOUSE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

February 4, 2009:

H.R. 2. An Act to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

February 17, 2009:

H.R. 1. An Act making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes.

March 6, 2009:

H.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2009, and for other purposes.

March 11, 2009:

H.R. 1105. An Act making omnibus appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes.

March 20, 2009:

H.R. 1127. An Act to extend certain immigration programs.

H.R. 1541. An Act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

March 30, 2009:

H.R. 146. An Act to designate certain land as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1512. An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

January 16, 2009:

S.J. Res. 3. A joint resolution ensuring that the compensation and other emoluments attached to the office of the Secretary of the Interior are those which were in effect on January 1, 2005.

January 29, 2009:

S. 181. An Act to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and to modify the operation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes.

February 11, 2009:

S. 352. An Act to postpone the DTV transition date.

March 9, 2009:

S. 234. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2105 East Cook Street in Springfield, Illinois, as the ''Colonel John H. Wilson, Jr. Post Office Building''.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of major knee surgery and replacement.

Mr. WESTMORELAND (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a personal illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MASSA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REICHERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOOZMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1388. The Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, an Act to reauthorize and reform the national service laws.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 6, 2009, at 10 a.m., unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 93, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the first quarter of 2009 pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY AND AFGHANISTAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 14 AND FEB. 22, 2009

Name of Member or Employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Hon. John Larson	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Hon. George Miller	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Hon. Rosa DeLauro	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Hon. William Pascrell, Jr.	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Hon. Edward Markey	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Hon. Michael Capuano	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Hon. Brian Monaghan	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Michael Sheehy	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,517.00	(3)					3,517.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi, Speaker	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Hon. John Larson	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Hon. George Miller	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Hon. Rosa DeLauro	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Hon. William Pascrell, Jr.	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Hon. Edward Markey	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Hon. Michael Capuano	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Hon. Brian Monaghan	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Michael Sheehy	2/20	2/21	Afghanistan		75.00	(3)					75.00
Nadeam Elshami	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,802.00	(3)					3,802.00
Stacy Kerr	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,802.00	(3)					3,802.00
Kate Knudson	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,802.00	(3)					3,802.00
Bridget Fallon	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,802.00	(3)					3,802.00
Steven Rusnak	2/14	2/22	Italy		3,802.00	(3)					3,802.00
Committee total											58,522.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, Mar. 24 2009.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY WINTER MEETING IN BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, OECD MEETING IN PARIS, FRANCE, AND BILATERAL MEETINGS IN VIENNA, AUSTRIA, AND OBERAMMERGAU/GARMISCH, GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 14 AND FEB. 22, 2009

Name of Member or Employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John Tanner	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		(3)				2,880.55
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Hon. John Boozman	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		(3)				2,880.55
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Hon. Jo Ann Emerson	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		(3)				2,880.55
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Hon. Baron Hill	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		(3)				2,880.55
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Hon. Carolyn McCarthy	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		(3)				2,880.55
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Hon. Charlie Melancon	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		(3)				2,880.55
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Hon. Jeff Miller	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		4,253.93				4,871.93
Hon. Dennis Moore	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		(3)				2,880.55
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Hon. Mike Ross	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		(3)				2,880.55
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Hon. David Scott	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		(3)				2,880.55
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Melissa Adamson	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		(3)				2,880.55
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Kathy Becker	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		3,391.10				6,271.65
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Paul Belkin	2/14	2/17	Belgium		618.00		3,391.10				6,271.65
	2/17	2/18	France		627.78						
	2/18	2/20	Austria		862.13						
	2/20	2/22	Germany		772.64						
Delegation Expenses:											
Representational Funds									17,815.15		17,815.15
Miscellaneous									684.97		684.97
Committee total					35,184.60		11,036.13		18,500.12		64,720.85

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN S. TANNER, Chairman, Mar. 24, 2009.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1178. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons [Docket No.: EEWAP1201] (RIN: 1904-AB84) received March 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1179. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementations Plans; Kentucky; Approval Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plans for the 1997 8-hour ozone standard for the Huntington-Ashland Area, Lexington Area and Edmonson County [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-1186-200821(a); FRL-8781-5] received March 25, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1180. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan; Maryland; Reasonably Available Control Technology Requirements for Volatile Organic Compounds [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0058; FRL-8780-2] received March 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1181. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Volatile Organic Compound Reasonably Available Control Technology for Reynolds Consumer Products Company [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0093; FRL-8779-8] received March 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1182. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Amendments to the Control of Air Pollution from Combustion of Refuse [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0110; FRL-8782-2] received March 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1183. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revisions to the Alabama State Implementation Plan; Birmingham and Jackson Counties [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0359-200823(a); FRL-8781-7] received March 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1184. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Control of Emissions From Existing Other Solid Waste Incinerator Units; Arizona; Pima County Department of Environmental Quality [EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0942; FRL-8781-2] received March 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1185. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Delegation of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; State of California; Amador County Air Pollution Control

District, San Diego County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2008-0759; FRL-8783-7] received March 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1186. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — New Mexico: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-RCRA-2008-0756-; FRL-8784-9] received March 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1187. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, PSHSB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Improving Public Saftey Communications in the 800 MHz Band; New 800 MHz Band Plan for U.S. — Canada Border Regions [WT Docket 02-55] received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1188. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report detailing payments made to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommunications services pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses, as required by Section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), as amended by Section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1189. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, Bureau for Africa, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1190. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, Bureau for Africa, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1191. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, Bureau for Asia, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1192. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, Bureau for Asia, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1193. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict & Humanitarian Assist., transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1194. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict & Humanitarian Assist., transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1195. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, Bureau for Global Health, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1196. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, Agency for International Development, Bureau for Middle East, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1197. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1198. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1199. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1200. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Office of Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1201. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Office of Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1202. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Office of Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1203. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Office of Assistant Secretary for Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1204. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Office of Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1205. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Office of Asst. Secretary for Congressional & Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1206. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1207. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Office of Minority Economic Impact, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1208. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Office of Science, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1209. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer, Department of Energy, Under Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1210. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Human Capital Mgt, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1211. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau for Europe and Eurasia, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1212. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau for Europe and Eurasia, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1213. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau for Global Health, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1214. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1215. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1216. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau for Middle East, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1217. A letter from the White House Liaison, U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1218. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 071212833-8179-02] (RIN: 0648-XM22) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1219. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's Report of the Attorney General on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act for the six months ending June 30, 2008; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1220. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-80C2 and CF6-80E1 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2007-28413; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-25-AD; Amendment

39-15826; AD 2009-05-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1221. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, DC-10-10F, DC-10-15, DC-10-30, DC-10-30F (KC-10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F, MD-10-10F, MD-10-30F, MD-11, and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0735; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-085-AD; Amendment 39-15803; AD 2009-03-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1222. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tower, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1186; Airspace Docket No.: 08-AGL-12] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1223. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Columbus, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1185; Airspace Docket No.: 08-AGL-11] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1224. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Medford, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1211; Airspace Docket No.: 08-AGL-13] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1225. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30654 Amdt. No.: 3310] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1226. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30655 Amdt. No.: 3311] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1227. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0130; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-225-AD; Amendment 39-15817; AD 2009-04-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1228. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Gain Recognition Agreements with Respect to Certain Transfers of Stock or Securities by United States Persons to Foreign Corporations [TD 9446] (RIN: 1545-BG09) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1229. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Fringe Benefits Aircraft Valuation Formula (Rev. Rul. 2009-6) received March 24, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1230. A letter from the Under Secretary for Benefits and Acting Under Secretary of Defense Personnel and Readiness, Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of transmitting a report for fiscal year 2008 regarding the activities and accomplishments of both Departments, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 320; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California: Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Report of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (Rept. 111–74). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 1865. A bill to eliminate the requirement that States collect Social Security numbers from applicants for recreational licenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. STARK, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1866. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1867. A bill to authorize additional resources for the Department of Homeland Security to enhance security activities along the international border with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JONES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HELLER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LINDER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia):

H.R. 1868. A bill to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1869. A bill to require the President to call a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WU, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1870. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for relief to surviving spouses and children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

H.R. 1871. A bill to designate certain counties in the State of Arizona as high-intensity drug trafficking areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPACE (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. NYE):

H.R. 1872. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to develop and implement a secure electronic method of forwarding the Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) to the appropriate office of the Department of Veterans Affairs for the State or other locality in which a member of the Armed Forces will first reside after the discharge or release of the member from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 1873. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 with respect to juveniles who have committed offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. HARE, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MASSA, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1874. A bill to provide Federal contracting preferences for, and a reduction in the rate of income tax imposed on, Patriot corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MASSA):

H.R. 1875. A bill to establish an Emergency Commission To End the Trade Deficit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 1876. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the incorporation of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) principles in military construction projects carried out in the United States or overseas, to require a specific goal regarding the use of renewable energy sources on all military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. WATERS, Mr.

DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 1877. A bill to amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to reauthorize the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 1878. A bill to establish a health and education grant program related to autism spectrum disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 1879. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for employment and reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BEAN (for herself and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 1880. A bill to establish a system of regulation and supervision for insurers, insurance agencies, and insurance producers chartered or licensed under Federal law that ensures the stability and financial integrity of those insurers, agencies, and producers and that protects policyholders and other consumers served by such insurers, agencies, or producers; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCMAHON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1881. A bill to enhance the transportation security functions of the Department of Homeland Security by providing for an enhanced personnel system for employees of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1882. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide safeguards for credit card holders whose accounts were, or are about to be, terminated for inactivity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 1883. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a demonstration grants program to provide for certain patient coordination, outreach, and assistance services to reduce barriers to receiving health care and improve health care outcomes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GORDON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 1884. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 1885. A bill to protect private property rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 1886. A bill to authorize democratic, economic, and social development assistance for Pakistan, to authorize security assistance for Pakistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILROY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. TITUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1887. A bill to establish a Presidential Commission on Women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1888. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax to vehicle fleet operators for purchasing tires made from recycled rubber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1889. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reserve funding for American Samoa, the Northern Marianas Islands, Guam, and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1890. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to increase the percentage of State revolving loan funds reserved for American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 1891. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an above-the-line deduction for half of an individual's long-term care insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUSTRIA:

H.R. 1892. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 102 North Main Street in Cedarville, Ohio, as the ''William 'Brent'' Turner Post Office'; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1893. A bill to prohibit any person which sells to or otherwise disposes of any asset through a public-private investment program, including the Public-Private Investment Program for Legacy Assets, from purchasing or otherwise acquiring any other asset from or through such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. OLVER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. KILROY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FARR, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1894. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and increase utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under the Medicare part B program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 1895. A bill to provide driver safety grants to States with graduated driver licensing laws that meet certain minimum requirements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. LEE of New York):

H.R. 1896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that installment sales treatment shall not fail to apply to property acquired for conservation purposes by a State or local government or certain tax-exempt organizations merely because purchase funds are held in a sinking or similar fund pursuant to State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mrs. BONO MACK):

H.R. 1897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to employers for the costs of implementing wellness programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. KIND, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1898. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program for consultations regarding orders for life sustaining treatment and to provide grants for the development and expansion of programs for such orders; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOYD (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1899. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Muscogee Nation of Florida; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1900. A bill to provide for emergency deployments of United States Border Patrol agents and to increase the number of DEA and ATF agents along the international border of the United States to increase resources to identify and eliminate illicit sources of firearms into Mexico for use by violent drug trafficking organizations and for other lawful activities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOYD (for himself, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 1901. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to assess the water management, needs, and conservation of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 1902. A bill to provide veterans with individualized notice about available benefits, to streamline application processes for the benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. DREIER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 1903. A bill to provide incentives for the residential housing market; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. JONES, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1904. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individual taxpayers to designate a portion of income taxes to fund the improvement of barriers at the United States border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FARR, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 1905. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a coastal climate change adaptation planning and response program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 1906. A bill to permanently prohibit oil and gas leasing off the coast of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself and Ms. HARMAN):

H.R. 1907. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to use consumer information maintained by retailers to improve recalls of food, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado):

H.R. 1908. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for property certified by the Environmental Protection Agency under the WaterSense program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1909. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to suspend the application of mark-to-market accounting; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1910. A bill to create the Office of the Chief Technology Officer within the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1911. A bill to amend the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to require funding to help award recipients defray the costs of data collection requirements initiated pursuant to such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for qualified conservation contributions which include National Scenic Trails; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. KILROY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1913. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States, local jurisdictions, and Indian tribes to prosecute hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 1914. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for the suspension of each provision of the Act during periods of drought with respect to Federal and State agencies that manage Federal river basins that are located in each region affected by the drought; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1915. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for expanded coverage of paramedic intercept services under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1916. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to provide for a revised schedule of price increases for the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp, popularly known as the ''Duck Stamp'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1917. A bill to establish the Centennial Historic District in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MORAN of Kansas):

H.R. 1918. A bill to permit United States companies to participate in the exploration for and the extraction of hydrocarbon resources from any portion of a foreign maritime exclusive economic zone that is contiguous to the exclusive economic zone of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1919. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the withholding of income and social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 1920. A bill to prohibit United States funding for the 2009 United Nations Durban Review Conference (''Durban II Conference'') or any other activity relating to the planning, preparation, or implementation of a

follow-up meeting to the 2001 United Nations World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance ('Durban I Conference') in Durban, South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 1921. A bill to establish an Office of Public Advocate within the Department of Justice to provide services and guidance to citizens in dealing with concerns involving the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 1922. A bill to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to hold at least 1 public hearing before issuance of a permit affecting public or private land use in a locality; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PENCE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 1923. A bill to require the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to make video recordings of the examination and testing of firearms and ammunition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN (for herself, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1924. A bill to amend the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act, the Indian Tribal Justice Act, the Indian Tribal Justice Technical and Legal Assistance Act of 2000, and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to improve the prosecution of, and response to, crimes in Indian country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILL, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HODES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MASSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WU, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1925. A bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 1926. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to establish a Global Warming Education Program; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1927. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide comprehensive cancer patient treatment education under the Medicare Program and to provide for research to improve cancer symptom management; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KAGEN (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1928. A bill to increase home healthcare services, particularly for underserved and at-risk populations, by assisting visiting nurse associations and other nonprofit home health agencies to improve training and workforce development for home healthcare nurses, promoting and facilitating academic-practice collaborations, and enhancing recruitment and retention of home healthcare nurses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1929. A bill to establish the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac Investigative Commission to investigate the policies and practices engaged in by officers and directors at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac responsible for making the decisions that led to the enterprises' financial instability and the subsequent Federal conservatorship of such enterprises; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 1930. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a loan repayment program for faculty members at programs of general dentistry or pediatric dentistry to alleviate faculty shortages; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. STARK, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 1931. A bill to improve the treatment of juveniles with mental health or substance abuse disorders by establishing new grant programs for increased training, technical assistance, and coordination of service providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1932. A bill to increase the number of well-trained mental health service professionals (including those based in schools) providing clinical mental health care to children and adolescents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LATHAM, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1933. A bill to direct the Attorney General to make an annual grant to the A Child Is Missing Alert and Recovery Center to assist law enforcement agencies in the rapid recovery of missing children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRATOVIL (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H.R. 1934. A bill to apply in fiscal year 2009 the exemption of returning workers from the numerical limitations for seasonal nonimmigrant workers in order to provide short-term immediate relief to small and seasonal businesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 1935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of partnership interests held by partners providing services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 1936. A bill to provide certain requirements for the licensing of commercial nuclear facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1937. A bill to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to retain and redistribute certain amounts collected as fines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1938. A bill to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Public Health Service Act to set standards for medical diagnostic equipment and to establish a program for promoting good health, disease prevention, and wellness and for the prevention of secondary conditions for individuals with

disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 1939. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish a system of background checks for employers and employees of the electronic life safety and security system installation and monitoring industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 1940. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a Wellness Trust; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HELLER, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 1941. A bill to allow for additional flights beyond the perimeter restriction applicable to Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NADLER of New York (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1942. A bill to amend title 11 and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER of New York (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1943. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for adjustments in the individual income tax rates to reflect regional differences in the cost-of-living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1944. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 1945. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility and suitability of constructing a storage reservoir, outlet works, and a delivery system for the Tule River Indian Tribe of the Tule River Reservation in the State of California to provide a water supply for domestic, municipal, industrial, and agricultural purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan):

H.R. 1946. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to address health workforce shortages; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1947. A bill to regulate certain deferred prosecution agreements and nonprosecution agreements in Federal criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. PAUL, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 1948. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow reimbursement from flexible spending accounts for certain dental products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1949. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1950. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for professional school personnel in prekindergarten, kindergarten, and grades 1 through 12; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 1951. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for tuition and related expenses for public and nonpublic elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 1952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts contributed to charitable organizations which provide elementary or secondary school scholarships and for contributions of, and for, instructional materials and materials for extracurricular activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the Hope Scholarship Credit to be used for elementary and secondary education expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make higher education more affordable by providing a full tax deduction for higher education expenses and interest on student loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 1955. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on the sale of animals which are raised and sold as part of an educational program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1956. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset against income tax refunds to pay for State judicial debts that are past-due; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1957. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a higher education tuition credit in place of existing education tax incentives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1958. A bill to amend the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 to repeal the limitation on the authorized uses of the former bombardment area on the island of Culebra and the prohibition on Federal Government responsibility for decontamination of the area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H.R. 1959. A bill to direct the Department of Defense to utilize no-cost economic development conveyances as the preferred method of disposal of excess property generated through the base closure process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JONES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 1960. A bill to make the repeal of the estate tax permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1961. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the availability of the saver's credit, to make the credit refundable, and to make Federal matching contributions into the retirement savings of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1962. A bill to authorize the Space Shuttle to be flown from 2010 through 2015, and to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for this purpose; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN):

H.R. 1963. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the Armed Forces who are being separated from active duty receive comprehensive employment assistance, job training assistance, and other transitional services, to require that such members receive a psychological evaluation in addition to the physical examination they receive as part of their separation from active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1964. A bill to address HIV/AIDS in the African-American community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 1965. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Commerce to submit to Congress reports on the commercial and passenger vehicle traffic at certain points of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 1966. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to cyberbullying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1967. A bill to prohibit funding organizations that support or participate in coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1968. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on capital losses to $10,500 and to index such limitation to inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. CAO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 1969. A bill to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SPACE (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BERRY):

H.R. 1970. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exempt unsanctioned State-licensed retail pharmacies from the surety bond requirement under the Medicare Program for suppliers of durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 1971. A bill to provide for the elimination of duties on certain comforter shells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 1972. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide standards and procedures to guide State and local law enforcement agencies and law enforcement officers during internal investigations, interrogation of law enforcement officers, and administrative disciplinary hearings, to ensure accountability of law enforcement officers, to guarantee the due process rights of law enforcement officers, and to require States to enact law enforcement discipline, accountability, and due process laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1973. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to require post offices to have running water and sanitation facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HILL, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MICA, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 1974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the depreciation classification of motorsports entertainment complexes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1975. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 West Percy Street in Indianola, Mississippi, as the ''Minnie Cox Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WATSON (for herself, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1976. A bill to authorize grants for nongovernmental organizations that use independently produced documentary films to promote better understanding of the United States abroad and better understanding of global perspectives and other countries in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEXLER:

H.R. 1977. A bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to study drywall imported from China in 2004 through 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1978. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to improve the ability of State and local governments to prevent the abduction of children by family members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky):

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution encouraging the negotiation of an ''Incidents at Sea Agreement'' between the United States of America and the Government of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHILDERS:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance of the Department of Agriculture Forest Service Experimental Forests and Ranges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance of autism awareness, supporting efforts to increase funding for research into the causes and treatment of autism and to improve training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution calling on the President to support United Nations Security Council referrals of situations involving genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity to the International Criminal Court, to cooperate with investigations and prosecutions conducted by the International Criminal Court, and participate as an observer at meetings of the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution recognizing the disparate impact of climate change on women and the efforts of women globally to address climate change; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mr. PLATTS):

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Early Educator Worthy Wage Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 319. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should take all necessary steps to expeditiously deploy a missile defense system in Europe that will help provide such a defense to United States allies in Europe while enhancing United States defenses against missile attacks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WATT (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. BARROW, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CAO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H. Res. 320. A resolution honoring the Life and achievements of Dr. John Hope Franklin; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BACA:

H. Res. 321. A resolution congratulating the boys' basketball team at Eisenhower High School in Rialto, California, for winning the State championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H. Res. 322. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 25, 2009 as ''National Day of the Cowboy''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. BACHMANN):

H. Res. 323. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that rescission bills always be considered under open rules every year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 324. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 2009 as ''Jazz Appreciation Month'' and April 25, 2009, as ''Willis Conover Day'', and honoring the global impact of jazz music; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H. Res. 325. A resolution expressing support for designation of a ''Free Enterprise Education Week'' to encourage elementary and secondary schools, institutions of higher education, and small and large businesses to educate students about free enterprise; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCMAHON:

H. Res. 326. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of April 13, 2009, through April 17, 2009, as ''Protect Your Pharmacy Week'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCMAHON:

H. Res. 327. A resolution honoring the humble service of Edward Cardinal Egan as Archbishop of the New York Archdiocese and congratulating Archbishop Timothy Dolan on his appointment by His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI to succeed Cardinal Egan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. EHLERS):

H. Res. 328. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all Americans should recognize National Military Appreciation Month with appropriate programs and activities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 329. A resolution recognizing the anniversary of the tragic accident of the steamboat ship SS Sultana; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TANNER (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, and Mr. WAMP):

H. Res. 330. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of the Navy should name an appropriate Navy ship in honor of Marine Corps General Clifton B. Cates of Tiptonville, Tennessee; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H. Res. 331. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Drowning Prevention and Water Safety Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIAHRT:

H. Res. 332. A resolution providing that the House of Representatives will focus on removing barriers to a prosperous economy and therefore renew the dream; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. FATTAH):

H. Res. 333. A resolution recognizing nonproliferation options for nuclear understanding to keep everyone safe (NO NUKES); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

14. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the State Senate of Oklahoma, relative to Senate Resolution No. 5 strongly opposing the federal Freedom of Choice Act; and directing distribution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. TIBERI introduced a bill (H.R. 1979) for the relief of Mary Cole, Decontee Cole, Emmanuel Cole, Anna Cole, Yon Deh Cole, and Emmanuel Cole, Jr; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. ROONEY, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 24: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 43: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TURNER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. KIND, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 82: Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 144: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 154: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 179: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 197: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 207: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. REYES, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 211: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 235: Mr. MINNICK, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 270: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 275: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 301: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 302: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 303: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 333: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 347: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BEAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KIND, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. Titus, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 415: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 422: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. HELLER, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 424: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 442: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 444: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 468: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H.R. 498: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 503: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 520: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 556: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 557: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 560: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 574: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 616: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JENKINS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 708: Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 745: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NYE, Mr. STARK, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. DENT, Mr. MICA, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 764: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 775: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.R. 832: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 836: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BONNER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 848: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 855: Ms. KOSMAS.

H.R. 874: Mr. RUSH and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 890: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 896: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 900: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 904: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 914: Mr. LATTA and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 916: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 930: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 948: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 959: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 964: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 984: Mr. FILNER and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 988: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1024: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1027: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1033: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1050: Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 1061: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1064: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1067: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1068: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1074: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 1077: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1126: Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1132: Mr. HIGGINS and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1158: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1161: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1178: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 1179: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1180: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1185: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1189: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. DENT, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1193: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 1203: Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1205: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. NUNES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 1206: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1207: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 1208: Mr. BONNER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 1209: Mr. BONNER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARROW, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 1210: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1230: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1242: Mr. STEARNS and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1243: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CAO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CHILDERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DENT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HARE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KILROY, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1250: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1269: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 1283: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1294: Mr. HELLER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1298: Mr. WOLF and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1300: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1305: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1308: Mr. HIMES, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. MINNICK.
H.R. 1310: Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1313: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 1318: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1324: Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1335: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOCCIERI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1349: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 1350: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1351: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1352: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BROWN of of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1386: Ms. GIFFORDS.
H.R. 1389: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1392: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1398: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1403: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1414: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 1433: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1443: Mr. STARK, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1449: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H.R. 1454: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MACK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1458: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H.R. 1470: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1483: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1499: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1509: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1521: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1548: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1550: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1551: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1558: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1584: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1585: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1587: Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 1588: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H.R. 1604: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WU, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 1605: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. MCMAHON.
H.R. 1612: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1615: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 1616: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1621: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1622: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 1646: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1662: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BOREN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BACA, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1671: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1673: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 1677: Ms. SUTTON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1681: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1683: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1685: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1686: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1689: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1690: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1701: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1710: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1723: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1737: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 1740: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 1744: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. REYES, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. FOXX, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1749: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1762: Ms. GIFFORDS and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 1764: Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1778: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1799: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1800: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1802: Mr. HELLER and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1805: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1814: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1815: Ms. FOXX, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mrs. BONO MACK.
H.R. 1829: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1831: Mr. NUNES, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1836: Mr. NYE.
H.R. 1844: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1846: Mr. MINNICK.
H.R. 1864: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.J. Res. 41: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. MARCHANT.
H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. GERLACH.
H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. WELCH, Mr. KIND, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. HELLER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. SPACE, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Con. Res. 92: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H. Res. 20: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H. Res. 42: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Res. 65: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 111: Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 130: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 159: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Ms. DELAURO.
H. Res. 191: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H. Res. 204: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 208: Mr. MCHENRY.
H. Res. 244: Mr. SOUDER.
H. Res. 245: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 248: Mrs. CAPITO.
H. Res. 252: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Res. 260: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 274: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 283: Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 293: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H. Res. 299: Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 300: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 301: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BOREN.
H. Res. 309: Mr. SIRES and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H. Res. 311: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. ELLISON.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

23. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Township of Irvington, New Jersey, relative to Resolution MC 09-0210-8 In Support of and Recommending for Consideration Certain Legislative Initiatives To Be Included Within the Pending Federal Economic Stimulus Plan; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

24. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 87 of 2009 Requesting That The United States House of Representatives and Senate Create, Introduce And Pass Legislation That Would Direct the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) To Amend 10 CFR Part 54 of The Commission's Regulations (Requirements For Renewal of Operating Licenses For Nuclear Power Plants) To Include The Criteria Used In Licensing A Power Plant; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

25. Also, a petition of the City of North Miami Beach, Florida, relative to Resolution No. R2009-14 Expressing Opposition to and Strong Concerns Regarding Senate Bill 630 and Similar Legislation That Would Impose a Moratorium on the Collection of Impact Fees By Local Governments; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.