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.—

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: $13,623,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $14,753,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $15,719,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $16,798,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,048,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $19,341,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $20,726,000,000,000.

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 cochair 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.
(17) General Government (800):
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)	Wolf	Wu
Wittman	Woolsey	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Hinojosa	Sablan
Miller, Gary	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.—

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 shortsighted 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 long-standing 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