□ 1030

EARLY DIAGNOSIS SAVES MONEY FOR RESEARCH

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

Mr. PALLONE. I heard my Republican colleague from California who just spoke say that somehow the President was suggesting that this health care reform bill, which is so important, might go so far as to cure cancer. I tell you, it's not going to cure cancer. But if you think about the fact that in this bill we put so much emphasis on prevention and we make sure that 97 percent of Americans who are not elderly would now be covered, the fact of the matter is that means that people go to a doctor on a regular basis. And if they go to a doctor and they find out that they have cancer at an earlier stage, then they get the attention so maybe they don't die from the cancer.

You know what? If everybody goes to the doctor now and as a result of that they don't have to go for more serious treatment and the expense that's involved with that, there will be money saved—and that money can go towards more research on cancer and the cure for cancer.

So I would say to my colleague, we're not saying it's going to cure cancer, but I tell you it would do a lot towards preventing those people that have serious problems, finding them out early, being diagnosed, and helping them out.

SELLING THE FAILED STIMULUS PLAN

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

Ms. FOXX. Five months ago, President Obama warned that if Congress failed to pass the stimulus plan, unemployment could reach 9 percent. But the President promised if we took action and accepted his stimulus plan, unemployment would halt around 8 percent.

Despite borrowing $787 billion for wasteful government spending under the guise of stimulus, the national unemployment rate now stands at 9.5 percent—a rate not seen in 26 years.

Even though unemployment is rising at an alarming rate, the President continues to sell the American people on his failed stimulus plan. Just recently, the President said the stimulus plan had ''done its job.'' The American people know better. The American people know you can't spend and borrow your way back to a growing economy.

It's time for a real economic recovery plan, one that puts money back in the hands of families and small businesses. It's time for Congress to pass the House Republican's economic recovery plan—a plan for fiscal discipline and tax relief.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3170, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 644 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 644

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3170) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read through page 145, line 11. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, except as provided in section 2, no amendment shall be in order except the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. In the case of sundry amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After disposition of the amendments specified in the first section of this resolution, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees each may offer one pro forma amendment to the bill for the purpose of debate, which shall be controlled by the proponent.

SEC. 3. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

SEC. 4. During consideration of H.R. 3170, the Chair may reduce to two minutes the minimum time for electronic voting under clause 6 of rule XVIII and clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against consideration of the rule because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden to identify the specific language in the resolution on which the point of order is predicated. Such a point of order shall be disposed of by the question of consideration.

The gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

After that debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: ''Will the House now consider the resolution?''

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I rise today once again to plead with the majority party to lift the legislative version of martial law that's been imposed on appropriation bills this year.

We're more than halfway through the season and so far we've had, for appropriation bills, more than 700 amendments have been filed with the Rules Committee. Only 119, or less than 20 percent, have been made in order. Roughly a quarter of them that have been made in order have been my earmark amendments, which I'm pleased for. Don't get me wrong. I'm grateful they're made in order.

But these earmarks, this is about the only vetting, as shallow is it may be, on the floor of the House that these earmarks get, because they're certainly not getting the vetting they deserve in the Appropriations Committee. But this is insufficient.

It's not right to have a legislative version of martial law on appropriation bills and to bring up the issue of timing, to say, We don't have time to deal with all the amendments that have been offered, as was demonstrated yesterday when I asked unanimous consent five times—five times—to simply swap out an amendment that was not ruled in order by the Rules Committee—that was germane, just not ruled in order—for one of mine that would have been given.

It wouldn't have taken any extra time. We would have been under the same time constraints of the bill. So we would be living within the time constraints that the majority party has laid down.