

The businesses that need these signs up in front of them are also the ones that are under the scrutiny of the IRS. They're under the scrutiny of the Federal regulators. There is some information that I have accumulated that shows that the businesses in this country are subjected to over 680 Federal regulating agencies. Six hundred-eighty. And the burden that small business has is they don't have multiple floors in their high-rise office buildings that are full of lawyers and counselors that are in the business of keeping these businesses in compliance with all the Federal regulations.

They need to have their property rights preserved. They need to have low taxation and low regulation. Big business will often come to this Congress and advocate for more regulations because they know it puts them at a competitive advantage over the small businesses that are at a distinct disadvantage, Mr. Speaker.

These businesses need every advantage we can give them because they are the incubators for the businesses that will grow into the large employers into the future. They happen to also be the businesses that employ a significant majority—70 to 80 percent—of the employees in this country.

They can't make it without signs. They can't make it without being able to exercise those property rights. The Small Business Administration recognizes that. We recognize that, also, in this resolution tonight, as we recognize the burden of this economy, the burden of this budget, and the extravagant expenses and spending that's taking place that's rolling out from the top reaches of the government in this country.

Somehow, there has been this tsunami of a current that has swallowed us up—a Keynesian current—the idea that we can spend and borrow our way into prosperity, even though a family can't do that, a small business knows they can't do that, the on-premise sign industry knows that you can't do that.

You've got to have effective utilization of the resources in order to find a profit so that you can hire people. That's what creates jobs, is profit. Productivity marketed well, with good advertising, creates the profit that's necessary in order to hire employees and it creates the good jobs.

I want to provide the provision so that in this country our small businesses can succeed with signage, with low taxes, low regulation, and not putting the burden off onto future generations.

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

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would yield myself the balance of my time.

To reiterate these points that I've made, it may not serve a purpose here, but I would take us back to where we stand with the Federal spending that exists today.

This Federal spending that doubles our deficit in 5 years and triples it in 10

years, this spending, this profligate spending that's rooted in the Keynesian philosophy—John Maynard Keynes—who said, "I can solve all the unemployment in America." This is during the economic crisis called the Great Depression of the thirties.

How did he propose to solve all the unemployment problem in America? He said, If I can just go out to an abandoned coal mine and drill a lot of holes into the bottom of that abandoned coal mine and put U.S. dollars in those holes, fill them back up again and fill the coal mine full of garbage"—and that was the word he used, was garbage, which I thought was interesting—then he would turn the entrepreneurs in America loose and they could go about digging through that garbage and that would put everybody to work and it would solve the unemployment.

This is the mindset that prevails in this psychology that comes from those who are spending trillions and trillions of our grandchildren's dollars.

It's interesting. I don't know that John Maynard Keynes when he talked about digging holes and burying money and filling the coal mine up with garbage, he didn't talk about the signage necessary to be able to direct the entrepreneurs to the landfill or the coal mine so they could begin to dig through that garbage and come up with this money.

In fact, Keynes said: The more foolish the spending, the better, because at least when you spend it in a foolish way, it's not competing directly with the private sector that has, by virtue of it being able to compete, demonstrated that it is a more prudent expenditure than government can possibly make.

So I don't submit that we bury money in the coal mine or fill the coal mine up with garbage. I think that the EPA would probably raise an objection with that, Mr. Speaker. But I do submit that we get our wits about us, get a handle on what we're doing with our expenditures, get control of this profligate spending that's taking place and take responsibility in our time, in our generation, this year, now, here, in the House of Representatives, instead of delaying it off onto future generations.

Let's tighten our belt now like a family would tighten their belt now. Let's make sure that the entrepreneurs in America have the tools they need to help us recover from this downward spiral in our economy.

Let's keep the taxes low, let's keep our spending low, let's keep our borrowing low. Let's keep our regulations low and let's put our signs up high so everybody can see where to turn off to the small business and do business there.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to clear the well while another Member is under recognition.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 298.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert material relevant to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 85, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

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 305 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 85.

□ 2058

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 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 concurrent resolution.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, President Bush has left President Obama a

hard hand to play. The economy is receding, the budget is in deficit by \$1.752 trillion, according to OMB, and the end is nowhere in sight.

□ 2100

President Obama has responded with a budget that meets the challenge head on. The Budget Committee's resolution before us tonight reflects his policies and his proposals.

The President has recognized that we have not one but two deficits. The first is an economy running at 6 percent to 7 percent below its full capacity. To move our economy closer to its capacity, the President has signed into law a package of stimulus measures totaling \$787 billion.

Here is what the Congressional Budget Office says in its analysis issued 2 weeks ago about the stimulus package, and I am quoting, "The adoption of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and very aggressive actions by the Federal Reserve and the Treasury will help end this recession this fall." Let's hope they are right.

In light of this prognosis, it is hard to believe, but our colleagues from across the aisle use their budget to call for terminating, ending, the Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

The President next turned to the budget. He has sent us a budget to cut the deficit by two-thirds, two-thirds by 2013, from \$1,752,000,000 from this year to \$533 billion in 2013.

Now, it is all but impossible to balance a budget when the economy is in recession, and, for that matter, it is ill-advised. To end, or at least to mitigate this recession, our economy is in need of more demand for goods and more demand for services, and any demand we generate to make the economy run better will make the deficit run larger at least for now.

But here is the stark reality: The deficit that President Bush left behind constitutes a massive 12.3 percent of our gross domestic product. At least two-thirds of that stems from tax and spending policies undertaken by the Bush administration. Anyone, almost anyone, would agree that this is an unsustainable deficit, defensible only in deep intractable recessions.

President Obama clearly believes that, because he has responded with a budget that pares the deficit down to 3 percent of GDP in 2013. His budget cuts the deficit to \$533 billion in 4 years.

The budget embodied in our resolution before us tonight uses CBO projections instead of OMB, and reduces the deficit to \$586 billion in 2013. That is 3.6 percent of GDP or, roughly, the real rate of growth for that year.

Our budget is not so committed to deficit reduction that it overrides or overlooks other needs. In fact, it takes on topics that previous budgets have found too tough to tackle, like health care for the millions of Americans who lack insurance.

On top of that, it slows down defense spending with an increase of 4 percent,

and makes a moderate adjustment to nondefense discretionary spending, lifting it a bit above this year.

Notwithstanding deficits, the President's budget launches some bold initiatives to make our economy more productive and our people more competitive: First, in education through Pell Grants in particular; next, in health care for the millions who are uninsured; and, finally, on alternative energy to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and the depletion of our environment. This resolution upholds those priorities.

Now, some will single out instances where additional revenue is raised, for example, by allowing certain concessions for upper-bracket taxpayers to expire at the end of 2010, which is the date they were set to expire.

But the bigger picture will show that this budget leaves in place the middle-income tax cuts adopted in 2001 and 2003, the 10 percent bracket, the child tax credit, and the marriage penalty relief. It indexes the alternative minimum tax to keep it from coming down on middle-income taxpayers, for whom it was never intended. It also extends estate tax exemptions at the 2009 level, \$3.5 million per decedent, and indexes the exemptions for future years.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have complained about the President's tax and spending policies; but let me read from CBO's own non-partisan analysis of the President's budget, which is basically before us tonight.

I am quoting: Proposed changes in tax policy would reduce revenues by an estimated \$1.7 trillion over the next 10 years. Reduced revenues, by an estimated \$1.7 trillion over the next 10 years. That is CBO talking.

The President's major initiatives, those in health care, energy, education, the environment, are all implemented by way of reserve funds. And I would stress that these funds are deficit neutral. They are yet to be funded, and will only become operative to the extent they are funded and will only be enacted if they are deficit neutral.

The resolution before us sounds all of these themes and, with a few exception, supports the principles that underlie the President's own budget. This is just the beginning; however, it is a bold beginning for the 2010 budget.

Our resolution is laid out in the form of a 5-year budget using CBO's scoring and CBO's projections of the economy. OMB has run its budget out over 10 years and our Republican colleagues have done the same, but a 5-year budget is not at all unusual; in fact, it is the customary timeframe for budgeting. In recent years, four deficit reduction acts have been enacted, and all implemented budgets of less than 10 years. Graham-Rudman-Hollings, the Bush Budget Summit, the Clinton Budget in 1993, and the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 all were 5-year budgets.

The farther out you run forecasts, the more tenuous they become. It is

speculative just to predict what the economy is going to do 10 months from now much less 10 years from now. Five-year forecasts are, therefore, more realistic, more reliable; and, if the projected results don't pan out, they are more amenable to adjustment.

All projections rest on assumptions about the future, and the assumptions can have a profound effect on the bottom line. To show you how uncertain assumptions can be and projections can become, look at CBO's recent experience. Just since last January, CBO's estimate of the deficit is off by \$436 billion, since January. Look at the long run, because small differences compound over time into big differences. Over 10 years, the difference between OMB's estimate of tax revenues received and CBO's is \$2.8 trillion. That is a huge difference that has a huge impact on the bottom line of these competing forecasts.

Fortunately, the congressional budget process is an annual process. Since we revisit the budget every year, we can take steps to correct its course, which we will surely do with deficits of this gravity looming over us.

For our part, I can tell you that we are mindful of the second 5 years. As we approach 2015 and 2016, we will be making corrections to see that the deficit stays on a downward trajectory. We believe that these midcourse corrections can best be made when our economy has emerged from the recession and we have a much better and clearer view of an economy that bounces back.

Right now, our economy is mired in the worst recession since the 1930s. It stands in marked contrast to the fiscal situation that the Bush administration faced 8 years ago. Instead of inheriting a surplus of \$5.6 trillion as did President Bush, President Obama has inherited a deficit, a deficit of \$1.7 trillion to \$1.8 trillion. At least \$1.3 trillion is attributable to the spending and taxing policies of the Bush administration.

In effect, President Bush told us we could have it all, guns, butter, and tax cuts, too, and never mind the deficits. Well, 8 years and \$5 trillion later, the country is confronted with the worst deficits in our peacetime history. These are not cyclical deficits so much as they are structural deficits. They were built into the structure of the budget over the last 8 years, and they will overhang our budget for years to come as we try to wind them down.

This situation cannot be reversed in a year, but we offer today a budget resolution that puts us on the right path. It will have to be renewed, it will have to be complemented, it will have to be adjusted many times before the economy and the budget are right again, but today we can start that process by voting for this resolution.

I ask the Chair if she could tell me how much time was consumed.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has used 9 minutes.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, let me inquire about the time allotments. I realize we have 2 hours equally divided. It is my understanding the gentleman is going to do 10-minute blocks. Is that what the chairman is going to be doing? Okay. Let me ask, Madam Chair, how much time is remaining on their side.

The CHAIR. They have used 9 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 10 minutes to myself to control that block of time. Madam Chairman, this is a big debate. This is a very, very significant debate. This is a debate about the budget of our country, the fiscal future of our country. It is a debate that is probably the biggest fiscal debate we have had in this country in decades.

It is 9 p.m. on a Wednesday night. This is a debate that is going to go on for 3 hours, into the late part of the night. I wonder why the majority decided: Let's have this debate when everybody is watching CSI. Let's have this debate when no one is watching C-SPAN.

If we are so excited about this budget, why aren't we having this debate in the broad daylight? If we really think this is the way forward for America, why don't we talk about it when America is watching? It is almost like a pay raise debate.

Now, let's talk about this budget. We need more than just 3 hours, I would say, to debate this budget. Let's look at just what this budget does.

Now, you are going to hear three phrases: Spends too much, borrows too much, taxes too much. That underscores what this budget really does.

Madam Chairman, the debt held by the public under this budget doubles in 5½ years, triples in a little over 10 years. Let's put it in a different way.

The kind of red ink this budget proposes for our children and our grandchildren, for our country, is more under this presidency than the presidencies of George Washington to George W. Bush combined.

We used to see these charts out in front of the offices of the Members who call themselves Blue Dogs, until the charts were banned out in front of offices, that said: Here is what the national debt is. Here is your share. It is shameful. It is terrible. We have got to get our debt. And yet, we are told that the Blue Dogs are marching in lockstep for this budget that doubles the national debt in 5½ years and triples it in 10½ years.

And one thing would be interesting, one thing would be a decent argument if all the tax increases in this budget, \$1.5 trillion in tax increases, the biggest tax increase we last had was \$345 billion. So \$1.5 trillion in tax increases, small businesses, the assets that make up our pension funds, our 401(k) funds, our college savings plans, energy. One estimate from MIT says the cap-and-trade scheme could raise taxes on households by as much as \$4,500 a year. The Congressional Budget Office says,

no, it is more like \$1,600 a year. The point is, a lot of taxes.

Are these tax increases being used to reduce the deficit? Are these tax increases being used to pay down debt like President Clinton proposed in 1993, the last time we had a really large tax increase? No. They are to fuel higher spending.

But what is worse than all of that from a fiscal recklessness standpoint is all these new taxes, \$1.5 trillion, is to finance even more spending. So we are putting our country on this vicious cycle of chasing ever higher spending with ever higher taxes that never quite catch up with that spending to give us a record amount of debt. The problem is, one day maybe people won't buy our debt. What happens when that happens?

So we are going to hear from our colleagues over the next 1 hour, 45 minutes about all the great investments in education, the great investments in this and the investments on that, and spending money on this and spending money on that, and just how great and compassionate that is. I want to tell you one thing, I want to show you what the Congressional Budget Office just told us, and here is what they told us.

My three children, who are 4, 5, and 7 years old, when they are my age, here is the tax bill that will be due them—this is the Congressional Budget Office—if we don't get this under control. These are the tax rates that will be necessary to tax the next generation. When my kids are my age raising their kids in Janesville, Wisconsin, just like I am doing with my wife and myself, the bottom tax bracket for that generation if we pass this budget and pass this bill on to them, the 10 percent bracket goes up to 26 percent. Middle-income taxpayers who now pay a 25 percent income tax bracket pay 66 percent.

□ 2115

The upper bracket, which is the one that the small businesses pay, instead of paying 38 percent, or it is about to be 40, will pay 92 percent.

This is not some mythical pie-in-the-sky estimate. This is the Congressional Budget Office saying if you are going to raise taxes to pay for all this borrowing, here's what the next generation is going to get. We are passing on to the next generation the most reckless budget, the most reckless deficit and borrowing spree, in generations.

Here is my biggest concern, and I want to yield to some of my colleagues here. My concern is that at the beginning of this budget debate what we really ought to be talking about here is do we want the America we know and love, or do we want to take that system, put it aside and adopt another form of government, adopt a European-style system? Because that is, after all, what we are talking about here. Do we want to have our tax levels, our debt levels, the size of our government levels at these huge levels that we know

very well from history's stories show us high unemployment, stagnant wages and lower standards of living?

I just find it so interesting and so ironic that European capitals are lecturing us today on fiscal discipline. It is kind of embarrassing actually. I find it amazing that the Chinese are lecturing us about getting our borrowing under control because they are worried about the value of our currency in our bonds. It is embarrassing. And yet, in the middle of the night, we bring this budget up that proposes this enormous gusher of more spending, more borrowing and more taxing. And we think this is the road to prosperity? This is the road to serfdom.

We will offer an alternative tomorrow. Yes, our friends on the left will disagree with that alternative. We want America back. We want the country we grew up in. We want the country that says we are going to have a safety net to help those people who cannot help themselves, help them when they are down on their luck. We don't want everybody laying in a hammock where they are dependent on the government. We want a country that rewards achievement, production, activity, working hard, improving your life, making life better for you and making sure in your generation you take on your responsibilities and fix the problems so your kids are better off. That is the America we grew up in. That is the America we want, and that is the America you are kissing away with this budget.

We are going to talk numbers. We are going to talk statistics. But at the end of the day, we are passing an unconscionable amount of debt on to the next generation. And it is going to kill our current economy. I'm not one who is typically that passionate. I am not one who typically comes down here and says things like this. But I have never seen a budget like this in my life. I have never seen the numbers quite this awesome in how big they are. This is a budget that should be rejected.

We want bipartisanship. But for the majority to have it, you have to collaborate with us. And we are asking the Blue Dogs, I know you're out there. I know you're thinking about this vote. I know you're listening. Help us. Do you want your fingerprints on this mountain of borrowing? Do you want to go home to your constituents whom you told you were going to be conservatives and say you signed up for this stuff? You have the votes to stop this. The people who call themselves Blue Dog Democrats can stop this bill. They have the votes to do that. Do it, and join us, and let's work together to fix this.

I want to close my comments the way I opened them in the markup. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is a true gentleman. He brings real definition to this northerner as to what it means to be a southern gentleman. I would love nothing more than to sit across the table from that

man and strike a real budget bargain that actually reduces our debt, that actually puts our fiscal house in order. Because that is the kind of man that could do that kind of a budget. He did it in 1997. I think he can do it again.

Unfortunately, this administration, this House leadership, is leading us off the leftward cliff. They are leading us off a leftward cliff. And it is in the power of those Democrats who call themselves Blue Dogs to stop it from happening. And I am begging you, please, stop this crime on the next generation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, how much time do I have left in my allotment?

The CHAIR. Fifteen seconds.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, before yielding 11 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, I yield 1 minute to Mr. ANDREWS, the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Chair, my very sincere and articulate friend from Wisconsin forgot a few facts. He forgot that during the watch of his party, for every \$1 of debt they inherited, they left us with nearly \$2.

He neglected to mention that the budget before us cuts by two-thirds the deficit that we inherited from our friends on the other side. He neglected to mention the budget before us cuts by \$1.5 trillion taxes on middle-income Americans who drive school buses or sell real estate. And he neglected to mention that under their method of job creation, for every one job they created under their way, we created 108 under our way of managing the economy.

This is a very big debate and a very big choice between a failed status quo of the past and a progressive way to change our country in the future. That is why we are going to vote "yes" for this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 11 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Thank you to Chairman SPRATT for his tireless and excellent work on this budget. It is a budget that embraces the President's goals to rebuild the economy, to restore fiscal integrity and to give Congress the ability to make investments needed for our future prosperity and security.

First, it is important to understand and remember that President Obama and this Congress inherited the results of 8 years of failed economic and fiscal policies, doubling the national debt in 8 years and left this administration with \$1.3 trillion in debt and an economy in deep recession. We have already taken action to rebuild our economy and to create new jobs providing tax relief to 95 percent of Americans, creating jobs by assisting small businesses and our States, investing in needed infrastruc-

ture and investing in energy independence, health IT and education.

This budget builds, by these essential steps, by enabling Congressional action, that will lead us to future economic growth in the areas of education, energy and health care. We will not be prepared, we will not be economically competitive if we do not tackle these challenges.

For the next few minutes, my colleagues and I will focus on the critical investments we need to make in health care. This budget sets aside a revenue-neutral reserve fund for health care reform. "Revenue neutral" means that we will find the money to pay for health care reform. And it includes reconciliation language to ensure that we have the debate much needed here in Congress and with the American people on the issues of cost, quality and access to health care for all Americans. Through the discussion, we would hope that we can be bipartisan.

We expect to develop a uniquely American solution to address the concerns of American families and American businesses. Forty-seven million uninsured Americans, millions more underinsured and rising costs in health care premiums for our families, for our businesses and, yes, increasing costs for government. This American solution will achieve three important goals. One, we will contain the unsustainable growth in health care costs borne by public and private sectors. Two, we will improve quality and efficiency so that Americans get the very best and appropriate health care they need. And three, we will expand access and remove barriers to affordable health coverage for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget because it is honest, it is fiscally responsible, and it enables us to address the long-term goal of quality, affordable health coverage for all Americans, which is the foundation of economic prosperity and security for our citizens and our Nation.

Now I would like to ask to join in the conversation the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. This budget addresses our Nation's priorities. It confronts our economic crisis. It makes critical investments in our long-term growth. It cuts the deficit by nearly two-thirds and cuts taxes for middle-class Americans. It reduces wasteful spending while making long overdue investments to get our country back on track.

At its core, the idea is that we cannot fix our economy without fixing our health care, as the gentlewoman spoke about. Every day I hear stories from my constituents about a broken system; the woman who lost her job and health care benefits, the small business owner struggling to offer health care coverage to his or her employees, people with preexisting conditions who cannot find a health insurance policy at any cost.

There are no easy answers when it comes to making our health care sys-

tem work for everyone. One thing is clear: This is our window of opportunity. The country cannot wait another year. Bills are piling up, and people are putting off the health care they need. This budget is essential to ensuring quality, affordable health care for all of our citizens. And it says to them, as my colleague knows, it gives them flexibility, keep what you have now, or you have a choice of a private or a public health insurance plan.

This budget takes action to control the underlying cost of health care. It addresses chronic illness on which we spend 75 cents of every health care dollar. We must do a better job encouraging healthier life styles. It covers preventive services and improves care coordination, all of which improves the quality and creates a more efficient health care system that delivers better care, not just more care. And finally, we need to reform this broken health care system, not in spite of our struggling economy, but because of it.

I urge my colleagues to stand behind this responsible budget. It is the foundation of a strong economy, future growth and true health care reform. I thank the gentlewoman for leading this segment of the budget debate. Health care is what our future needs to be about. This budget does it.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I thank the gentlewoman.

Now I want to recognize the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. I want to thank Chairman SPRATT, and I want to thank Congresswoman SCHWARTZ for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution that is before us this evening. It is clear that in order to rebuild our economy and achieve long-term fiscal sustainability, we are going to make strategic investments in programs like health care, education and energy while simultaneously providing meaningful tax relief to families and businesses who are struggling right now to regain their economic footing. Well, this budget reflects those crucial priorities while adhering to an honest accounting of our fiscal challenges.

Now I believe that our greatest budgetary challenge right now is one that is deeply and unmistakably intertwined with the strength of our Nation's economy, and that is the need for health care reform.

Dr. Peter Orszag, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, recently testified before the House Budget Committee that "the single most important step that we can take to put our Nation back on a path to fiscal responsibility is to address rising health care costs." Well, I could not agree more. As the cost of health care continues to rise, it is burdening our families, placing employers at a competitive disadvantage and costing our government, and ultimately the taxpayers, billions in unnecessary expenditures.

Well, Madam Chair, this budget supports our shared goals for health care

reform and provides the framework necessary to improve the health of our Nation, reduce expenditures over the long-term and ultimately regain the economic strength of our great Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution. I give great credit to Chairman SPRATT and my colleagues on the Budget Committee for the hard work that they have put in to craft a responsible, truthful budget.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I thank the gentleman. And I want to yield to the gentleman from neighboring New Jersey, Representative ANDREWS.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Chair, for 8 dreary years, we have heard what the other party could not do. No, they could not stop the hemorrhaging of dollars from our pockets to pay for health care. No, they could not bring quality health care to every American. No, they couldn't provide health care for hardworking people who stand behind cash registers or pump gas or work at a nursing home. No. No. No.

We have turned a new leaf. There is a new opportunity to talk about what America can do. And this budget says what we can do together in health care. It says to those who have health care and like their coverage, they can keep it. It says to those who like the doctor or the hospital they go to, they can continue to do that.

But it says to those Americans who work so hard every day but cannot have a health care card in their pocket when they take their child to a pediatrician that it is your time now, it is your turn now to have some attention from this Capital and from this government.

□ 2130

And this budget facilitates and makes possible a plan where hardworking Americans can finally have access to affordable health care. The naysayers will say, no, it's too soon. No, it's too much. No, it's too grandiose. I don't think it's too soon. I think it's too late for a lot of people. I don't think it's too much. In some ways it's too little, and it certainly is time to stop the hemorrhaging of dollars from the pockets of our people, provide health care for hardworking people, and that is what this budget does.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. And last, and certainly very important in this debate is someone who's been very outspoken on health care, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, Representative SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I think I've been waiting for this budget, this opportunity most of my adult life, certainly, all of my public life.

Budgets aren't just about numbers. They're about visions and values, and to me there is no more important value than this budget's commitment to guaranteed, affordable, quality, comprehensive health care for all Americans.

No sector of our economy is immune from the twin problems of rising health care costs and declining access. Virtually no family in our country is immune. 47 million Americans are uninsured, but they're not the only ones struggling. Over half of all Americans are delaying, foregoing or skimping on necessary medical care. The consequences are serious.

Businesses, especially small businesses, are being forced to lay off long-term staff, cut or eliminate benefits, or even close their doors because of health care costs.

And this budget also makes room for improvements in Medicare, providing reasonable payments to doctors, and improving the quality of care for our seniors and persons with disabilities.

Some in this body have spoken against health care provisions in this budget because they say the cost is too great. But the American people know that the cost of maintaining the status quo is even greater and more unsustainable.

We can and, going forward, we will debate on how to achieve reform. And I'll be working hard to give everyone the option of choosing a public health insurance plan. But if we don't pass this budget now, we will miss the historic opportunity to finally make sure that every single American will have access to the affordable comprehensive health care that we all need.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Chairman, I think my colleagues have made the point, and we all have. It's time to take action on health care.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I will yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. AUSTRIA.

Mr. AUSTRIA. Madam Chairman, I'd like to thank the ranking member from Wisconsin for yielding. And as we just heard from the ranking member, this budget will increase the size, scope and cost of the Federal Government by historic amounts.

And when I fly home on weekends to my three sons—I also have three sons—it is difficult for me to go back home knowing the amount of debt, historic amounts of debt that I am putting on my children, our children and our grandchildren, that will be paid for for years to come.

And now to chase some of the spending, what this budget does, it now includes nearly \$1.5 trillion in new taxes, a tax hike over the next decade that's going to further weaken America's prospects for sustained economic growth and job creation well into the future. And it's no surprise that the bulk of these tax hikes are allegedly to hit those nameless, faceless wealthy Americans, so to speak. But, in fact, those people, those individuals that we're talking about, many of those are small business owners and investors, the same small business owners and investors who create 60 to 80 percent of the jobs in this country, and who are precisely the people whose enterprise is needed to restore the economy.

This budget includes a cap-and-trade proposal that sounds harmless, but, in fact, it is very harmful. It's a \$629 billion tax increase on who? On hardworking families, families that are struggling to make it from paycheck to paycheck.

If you use natural gas, if you turn on the light switch and use electricity, you heat your home, you fill up your gas tank with gasoline, anything you use with carbon, we're now going to raise the cost of energy on you. We're going to raise, in this bill, the cost of energy for the average American family by about \$1,600 per year. And I have seen reports that are two, three times that amount.

And this tax will further erode the job growth of the U.S. manufacturing sector. And I am from a State in the Midwest, Ohio, where we have a lot of manufacturing. And I fear that we're putting American companies at an even greater competitive disadvantage with China and other countries.

When we take a step back, we may ask ourselves, why would the President and the Democrat leadership want to raise taxes on small businesses and families during a recession?

Well, Madam Chairman, we just, we heard earlier, it's because of all the spending that we heard about earlier from our ranking member, that they need these tax hikes to give the illusion that they're not increasing the deficit and debt as much as they really are.

The problem is, there's no spending restraints in this bill. And that illusion is only going to be able to last so long because, even with the massive tax increases in this bill, this budget spending growth is so explosive that it outpaces revenue for the entire budget period.

So it's clear the tax hikes that we're looking at today, I think, are just for starters. I mean, even the New York Times recently warned that, in fact, the President will inevitably have to raise taxes.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. AUSTRIA. Let me just point out, because we are going to hear more about this. I want to make one key point, and that is that this budget relies on the flawed notion that the Federal Government can spend all it wants for as long as it wants and just borrow from other countries and tax our own citizens. And for what? Just to keep this good deal of spending going?

We can do better. Americans expect better, and we need to fix this problem. It's a concern short-term and long-term.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Chair, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California, a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. NUNES.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chairman, outlined in the Democrats' budget proposal is something called cap-and-

trade. Not many people are familiar with what cap-and-trade means. But simply, it's an energy tax. It's a tax on everyone who drives a car, flips on a light switch, or consumes a manufactured item made in the United States. In fact, it's the largest tax increase in American history, amounting to almost \$2 trillion, and it will impact everyone. This is why I refer to it as cap-and-tax.

Even President Obama admitted to the San Francisco Chronicle that, under this cap-and-tax scheme, energy prices would skyrocket. Total costs of this tax are estimated at nearly \$2,000 for each American household.

So what does this mean to the American household? What would they have to give up to make up for this \$2,000?

You could quit eating. Or just don't buy any furniture or appliances for the year. Or maybe don't buy your children any shoes or clothes for the year. Or if you're real concerned about global warming, just stop using electricity and stop heating your home. Or, like some people do today in Washington, just stop paying your property tax. That would make up the \$2,000.

Under this scheme, the Democrats treat energy as a luxury. When energy becomes a luxury, all else becomes a luxury too because energy makes everything possible.

Seldom do the experts agree on much, but on cap-and-tax, there's a clear consensus. It will destroy millions of jobs and devastate our economy.

Republicans want to reduce carbon emissions. We believe it's a worthy goal. The Republican budget alternative that we will talk about tomorrow expands domestic oil exploration in Alaska, on the Outer Continental Shelf and other untapped natural resources. This will create new American jobs today, high-paying jobs, not phantom green jobs.

At the same time, the Republican budget mandates that the revenues from this new oil and gas exploration, literally hundreds of billions of dollars, be directed to things like solar panels and wind farms. No Democrat plan has ever contemplated such a massive investment in solar and wind. And this, all at no cost to the taxpayers. The oil companies pay for it.

Our budget also highlights the importance of investments into nuclear energy. Nuclear power produces zero carbon emissions. Let me repeat, zero carbon emissions. It provides us with clean, cheap and abundant electricity.

Construction of 200 nuclear reactors would reduce carbon emissions more than any disastrous cap-and-tax scheme. An investment in nuclear power would also help America achieve energy independence, lower consumer prices and, in sharp contrast with the Democrats cap-and-tax scheme, nuclear power investments would actually create jobs.

A choice is hereby laid before this body: A Democrat budget that taxes

energy and creates the largest tax increase in American history, while having no impact on carbon emissions, or a Republican alternative that actually invests more in renewable energy than the Democrats, takes more carbon out of the air, and doesn't cost the taxpayers anything.

A vote for the Democrat budget would represent much more than a lack of common sense. It would be a clear sign that the priorities of the Democrats rest, not with the American people, but with the special interests of the radical environmentalists.

The Republican budget is about common sense. It uses American resources to create American jobs on behalf of the American people.

I would urge my colleagues to reject the Democrat budget and, hopefully, we can get enough Blue Dogs to support the Republican alternative that we'll offer tomorrow.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, Thomas Jefferson said in 1821, "There does not exist an engine so destructive of the government and so demoralizing of the Nation as a public debt. It will bring on us more ruin at home than all the enemies from abroad." This was said in 1821.

One of my colleagues on the Democrat side a while ago said something about the hemorrhaging of the dollar. One of the reasons the dollar is hemorrhaging right now is we're inflating the money supply so rapidly that the dollar's going down the tubes. And if we keep on this trail, it's going to be worthless. We're spending money so fast it's unbelievable.

Mr. Geithner's got to put another 2 or \$3 trillion into the financial system, and this budget, \$3.5 trillion, is going to bankrupt this country. And my colleagues, like Mr. RYAN said a while ago, we're going to saddle our kids and our posterity with a debt that they'll never be able to repay. The inflation and the taxes they'll face will be unbelievable.

Let me just say, since we don't have a lot of time, there are parallels with what's happened in history. The same things we're doing today—if you don't believe this, read the book *The Forgotten Man*. The same things that we did during the Great Depression we're doing right now today, and it prolonged the Depression, and it lasted 10 or 11 years because of that.

And in the 1970s we had a similar situation. We had inflation that was 14 percent, unemployment that was 12 percent. And Ronald Reagan came in and, instead of raising spending like you're doing today, he cut taxes across the board and, as a result, we had the longest period of economic expansion that we've had in history.

Why don't we learn from history?

It seems to me my colleagues on the Democrat side think we can spend our

way out of this. Tax and spend, tax and spend. It will not work. It hasn't worked in the past, it only makes things worse. We are heading toward a major, major depression if we don't cut this spending and start doing things that will stimulate economic growth like cutting taxes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I will yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for a rejoinder.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, I have listened to my friend, Mr. RYAN, whom I deeply respect, but am taken aback by his introduction. He's concerned that we're having the debate this evening. This is why we call it prime time. This is when you stage the Academy Awards, the Super Bowl, things you want America to see.

But I could understand why they would want it during the day when people are working and not listening to this debate because they want, as Mr. RYAN says, to go back to the America they grew up in, the policies of the Fifties, the energy policies of the Sixties, the fraying infrastructure of years ago.

This is a budget that points to today's problems with solutions for the future, a carbon-constrained economy where carbon pollution will no longer be free, and we can actually create the jobs they're talking about.

Remember the last time you heard them in high dudgeon; it's when the Democrats controlled everything and we passed that awful Clinton budget that produced, not the doom they called for, but sustained prosperity.

□ 2145

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, from the Blue Dogs, Mr. BOYD.

Mr. BOYD. This budget resolution, ladies and gentlemen, directs the Education and Labor Committee to find savings via the reconciliation process. As we know, President Obama's blueprint budget assumed that those savings would come from providing all future student loans through the government's direct loan program and ending the Federal Family Education Loan program.

I'm here today to express my concern that, if this reconciliation bill implements the President's proposal, it could prove detrimental to thousands of employees who serve in the current student loan industry throughout this country, 650 of which are located in Panama City, Florida.

While I'm supporting stabilizing the student loan industry and am supporting initiatives to make our Federal Government more efficient, I believe it is prudent for us to find a way to continue to use the present Federal Family Education Loan industry to preserve efficiency and to provide employment to these many Americans during this time of economic crisis.

Chairman MILLER, in light of these concerns, this budget resolution includes report language that urges your

committee to review the options for the student loan program that will maintain a role for the Federal Family Education Loan program limits. I would like to put this question to you, sir, as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee:

As your committee moves forward this year, Chairman MILLER, will you be willing to work with me and with other members with similar concerns to preserve a role for the private student loan program infrastructure that currently exists and that services 75 percent of all loans at American colleges and universities?

Before yielding to Mr. MILLER for his response, Madam Chair, I would like to yield first to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chair, I support this budget and, in particular, the significant investment it makes in education. We must invest in education if our workers are going to be able to compete in the 21st century global economy. However, I share my friend Mr. BOYD's concerns about ending guaranteed student loans. This would threaten hundreds of jobs in North Carolina. It would also cut off access to the valuable services some of the lenders provide that help students pay for, apply to and pay for college.

In North Carolina, we have a unique situation where a State nonprofit provides significant benefits to students in addition to providing the loans. I am concerned that the legislation will have the unintended consequences of reducing the benefits that students receive from our nonprofit lenders.

We should take steps to preserve the good things done by guaranteed agencies to improve college access and affordability and to keep loan defaults low even if Federal Family Loans are reduced.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 85, the budget resolution for FY 2010.

H. Con. Res. 85 builds on the work of this Congress to put our economy back on track, addressing the current crisis and building for future needs. This bill lays out a plan to cut the deficit by nearly two-thirds by 2013, and creates jobs with investments and reforms in health care, clean energy, and education.

A budget is more than just a document, it is a statement of our nation's priorities and values.

As the only former state schools chief serving in Congress, I am particularly pleased that the budget prioritizes education and innovation. In recent months, first with the economic recovery legislation and then as we finished the 2009 appropriations process, Congress devoted significant funding to education to create quality jobs now and in the future. This budget resolution provides a blueprint to follow through on these priorities.

I have always believed that education is the most important investment we can make for our future prosperity. In the current economic downturn, it is even more critical that we ensure our workforce is able to compete in the 21st century global marketplace.

This resolution reverses the previous Administration's neglect of education and provides significant and needed investments in our nation's schools. It reflects the fact that education is a lifetime activity, spanning from early childhood to post-secondary education and technical training.

The resolution strongly supports early learning, including the President's initiatives to help strengthen and expand early childhood education programs. It increases child nutrition funding, paying for school meals because a hungry child just cannot be successful in school.

At the other end of the spectrum, this resolution builds on Congress' recent efforts to help students afford and complete college.

Education is the key to economic growth, future success, and access to opportunity for our citizens, and this Budget Resolution makes a clear statement that education is a top priority. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

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

Mr. BOYD. Madam Chair, I would like now to yield to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from North Carolina for posing these questions, and I know that we will be able to work together as my committee and this Congress consider proposals to reform the Federal student loan program.

Access to Federal financing for higher education is a top priority. As you know, last year, we passed a stopgap measure to ensure that students and their families continued to have access to Federal student loans even in this economic climate. This stopgap measure was never intended to be a permanent solution, and we need to look at reforms to make sure that we have a reliable, efficient and sustainable program.

I expect that there will be a role for private lenders in the future of the student loan program. Private lenders, for example, have played a significant role in ensuring high standards for servicing, and future reforms must harness this expertise. Also, let's not forget that, no matter what reforms are enacted, there is over \$500 billion outstanding in loan volume in the current FFEL program that will need to be serviced as borrowers repay their loans.

My staff and I have met with a number of private lenders, and we will continue to do so as we move forward. I look forward to continuing this dialogue with the gentleman from Florida and with the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BOYD. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. SPRATT. I would inquire of the gentleman from Wisconsin if he wishes to have further speakers at this point or if we should go ahead.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Let me ask the Chair how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 70½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina has 64 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, the vice ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, never in our history have so few voted so fast to indebt so many. This is courtesy of a Democratic-controlled Congress.

\$700 billion of bailout money, \$6,034 per household; a \$1.138 trillion government stimulus plan, \$9,810 per American household; a \$410 billion omnibus spending plan, \$3,534 per American household.

On top of this, the Democrats now propose the single largest budget in American history and the largest as a share of the economy since World War II. It is a budget that will increase spending to \$3.6 trillion, over \$31,000 per American household. It is a budget that spends too much. It is a budget that taxes too much. It is a budget that borrows too much, and it threatens to bankrupt our country.

Even before all of the spending described above, our Nation was headed for a day of reckoning, but don't take my word for it. 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 the former Comptroller General with the Government Accountability Office:

"The rising cost of government entitlements are a fiscal cancer, a fiscal cancer that threatens catastrophic consequences for our country and could bankrupt America."

The Democrats' budget will nearly triple the national debt in 10 years, costing taxpayers a dizzying \$148,926 per household. Madam Chair, just look at this chart. It is a sea of red ink for generations to come. This budget, this Democratic budget, will create more debt for America in the next 10 years than was run up in the previous 220. Now, Madam Chair, let me repeat that just in case anybody missed it. This Democratic budget will create more debt for America in the next 10 years than was run up in the previous 220. Our Nation has never seen this level of debt in its entire history. It very well may bankrupt us.

Now, Madam Chair, using history as my guide, no Nation has ever borrowed and spent its way into prosperity. At the outset of World War II, Henry Morgenthau, FDR's Secretary of Treasury, said the following:

"We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before, and it does not work . . .

After 8 years of this administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started . . . and an enormous debt to boot."

Let's recall Japan's lost decade of the 1990s when they attempted to borrow and spend their way into prosperity. They took on the greatest amount of debt of any industrialized Nation in the world, and after 10 years, they had no economic growth, no new jobs, and their per capita income fell from second in the world to 10th. Read what the New York Times had to say about it:

"Japan failed to generate a convincing recovery. This has led many to conclude that spending did little more than sink Japan deeply into debt, leaving an enormous tax burden for future generations. Among ordinary Japanese, the spending is widely disparaged for having turned the Nation into a public works-based welfare state and for making regional economies dependent on Tokyo for jobs."

Madam Chair, this Democratic budget spends too much. It taxes too much. It borrows too much, and it threatens to bankrupt our Nation.

On top of this, Madam Chair, the Democratic budget is proposing a national energy tax, a national energy tax, which, according to studies at MIT, could pose a \$3,128 burden on every working family in America. They're offering a half-a-trillion-dollar tax increase on small businesses—the job engine in America, the font of three out of four new jobs created in America. They're offering a tax on capital of up to one-third when we desperately need capital to help preserve the jobs we have today and to grow the jobs of tomorrow. Madam Chair, I've heard from struggling Americans about how this Democratic budget is going to impact them.

I've heard from Gary of Garland, Texas, who said, "The money that government is so lavishly spending is coming from people who have worked very hard and made good decisions and, thus, pay taxes. Money is being stolen from our children and grandchildren to bail out just about anyone who was irresponsible."

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HENSARLING. We've heard how this Democratic budget affects small business. We've heard from Susan of Tennessee Colony:

"I have owned my company for 25 years . . . but today, I have had to lay off 25 people and cut hours on the remaining 35 . . . and now Mr. Obama wants to place higher taxes on me because I am successful. So much for our American dream."

We've heard how this Democratic budget affects the education dreams of America. We've heard from Bruce in Idaho Falls:

"We are at the point where we just have enough money to send our oldest daughter to college. An additional en-

ergy expense would make it impossible for us to pay for the expenses for our daughter's college education." This is how the Democratic budget affects the education dreams of Americans.

Madam Chair, the President's chief of staff has said, "Never let a serious crisis go to waste. It's an opportunity to do things you couldn't do before."

Well, the Democrats are going to spend like never before. They are going to tax like never before. They are going to borrow like never before. They will bankrupt our Nation. There is a better alternative that promotes freedom, economic opportunity and jobs for all. It's the Republican alternative. We'll see it tomorrow.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. JORDAN.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding and just would say, Madam Chair, that the passion that the gentleman from Wisconsin displayed in his opening remarks was right on target. It was totally appropriate because this budget is an assault on liberty. It's an attack on freedom, and it does so in four ways.

First of all, it is the largest tax increase in history, which attacks the liberty and freedom of current taxpayers. We're going to have to pay more in taxes. We all understand that. It diminishes our opportunity to go after our goals and our dreams—for the American people to pursue those things that have meaning and significance to them. It's an attack on future generations of Americans, as we've heard from every single speaker, because this budget piles up the largest debt in history. There will be more debt in the next 6 years than it took the 43 previous Presidents to accumulate. From George to George—from Washington to Bush—we didn't accumulate as much debt as this budget will do in the next 6 years.

Think about this: A \$23 trillion national debt this budget takes us to. Think about this: To pay that off, we first have to get to balance. Then we have to run a \$1 trillion surplus for 23 years, and that's not even counting the interest. That's what we have to do to pay this. That's how big this is.

There are two other ways it attacks freedom: The cap-and-trade that the gentleman from California talked so eloquently about. This is going to be a tax on every single American and on every single small business owner. It's going to make it that much tougher for us to compete in the international marketplace, particularly against our emerging competitors in China and in Japan.

Then, finally, the further nationalizing of health care: The money set aside in this budget to create this board that's going to now decide what kind of health care treatment you and your family receive, not you and your doctor, not you and your family. A bunch of bureaucrats in Washington

are going to be deciding what kind of health care you're going to get.

In my mind, this is not alarmist talk. These are the facts. The liberties and freedoms of Americans are at stake, and it's important we recognize that.

I want to close with this, Madam Chair: Twelve days ago, in our district, Olen Beck was born—9 pounds, 3 ounces, 19¼ inches long, named after his grandfather. Little does this baby Olen know, but he already owes more than \$30,000 in debt, and if this budget passes before this young man can even write his name, he will owe \$70,000. That's what this budget does.

One of the things that makes this country great is the willingness of parents to make sacrifices for their children so they can have life a little better than they did, and they, in turn, become adults and parents, and they do the same thing for the next generation. It has been that cycle that has allowed the United States of America to be the greatest Nation in history. When we begin to break that trend, to break that process, that's when we have problems, and that's what this budget does, and that's why I urge a "no" vote.

□ 2200

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to this budget resolution. People who live in the real world who work for a living, who build houses, wait on tables, they understand you can't spend money you don't have. They know you can't spend your way out of an economic crisis. They are cutting at home and at work. They are cutting on the extras. There is no fluff in their budgets, and there shouldn't be in any in ours.

But the Democrat budget fails to reflect the commonsense values of Americans every day. This budget spends too much, it borrows too much, and guess what, it taxes too much.

John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan both knew that the worst things that you could do during a recession is raise taxes. But unfortunately, that's exactly what President Obama's budget does, to the tune of well over \$1.5 trillion, much of which will be placed squarely on the shoulders of my State's number one job creators, small businesses.

The truth is that despite the claims to the contrary this budget won't create new jobs in places like Westminster, South Carolina, and Due West, South Carolina, and New Ellenton, South Carolina. It will crush them. In the long run, this budget will saddle future generations of Americans with mountains of unsustainable debt.

This budget finances the present by mortgaging our children and our grandchildren's future.

The people back home deserve better, Madam Chairman. The next generation

deserves better, Madam Chairman. And that's what the Republicans are going to give this House tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" to the Democrat budget, vote "no" against higher spending, vote "no" against higher taxes, and vote "no" against borrowing.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute first to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for a rejoinder, and then I will go to Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my chairman for yielding.

Our friends often honor the memory of our late President Reagan, but they forget one thing that President Reagan said, that facts are stubborn things.

I think I understand why, because they overlook the fact that this budget cuts taxes by \$1.7 trillion for people who teach school or fight fires or who sell real estate for middle-class people. They overlook the fact that they inherited a situation where we're on track to retire the debt within a decade but they wound up doubling it from \$3.4 trillion to \$6.3 trillion under their watch. They ignore the fact that 95 percent of Americans get a tax cut under this budget, and their favorite constituents, a few of them do not.

Facts are stubborn things. The fact is that our approach has created jobs and economic growth; theirs does not.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, this budget makes important investments in education. From early childhood through college, it is well known that education is the key to the success in the United States. And in today's high-tech, information-based economy, the old adage that the more you learn, the more you earn, certainly applies.

Because those with a good education will earn more, and they will be less likely to require social services and less likely to be involved in crime and less likely to be unemployed. And communities that invest in education will be more likely to attract businesses and jobs and will suffer less crime and social problems.

To address the committee budget in detail, I will now yield to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, for the purposes of a statement (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Thank you, Mr. SCOTT. And I want to thank you, and I want to thank the budget chairman, JOHN SPRATT, and all of the members of this committee for this budget.

This budget does what business leaders have come to Washington year after year over the last 8 years during the Bush administration and asked us to provide resources for a quality education in K-12 to provide the resources so our children will graduate from high school prepared to go on to college,

prepared to go into careers, prepared to go into the job market in a globalized world; but they failed to do that for 8 years. Now we finally have a budget that gives us the resources so that we can provide that quality education, so we can invest in teachers, we can invest in the professional development of those teachers, we can provide the resources and the technology that our classrooms across this country scream out for on behalf of our children, so that they can participate in the technology advances in our society.

We also make sure that when they graduate from college, that the college will be more affordable than anytime in history because of the actions of this Congress last year and the actions of this budget.

Since last year, we increased the Pell scholarship by over \$1,500. We cut the interest on need-based Federal student loans in half. We enacted loan forgiveness so people can follow their careers and their desires whether they want to be a teacher or a firefighter or a public prosecutor or a public defender or a public health nurse. They have the opportunity to be able to do that because of the loan forgiveness that has been provided.

And this year, because of the changes that the President is asking for, the direct loan program will be able to provide tens of billions of additional dollars to make sure that people can afford college at this time when it's most necessary that they receive a college education to compete in this globalized economy.

And I want to thank the Budget Committee for making this budget available so we can vote "aye" on this budget tomorrow.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the Budget and Education Labor Committee, Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank Mr. SCOTT for yielding.

As Chairman MILLER indicated, since January of 2007 this Democratic Congress has made great strides in ensuring that students across the country have access to high-quality education. Passage of this budget resolution continues this commitment to ensuring that every child who dreams of going to college can do so.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have described this budget as a budget that expands Federal control of education. What it really expands is access to educational opportunity, particularly in the area of higher education. And not only does this budget significantly expand access, it does so in a fashion that is fully paid for.

The budget resolution would accommodate the President's major initiatives in higher education, which include increasing the Pell Grant maximum by an additional \$155 and indexing that maximum to the CPI plus 1 percent. It would also include phasing out FFEL lending and moving to 100-

percent direct lending providing students with the same access to support but doing so at a 5-year savings of \$47 billion.

It also calls for restructuring the Perkins Loan Program, increasing funding for this program by a factor of six and increasing the number of students who can benefit from this program by 2.7 million students.

And finally, it calls for a creation of a college access and completion fund of \$2.5 billion over 5 years so that schools can adopt best practices in both access and completion.

Taken as a whole, these four proposals will be of significant assistance to students. We cannot achieve economic prosperity without an educated populous. This budget will ensure that those who can benefit from higher education will do so and that students will get their chance at their slice of the American dream.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this budget resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield to the gentlelady from Massachusetts, a hard-working member of the Budget Committee, Ms. TSONGAS.

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia.

I am pleased to rise in support of this Democratic budget resolution which makes a much-needed investment in early education. We have heard much about the costs of action but not enough about the costs of inaction.

As we look ahead to an increasingly competitive global economy, it has never been more important to ensure that our citizens are well prepared. Simply put, we will not again experience sustained economic growth if we do not invest in educating our future workforce now.

A number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have proposed a freeze on all non-defense spending for the next 5 years. I understand their concerns about fiscal responsibility. And I know their proposals are well-intentioned. However, I can think of nothing worse for the health of our economy in the short term and in the long term than restricting access to education.

As we all know, State and local governments around the country have been forced to lay off teachers, cut programs, and reduce the number of children able to participate in early education and after-school programs. Education provides access to a better life, and early childhood education sets a foundation upon which later academic success is built.

If we take the shortsighted approach offered by our Republican colleagues, any small amount of savings we gain today will quickly be overwhelmed by the very real losses to our productivity tomorrow. Recognizing this basic fact, businesses, both large and small, have made supporting education one of their top priorities for their communities and for Congress. And this is certainly true in my State of Massachusetts.

I represent old industrial cities where public education dollars pay a critical role in helping all of our children gain the skills that they need to succeed in our knowledge-based economy and in helping newcomers integrate into our American society.

During the last administration, we failed to properly fund education, particularly for the youngest and most vulnerable. But through the economic Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we have already begun to reorient our priorities by including funding for Head Start, Early Head Start, and other early education programs.

This Democratic budget builds upon those investments and helps to strengthen and expand these programs, including proven home-visitation programs. These funds are critical because an active Federal partner can play a strategic role in concert with local and State partners to keep the education pipeline firm.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and I call on my colleagues to support this budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I would like to now call on the gentlelady from Wisconsin, an effective member of the Budget Committee, Ms. MOORE.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership.

Education is certainly the key to unlock the door to freedom. George Washington Carver once said. This horticulturist, inventor, chemist, educator, and, yes, former slave, was lifted through educational opportunity in America. His destiny was changed because of education, and America's gross domestic product was changed because of him.

Unfortunately, however, the last decade of divesting in American educational opportunity, in preference for short-term tax breaks, has reversed the course of the United States global dominance, particularly in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and math.

Year after year after year, the former President's education budget gutted and underfunded vital educational programs. Innovation and health research have been shackled under ideological and budgetary bondage. Happily, President Barack Obama begins the reinvestment in education with \$100 billion dollars invested in our future, invested in our children, and, yes, invested in our economic growth.

Since only 40 percent of our youths age 25-34 have a college degree, I am particularly pleased that the chairman's mark will enable us to focus on college affordability through increasing Pell Grants and on college retention efforts provided through programs such as Upward Bound and Trio. Indeed, that golden door to freedom will only open with an appropriately educated workforce where we lift our young people to their rightful place in a global economy.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chairman, the budget we will vote on tomorrow will invest in education, Head Start, especially Early Head Start, Title I, nutrition programs, drop-out prevention programs, quality elementary and secondary education and after-school programs, and college awareness programs. It will have financial aid so that young people can attend college, Pell Grants, reduction in student loan interest rates, and assistance to college.

The budget will provide the necessary funding for the United States to regain our economic competitiveness by achieving a well-educated workforce that will make our neighborhood safer.

And, Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, Chairman SPRATT, and Chairman MILLER, and President Obama for making education a priority in a fiscally responsible budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, a senior member of the Budget Committee, Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, tonight the Democrats are continuing their lengthy rhetorical tradition of saying one thing on the floor of the House but saying a far different thing in their budget.

We know the greatest long-term threat to our Nation's economic security is the looming explosion of spending in our Nation's largest entitlements.

We know this. Everyone in this House knows this. But in case anyone has forgotten, let me just share some facts that I did with the committee.

□ 2215

You know, back in 1959 when I was born, at that time the employer-employee share of the payroll tax used to support Social Security was 4.5 percent. When I was about ready to go to school in 1965 and Lyndon Johnson was the President, they added Medicare as an entitlement, and the taxes went up to 8.8 percent.

Today, the combined payroll tax for these programs is 15.3 percent, far higher than the programs' creators ever imagined. But what is worse is that, despite the fact that 15.3 percent of every dollar earned in America is used to fund these programs, that alone is not nearly enough money to keep them afloat.

When a child is born in this country, in the United States, as soon as that child takes its first breath, they owe for all those type programs \$184,000 the day they're born. For those keeping track, this is more than three-and-a-half times the median household income.

Just to preserve current benefits that these programs provide, this generation would have to pay twice the rate of taxes—that's more than 30 cents out

of every dollar earned in America—to maintain the status quo.

So, in short, even as my friends on the other side of the aisle repeat their claims to be protectors of those most in need, and those most likely to need the assistance that our largest safety net programs provide, their choices in this budget, as in their past two budgets, do absolutely nothing but to hit the gas on the demise of our Nation's most critical safety net, while at the same time consigning the next generation of Americans to a likely insurmountable burden of debt.

Every year that we don't fix this problem we add an additional \$2 to \$3 trillion in unfunded obligations to our children. And yet the Democratic majority often claims that their judgments are a moral document. I ask you, what kind of morals do we subscribe to if we prescribe our children to a life of indentured servitude in service of government largesse?

We know that there is a better way. We can reform these programs to ensure that they can do so, and we can start by amending this ill-conceived budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Chairman, it takes one second to say "no." One second to say "no" to this budget tomorrow. One second to save the American people \$23 trillion. One second to save the American people and their children and their children's children from the debt that we are piling on them. One second to save them from taxes every time they turn on a light. One second to save them from expenditures that we'll never see the end of. It will take one second to say "no."

Or we can say "yes" to the Republican budget. If you say "yes" to the Republican budget, we can get to the point where deficits disappear. We can get to a point where the American people will be proud of their Congress for spending only as much as they take in.

One second to say "yes" or one second to say "no." I encourage my colleagues to vote with the American people, for their pocketbooks, for their financial security, to save them from debt. One second. Say "yes" to the Republican budget. Say "no" to the Democrat budget and save us and our children and our grandchildren from a future of debt that we may never recover from.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), our House Republican Conference Chair.

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

Mr. PENCE. I rise in opposition to the Democratic budget.

The budget, brought by the majority to this floor in this debate, 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, and the numbers tell the tale. 2010 spending, \$3 trillion, 25 percent of GDP, more than \$1 trillion in tax increases. The 2010 deficit, \$1 trillion, and estimates suggests deficits nearly \$1 trillion for the next 10 years.

The truth is, Madam Chairman, the Democrat majority has brought to this floor the most fiscally irresponsible budget in American history. During debates like this we hear a lot about the numbers, but this isn't just about the numbers. The truth is, it's not about dollars and cents. It's about the American dream, and it's about our kids. It's about small business owners, working families, and family farmers that are dreading the idea of facing higher taxes, higher marginal rates, a national energy tax. And it's about our children and our children's children who may not yet understand what they have to fear and a mountain range of debt.

Let us not do this. Every American family, every American business is answering these challenging times with sacrifice and frugality. This Congress should do no different. Let us reject this Democrat budget. Let us embrace fiscal discipline and reform and growth in the form of the Republican alternative.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 1 minute for rejoinder to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

My friend, a very articulate new Member from Wyoming, said it only takes one second to say "no." I would respectfully say the Republicans have gotten it down to that short a period of time because they say it so often.

"No," we don't have an approach to solve the global warming problem. "No," we don't have an approach to fix the health care approach. "No," we don't have a plan to create jobs. "No," we don't have a plan to improve education.

This idea that when you turn a light on, your taxes are going to go up, is just false. There's nothing in this budget that requires any energy tax to be raised upon any person. If there ever is such a discussion of that, it will come to the floor under a separate vote, under a separate debate, and Members can make their judgment.

So I'm not surprised it takes them, Madam Chairman, only a second to say "no." Because they say it so often, they've gotten very good at it.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the chairman for yielding time, and I would like to begin our discussion of the energy component of this budget by yielding to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, as a member of the Budget Committee, I rise in support of this pro-growth resolution. Finally, America is moving for-

ward, and I want to thank our able chairman, JOHN SPRATT, for doing what the American people want us to do. They've told us they can't wait anymore.

This budget resolution addresses the necessity for our Nation to reduce its crippling and dangerous dependence on foreign oil. We must produce our own energy and do so through sustainable, renewable sources, while creating jobs here in America. Our people cannot wait.

We must re-imagine and re-tool America's energy economy. Alternative energy technologies provide one clear path to industrial growth and local employment. Our people cannot wait.

This Congress started with the Obama Recovery Act which set our ship of State on a new path forward to spur development and production of new energy sources and technologies. Our people cannot wait.

And this budget resolution includes a further commitment to renewable energy and energy efficiency. Especially through the deficit neutral energy fund, we will encourage and engage communities to emit fewer greenhouse gases and develop alternative energy technologies and production to create jobs in a new energy age.

The resolution not only helps our Nation recover, it focuses on cutting the deficit in half by 2013 through all the efficiencies and establishes a balance between investing in key areas to grow our economy and saving in order to help put our Nation on a growth path forward.

We are asking this of our citizens, are we not? And we should ask no less of our government. Our people cannot wait.

I rise in strong support of the resolution, and I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. BECERRA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy because this budget represents a reinvestment in our Nation's public lands, infrastructure, and energy independence. It is a visionary budget that will help renew and rebuild America while protecting the environment. The Republicans tomorrow will present not one but two budgets that would shortchange those very environmental protections.

We propose rather than continue to ignore the dangers of climate change, which the Republicans have done for the last 8 years, an unprecedented coalition, we join with to urge carbon pollution no longer be free to be dumped into our environment by establishing a reserve fund for energy and climate change that leaves the opportunity for committees of jurisdiction to pass legislation to reduce greenhouse gases at least for those who are going to be legislators and not just communicators.

A strong investment in the area of energy and environment is important

at a time when a third of our Nation's waters don't meet water quality standards, over 150 million people live in areas that exceed EPA's air pollution standards, and 76 million people live within 4 miles of a Superfund site. Tomorrow, the Republicans will give not one but two budgets that will shortchange those initiatives.

We have water systems, transportation systems, levee systems that are tested. We've seen it on television just this week, and the challenges of the 21st century demand a renewed national focus on ensuring the soundness of those programs. Tomorrow, the Republicans will propose two budgets to shortchange them.

Instead, Madam Chair, I suggest strongly that we work on moving forward with this budget, with agencies like the EPA and the Department of the Interior, to get back to improving air, water quality, preserving public lands, cleaning up toxic waste, reducing our dependence on foreign oil, and reverse the damage of the last 8 years, while we create millions of jobs and strengthen our communities and protect the planet.

Mr. BECERRA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the distinguished Member from California for yielding.

The concurrent resolution before the House reflects President Obama's bold vision for investing in America's future. Throughout the previous administration, a sustainable and clean energy policy was ignored and our dependence on foreign oil grew. I am proud that this Congress has done more in the past 2 months to promote energy efficiency and combat global climate change than the previous administration accomplished in a full 8 years.

At the local level, I enlisted counties across the Nation to join Cool Counties, a program designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Now is the time for the Federal Government to take similar action.

This budget increases investment in renewable energy and energy efficiency by 18 percent and provides for a clean energy policy that will safeguard our environment, our Nation, our economy, and create jobs. Through the use of a reserve fund, this budget makes significant energy investments in a deficit-neutral manner.

This Congress, through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, made almost \$60 billion in energy investment—\$39 billion in direct funding and \$20 billion in tax incentives.

Our actions will modernize our electricity grid. The current grid is outdated, inefficient and unreliable. A smart grid will enhance energy efficiency, lowering energy bills and improving air quality. A 5 percent increase in the efficiency of the grid will eliminate carbon emissions equivalent to the emissions of 53 million automobiles.

This Congress, through the Recovery Act, invested in the weatherization of

millions of American homes, enabling families to better insulate their homes and lower energy bills, and we know that weatherization is among the most efficient ways of lowering our energy dependency on foreign oil.

Investment in energy independence will benefit our economy. Instead of relying on foreign countries to meet our energy needs, this budget will promote the creation of green jobs right here in America. Instead of losing manufacturing jobs, as we have over the past 25 years, we can add jobs in wind and solar power generation; in the manufacturing of advanced batteries; in weatherization programs; in the creation of the smart grid; in the expansion of broadband; and in hybrid vehicle production. Investment in clean energy, Madam Chairman, is an investment in the American worker. It creates jobs.

We must invest once again in America, in efficient automobiles and wind turbines. These investments will protect our climate and lay the groundwork for a new age of industrial expansion founded on technological innovation.

The energy investments that this budget enables fulfill President Obama's vision for clean energy independence and promote a healthy environment while strengthening our economy.

I urge my colleagues to support the budget resolution.

□ 2230

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chair, may I inquire of the amount of time I have remaining that has been yielded to me. The CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Chair, this budget resolution provides bold and necessary investments that will create jobs today and encourage clean energy technology and infrastructure investments that will be the foundation of long-term energy independence—something we desperately need.

No one wants to see us continue to send \$700 billion to our foreign competitors when it comes to oil. No one wants to see so much of that money go to people who are hostile to this country and our values.

The previous administration had a woefully deficient record of promoting renewable energy investments, of providing assistance to modest-income families who are most affected by high energy prices, and of making long-term investments in energy independence.

This economic recovery plan by President Obama reflects real change. This economic recovery plan is what the American people hunger for. This economic recovery plan is what people expected to see out of a new President when they voted in November of 2008.

Madam Chair, this plan delivers what people have been asking for: Bold ideas that are ready to take this country in a far new and different direction.

In energy, no one can say otherwise. This is a plan that is farsighted and

will take us to a point where we can become independent of all those foreign sources of energy and we can start to live a future that will give us a chance to invest in our children's education, their health care, and better housing, because we will produce our own energy and we will do it in a far cleaner way.

This is a farsighted budget that the President has put before us. We should pass it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Members are reminded that they may not traverse the well or put up displays while other Members are under recognition.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Chair, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) just indicated his intention to vote for the Democratic budget. I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) knows that this Democratic budget raises taxes by \$1.2 trillion; it makes each American's share of the national debt \$70,000 dollars; or that it opens the door to a national energy tax that will cost every single family in America at least \$3,128 a year.

Madam Chair, knowing that, does the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) still intend to vote for this Democratic budget?

I would yield to the gentleman from Virginia to please answer my questions.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I'm hopeful that the gentleman will allow me to answer. Actually, he is misinformed. This budget actually cuts taxes by \$2 trillion. It finances the AMT—

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I reclaim my time. I was just asking for a yes or no answer.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Sir, I'm not going to answer your question yes or no. I'm going to answer it thoughtfully as a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, this budget is going to cost every single American family in this country \$3,128. It's going to cost jobs all across this country. I hope that when the gentleman's people within his district see the job loss and the increased cost, that he is ready to answer those questions.

Madam Chair, have you seen today's headline: Colossal Budget Passes. Each household owes \$3,128 in new taxes. President Obama's budget will tax every American household. Now for the next decade. Each household now owes Washington over \$120,000. Georgia sees 10th year of rising unemployment as the 2010 budget debt balloons.

We cannot continue this taxing too much, spending too much, borrowing too much. It's going to bankrupt America. That's what this budget does.

Mr. SPRATT. I will yield the gentleman 30 seconds of my time if he'll

explain his arithmetic and show us the taxes he's talking about in the text of the resolution. Because they're not there. This has been asserted again and again as a mantra. It doesn't exist.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I'd be happy to step in for the gentleman if the chairman wants to yield me the 30 seconds from his time to explain how you're not cutting taxes by \$2 trillion. I'd be happy to explain that.

Mr. SPRATT. It comes from CBO. Don't take it from me. From the analysis of the President's budget: Proposed changes in tax policy would reduce revenues by an estimated \$1.7 trillion, with 6.1 percent over the next 10 years. CBO.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield, that means if you don't think putting the alternative minimum tax on \$26 million households isn't a tax increase, then maybe you're right. If you don't think raising the dividends tax by 100 percent, the capital gains tax by 33 percent, and income tax rates across the board is not a tax increase, then by your definition that might be a tax cut.

What you're doing is you're playing baseline mumbo jumbo. You're saying we're going to assume all these massive tax increases in America. Oh, and ours are going to be a little lower than that, but they're still going to be up, and it's a tax cut. That's baseline mumbo jumbo. The point is this—the budget you're bringing to the floor raises taxes.

Mr. SPRATT. I reclaim the time. I'm glad to yield you some time, but it needs some sort of limit to it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Thank you for the 30 seconds.

Mr. SPRATT. I still don't know what the arithmetic is and I don't know where the taxes are, except the tax cuts, as you know, expire on December 3, 2010.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SPRATT. The President's budget will allow them to expire, except he then proposes to have the capital gains rate be 20 percent instead of 15 percent, which is less than it's traditionally been. And same thing for dividends—20 instead of 15 percent.

We don't dictate that in this resolution. We leave matters of that kind—specific policy choices—up to the Ways and Means Committee.

I'm going to reclaim my time so we can go forward.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. May I inquire, Madam Chair, as to how much time is remaining, because it's my understanding that we're in possession of a 10-minute block at this moment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 52½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina has 40 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will yield myself 1 minute to explain.

On January 1, 2011, income tax rates go up. That's a tax increase. On January 1, 2011, the capital gains tax goes

up. That's a tax increase. On January 1, 2011, dividend taxes go up. That's a tax increase.

On January 1, 2010, the alternative minimum tax hits 26 million taxpayers who weren't hit by it before in their budget. That's a tax increase.

You can't hide it. If it walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, it's a duck.

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Baseline mumbo jumbo, as Mr. RYAN just said. How appropriate, Madam Chairwoman, because tonight is April Fool's Day. How appropriate that we be considering this Democratic budget tonight. But, unfortunately, this is real. This is no joke. This is no laughing matter.

This budget raises taxes on all of our families, our small businesses, and on all Americans. And it puts our economy on a path towards insolvency by borrowing trillions and trillions of dollars more.

This budget, as we've already heard, is really the President's budget, Madam Chairwoman. And this President has promised—he had promised a new era of transparency, honesty, and accountability. Let me tell you, those who supported him—and even those who did not—were optimistic that that part, at least, would be true.

Let me quote from the President's budget document, "Too often in the past several years budgets tricks were used to make the government's books seem stronger than they actually were." He continues on, saying, "We should not tolerate these kinds of tricks when it comes to accounting for the public's tax dollars."

I think we all agree on that. But, unfortunately, as we have just seen, this budget is full of those same old tricks and gimmicks. It's full of the usual tired tactics, the same old business-as-usual, that mentality that's typical here in Washington.

Unfortunately, this is not the change that the American people expect. No, it isn't. This budget employs an arsenal of gimmicks to mask an unsustainable explosion of more spending, more deficits, and greater debt than this country has ever, ever seen, inherited and not.

Now it also raises taxes by \$1.5 trillion—with a T—trillion dollars, burdening American families and small businesses, the principal job creators of our country, costing American jobs. Yes, it would also increase the national debt to \$17.1 trillion in just 5 years—the highest level ever in the history of this country.

Now compared to what the President has inherited, this is child's play. We can do better. We must do better for the sake of our children, our grandchildren, and our future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Madam Chair, American families, farmers, and small business owners are making big sacrifices in their personal budgets so they can ride out this difficult economic climate. It's apparent, however, that many in Washington don't share this sacrifice when it comes to government spending.

Unfortunately, the budget proposed by President Obama and endorsed by the House Democrats would take us down a dangerous path. This budget's projected deficits over the next 10 years will exceed all of our previous deficits combined. This massive spending spree is a slap in the face of future generations that will have to pay the bill.

This budget includes trillions of dollars in tax increases that, incredibly, won't even come close to paying for this new spending. These tax hikes jeopardize the jobs of millions of Americans by squeezing small businesses already nearing the breaking point and would create a drag on any attempt to jump-start our economy.

I call upon my fellow Members to support the Republican alternative budget that reduces spending, dramatically simplifies the Tax Code, lowers taxes, and slashes the debt to a manageable level.

The Democrat budget ignores the entitlement crisis, while our alternative addresses the serious problem that puts our Nation's financial future in tremendous risk.

Madam Chair, we must maintain the great American tradition of providing our children a better opportunity than we received. This House should stand by the American taxpayer and support the alternative Republican budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong opposition to the Democratic budget that is before the Congress and in support of the Republican alternative and the Republican Study Committee alternative—two far more responsible budgets.

I know there are many on the Democratic side of the aisle who are proud to call themselves fiscal conservatives. You cannot vote for this budget, which spends too much, which increases spending by more than two-thirds over the course of this budget, to \$5.1 trillion per year without avoiding the charge of "big spender."

You cannot support this budget, which taxes too much—which taxes \$1.5 trillion over the course of this budget, without avoiding the charge of being a big spending tax-and-spend liberal. That is what you're facing in this budget. You cannot support this and continue to call yourselves fiscal conservatives.

My greatest concern is that this budget calls for borrowing too much.

Our budget debt will rise to \$23 trillion by 2019—2½ times the amount that it is today, yet we will have those on your side of the aisle who will claim to be fiscally conservative on a debt that we leave our children and grandchildren and mortgages their future. That is not fiscal responsibility.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote, "To preserve the independence of the people, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt." Unfortunately, it increasingly appears that Congress has chosen this disastrous path.

I urge my colleagues to avoid this spending addiction and to vote tomorrow for responsible budgets that will lead our Nation back to prosperity and a brighter future for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding.

Madam Chair, this is a very important debate tonight. The budget that is being presented tonight by the majority party would create an explosion of debt—a monumental burden of debt that would be placed on our children and our grandchildren.

□ 2245

It is a budget that will hurt job growth in our country because it raises taxes too much, largely on the backs of small businesses. It is a budget that spends too much. While American families and small businesses are struggling to make ends meet, this budget pushes spending up by over 9 percent this year alone. How many of our constituents are seeing their paychecks rise by 9 percent? It is a budget that will not only lead to record spending and deficits this year, it will double the national debt in 5 years and triple the national debt in just 10 years.

Madam Chair, when I was born, the share of the national debt was \$1,500. Today, my four daughters each have a share of approximately \$35,000 of our national debt. But the more alarming fact is that if the budget passes, that share and that burden on them will rise to \$70,000 for each of my four daughters and each person in this country.

So this budget creates a vicious spiral: Higher taxes will hurt job growth, and this huge debt in the budget is going to force the government to borrow more to pay the bill. By the year 2012, the United States will be paying \$1 billion per day just to pay the interest on our national debt. Just think what we could do with \$1 billion a day.

Madam Chair, it is our obligation to pass on to the next generation more choices and better opportunities. But if we pass this budget, we risk for the first time that future generations will have less opportunity and fewer choices. We can do better.

The alternative budget plan that has been put together by Mr. RYAN is a better path. It is a path of less spending, less deficits, and less borrowing. It is

time to put our fiscal house in order and reject the budget that is on the floor.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And, Madam Chair, I rise to oppose this Democratic budget. As we have heard repeatedly tonight, it spends too much, it taxes too much, and it borrows too much.

But I want to be fair to my friends on the Democratic side. There is one area of the budget where there is a glaring exception to that rule, and that is the defense of the United States of America.

Over the course of a 10-year projected Obama budget, we will move from 20 percent of the Federal budget down to 14 percent devoted to defending the country. We will move from just over 4 percent of the gross national product to 3 percent to defend the United States of America. We will risk canceling major weapons systems, like the future combat system, a tanker that will help us project air power around the world and missile defense, at a time when the North Koreans and the Iranians are developing missiles. That risks jobs, that risks security. That is reckless in a dangerous world.

That is not just my opinion, Madam Chairman. Let me read from Robert Samuelson's recent article, "Obama, the Great Pretender."

"It would be responsible for Obama to acknowledge the big gamble in his budget. National security has long been government's first job. In his budget, defense spending drops from 20 percent to 14 percent of the total from 2008 to 2016, the smallest share since the 1930s. The decline presumes a much safer world. If the world doesn't cooperate, deficits will grow."

More importantly, American soldiers and American security will be at risk, Madam Chairman. So let's reject this budget because it does spend too much, it does borrow too much, it does tax too much. And let's embrace the Republican alternative which spends less, borrows less, taxes less, but, most importantly, puts more resources where it counts, defending the United States of America.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield first 1 minute for a rejoinder to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would want to say to my friend from Oklahoma that this budget has robust defense increases. What it doesn't have is throwing money into a bottomless pit in a war in Iraq that has consumed so much of our resources for so long.

My friend from California, one of the senior Ways and Means members, criticized our budget. These are familiar words, because this is what Mr. HERGER said once before: The simple fact is that the plan will not lower interest

rates, it will not lower inflation, it will not create jobs, it will not lower the deficit. The tax plan will spur inflation, lose jobs, increase the deficit, and hurt our economic growth.

Mr. HERGER said that in August of 1993 about the Clinton budget plan, which was going to destroy all these jobs. It created 23 million new jobs, as opposed to the 200,000 new jobs the Republicans created during their 8 years on their watch.

Mr. SPRATT. I now yield 2 minutes for a colloquy to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Chairman, let me begin by thanking the chairman for the opportunity to discuss the House budget resolution. And I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work with me to include language in the budget resolution to support pay parity within the Federal workforce of our civilian and military employees.

Our men and women in uniform have distinguished themselves throughout history, particularly during this time of war; and, at the same time, we cannot forget the critical role civilian employees play in providing logistical support to our military as well as their important work on behalf of our taxpayers and essential government services.

I would also note that the House budget resolution lays the foundation to carry out President Obama's bold vision for fixing the American economy.

While advancing the major priorities of the Obama budget, the budget resolution is by definition a less specific document than the President's budget and, therefore, does not assume all of the specific offsets included.

For example, I have expressed concern about the President's proposals to cap tax deductions for mortgage interest and charitable deductions. Similarly, I and others believe the \$250,000 threshold to allow families to qualify for tax cut extensions is too low. I am pleased, therefore, that the budget resolution does not assume any specific tax offsets to meet its revenue targets.

If I may ask the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee two questions.

First, Mr. Chairman, does the chairman agree that the pay parity language included in the resolution provides equitable treatment for Federal employees, civilian and military?

Mr. SPRATT. I do. And I thank the gentleman for his leadership in our committee on this issue of ensuring that all Federal employees are equitably treated.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the distinguished chairman. On the issue of tax policy, might I ask the distinguished chairman, is it the case that the budget resolution does not specify particular tax offsets, but rather leaves that decision to the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. SPRATT. That is correct.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Let me close, Madam Chair, by thanking the chairman once again for his generous collaboration with me and my colleagues on this, my first budget as a member of the committee. Through his steady leadership, the budget resolution before the House today delivers the profound change in course and investments in America's communities for which my constituents have long been waiting.

Mr. SPRATT. I now recognize and yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, we would urge a "yes" vote on behalf of this budget for many reasons. One is the strong increase in funding for our veterans.

In less than 2 months, just about every Member of this House will go and make Memorial Day speeches. In November, just about every Member will make speeches lauding our veterans on Veterans Day.

Tomorrow, Madam Chairman, the Members of the House have a chance to do something more than talk; we have a chance to vote for a budget that strongly supports our veterans. But do not listen to us. Listen to the national commander of the American Legion, who says in a letter dated March 25, "The American Legion applauds the Budget Committee for the budget resolution recommendation for \$53.3 billion in discretionary funding for veterans."

Listen to the executive director of the VFW, who in a letter dated March 25, 2009, says, "On behalf of the 2.2 million men and women of the VFW and our auxiliaries, I would like to express our strong support for your proposed budget mark for veterans funding. The \$53.3 billion in appropriated veterans funding demonstrates your appreciation for those who have worn the uniform of this Nation, and it acknowledges the debt that this Nation owes to its former defenders."

Listen to the voice of the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America through its executive director. "For the second year in a row, the committee's budget resolution surpasses even the recommendation of the independent budget, the blueprint for the VA budget endorsed by the leading veterans organizations, including the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America. By increasing veterans funding by 11.5 percent, or \$5.5 billion, the committee has displayed their serious commitment to supporting our Nation's veterans."

Listen to the words of the Vietnam Veterans of America. "The Vietnam Veterans of America appreciates that Chairman SPRATT continues to make it possible even in this difficult budget year amidst tough economic times for the appropriators to be able to properly fund health care and other vital services for veterans," says the VVA's national president, John Rowan.

Listen to the Disabled American Veterans who say that, "Our support for

the discretionary funding levels included in Chairman SPRATT's budget closely reflect the recommendations of the independent budget and reaffirm the goal to provide sufficient funding for the VA." They say they particularly appreciate the fact that the chairman's budget rejects any proposal to bill veterans' third-party insurance for the care of service-connected illnesses or injuries.

These are not the words of Republicans or Democrats. These are the words of the elected leadership of the veterans service organizations of our country.

Veterans funding is one of the strongest aspects of this proposal. The increase is 11.5 percent. It is precisely the request that had been made. There is no issue with respect to requiring veterans to pay more than they presently do for their own health care.

I think the Members would be wise to listen to the words of the American Legion, listen to the words of the DAV, listen to the words of the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, listen to the words of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, listen to the words of the VFW, listen to the words of the Vietnam Veterans of America. There is strong support in this budget from the chairman, and it is one more good reason to vote "yes" for this budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to a gentleman from the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Democrat budget.

In 2010, the death tax is set to expire; however, the President's budget retains the death tax, and the Wall Street Journal said yesterday, and I quote, "The President's budget calls for the largest increase in the death tax in U.S. history in 2010."

The death tax is an unfair attack on small businesses and farmers across this Nation. You know, Members go across to their county fairs every summer. I was at one of mine. One piece of equipment, one combine with one head cost \$425,000. One piece, \$425,000. The death tax forces Americans to have to make tough decisions. They have to make decisions that they have to hire attorneys, you have got to hire CPAs, you have got to hire your financial planners. It is tough. You are taking time away from these people's business when they can be out working and making money. It is not right.

You know, the time has come that this death tax expire. It should expire. Most of all, to quote again from the Wall Street Journal yesterday, "What all this means is that the higher the estate tax, the lower the incentive to reinvest in family businesses. Former Congressional Budget Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin recently used the Summers Study as a springboard to compare the economic cost of a 45 percent estate tax versus a zero rate."

It goes on to say that, "He finds that the long-term impact of eliminating the death tax would be to increase small business capital investment by \$1.6 trillion. This additional investment would create 1.5 million new jobs.

"In other words, by raising the estate tax, in the name of fairness, Mr. Obama won't merely bring back from the dead one of the most despised of all Federal taxes, and not merely splinter many family-owned enterprises. He will also forfeit half the jobs he hopes to gain from his \$787 billion stimulus bill. Maybe that's why the news of this unwise tax increase was hidden in a footnote."

Madam Chairman, it is time that we make sure that this death tax expires. It is time that the government's cold hand gets out of the warm grave.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, Americans are awakening to the danger of a budget that spends too much, borrows too much, and taxes too much, because they know what that means. They know that you can't spend yourself rich; they know you can't borrow your way out of debt; and, they know that you can't tax your way to prosperity.

No Nation in the world has ever spent and borrowed and taxed its way to economic health, but many Nations have spent and borrowed and taxed their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy.

If you all want to know where all of these policies are taking us, just look to my home State of California.

□ 2300

There a tragic succession of Governors increased spending at unsustainable rates. They ran up unprecedented debts, and they imposed crushing new taxes. And the result is that today runaway spending has impoverished our economy. Interest costs are eating our budget alive. And our tax burden is producing one of the highest unemployment rates in the Nation and the biggest out-migration of domestic population in our history.

Indeed, we debate this budget on the very day that California begins collecting the biggest tax increase ever imposed by any State government in our Nation's history, the natural consequence of runaway spending, just as President Obama relies on the biggest tax increase by the Federal Government in our Nation's history. There will be backbreaking new taxes on small businesses, on investment, on energy production and on charitable giving. And this isn't complicated stuff. If you increase taxes on productivity, you get less productivity. If you increase taxes on energy production, you get less energy. If you increase taxes on charitable giving, you get less charity. If you increase taxes on investments, you get less job creation.

Madam Chairman, I have watched too much spending and too much borrowing and too much taxing wreck my home State of California. I beg you, do not let those same policies ruin our country.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chairman, the Democratic budget that we are considering tonight for fiscal year 2010 proposes to spend \$3.55 trillion, collect \$2.186 trillion in tax revenues thereby creating a deficit of \$1.222 trillion. That would be a record deficit except for the estimated fiscal 2009 deficit of \$1.694 trillion. In fact, their 5-year budget window shows deficits in each year that are larger than any deficit ever recorded. The Democratic budget's best year is fiscal year 2013 which shows a deficit of \$586 billion, which is \$127 billion larger than the current record holder of \$459 billion for fiscal year 2008 which was also on the Democrats' watch.

These estimates, as large as they are, may in fact be understated if the CBO's assumptions on how fast the economy recovers prove to be optimistic. Madam Chairman, we tend to think that expanding economies will last forever, but they don't. Today we believe that this recession will last forever, but it won't. It is temporary.

The debt that will be used to finance these record deficits is permanent debt. It will never be paid back.

I recently had a fifth grader in Fredericksburg, Texas, at a town hall meeting ask me what is our plan to pay off the national debt? I had to tell the young man the ugly truth is that there is absolutely no plan to pay off the national debt. To pay off debt, we have to run a surplus, which is something this budget does not remotely contemplate. The interest carry on this permanent debt represents a forever claim on the earnings of all future generations.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. In other words, those future generations will have to tax themselves to pay for the interest on this debt each year before their tax revenues can begin to address their problems. This begs the question of why should we use permanent debt to address temporary problems? We should not. We have used this technique for far too long, and this budget continues this inexcusable use of future generations' resources to fix our problems. We should not pass this budget. I urge my colleagues to vote against it tomorrow.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. My wife and I have three young kids. My son, Max, just turned 16. He got his driver's license. I want everybody to be warned that my

son now has his driver's license. You have all been warned.

I really worry, though, about the legacy that we are leaving our kids. My son is going to inherit something if the Democrats pass the budget that they propose, where 30 cents, 30 cents of every dollar spent, nearly 30 cents of every dollar will be spent by the Federal Government. I just think that is wrong. He is entering a world where they are going to have the single largest tax increase in the history of the United States of America where their debt has been doubled. We have got to stop running this country on a credit card. People have to pay that debt. And it is mere kids and our grandkids.

So I reject this budget that is proposed. I think we need to look closely what is the proper role of government. I think every time we send a dollar of the American people's money, we have to remember that we are reaching into everybody's pocket and pulling that money out and giving it to somebody else. Is that the proper role of government? Who is in the best position to actually spend those dollars? There are some that argue that only government can solve our problems. I reject that. It is only the American people that can grow this economy and grow this country. It has been on the backbone of the American entrepreneur, the woman who opens a business, it is the local small business man that is going to grow this country. It is not this government.

And so I reject this budget. We are going to find out real quickly if those Blue Dogs are Blue Dogs or if they are lap dogs. Because we have the chance to reject this budget and get fiscal constraint in order. We cannot be all things to all people. We have to learn to say "no." Government is not here to solve all of our problems. It is about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And I want my son to enter that world as optimistic as he can possibly be and a government that gets out of the way.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Our friend from Utah just said that we have to learn to say "no." That is something that his party has learned to say quite well. No plan for health care, no plan for education, no plan for job development, and no plan for energy independence. One of our colleagues talked about the estate tax. Interesting exchange, Madam Chairman, that our presentation was about honoring America's veterans and fully funding in a way that the VFW and the American Legion supports, and rather than any response to that point, the other side immediately jumped to talk about the estate tax, which I understand. And the reason we understand it is that this budget assumes that changes will be made in the present estate tax law so that 99.7 percent of American families will not pay the estate tax, 99.7 percent.

So our presentation was about veterans who wore the uniform of the country. Their presentation was about the 3 percent of Americans who would pay the estate tax under this proposal. That is where our priorities are.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 32 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 37 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. I will go ahead and use the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chair, I have sat here keeping a list of things that were wrong that cannot be recited in 2 minutes. One speaker got up and said there were no spending restraints. Deficit neutral reserve funds are all about spending restraints. We cannot undertake any of those initiatives until they are paid for. It is a substantial restraint. PAYGO is built into this budget. And it is guaranteed to be accorded a vote on this House floor to become statutory PAYGO instead of rule-of-the-House PAYGO.

There is a lot of talk about the costs of this budget, \$3.9 trillion. It makes me gag as well. But do you know why it is up so big? TARP, Freddie Mac, Fannie Mae and AIG, much of which, much of which was incurred and fixed on your watch, the watch of your administration, Hank Paulson and others. That is why it happens in this year's numbers, secondly.

Thirdly, as you listen to this debate you would think that President Obama has been in office in town for years now. Everything is effectively blamed on Democrats. His administration has been in office 3 months. What we are seeing today and next year and the following years is the wind down and the work off of the Bush structural deficits. They simply won't go away in short order. But Obama didn't wrack up this debt in the last 3 months. It has been created in the last 8 months when President Bush took a \$5.6 trillion surplus over 10 years, and by 2004 converted it to the biggest in history, to a \$412 billion dollar deficit, the biggest deficit at that time in American history. That happened under his watch, under his administration, under his spending policy and taxing policy.

So all of this effort, and in particular, this newfound concern over debt, I share your concern. But where were you over the last 8 years? Your silence was almost deafening. This President Bush built up the debt of the United States from \$5.7 trillion to \$11 trillion. What we are now doing is living in the backwash of the Bush administration trying to straighten up the mess that he left behind.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, the vice ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I listened very carefully to the distinguished chairman of the House Budget Committee. But unfortunately, I think he may need a history lesson on who has controlled this institution for the last 2 years. And also, as I read the Constitution, Madam Chair, I would say to my friend from South Carolina, if I were allowed to speak to him, it says that it is Congress, Congress is in charge of spending decisions, Congress has the ability to spend money, create debts and create deficits. And I agree. President Obama inherited a huge deficit. He inherited it from Democrats in the United States Congress. So he took a \$1.3 trillion debt, it was a \$160 billion deficit rather, and now he and the Democrats in Congress are adding to it a sea of red ink for as far as the eye could see. Never in the history of this country have we seen so much debt.

Their budget, Madam Chair, will simply bankrupt this country. And they seem to be oblivious to the facts. Again, never, never have so few voted so fast to indebted so many. And it is just the start of their economic calamity that they are trying to impose upon the Nation.

Now we hear all of this lofty talk about, well, we need this wonderful budget and all of this spending to get us out of the recession. Then why, why is it that the President's own OMB says that we are out of this recession in the fourth quarter of 2009? Then why impose this unconscionable burden of debt on our children?

Madam Chair, there was a time in America's history when the American ethic was, you work hard today so your children can live better tomorrow. Well, this Democratic economic program just turns that around and says, let government live better today so our children can work harder tomorrow. It is an outrage. It is an outrage. A national energy tax. Tax on small businesses. Taxes on the capital of capitalism. As one of my colleagues said, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MACK), our budget is about we the people. Their budget is about I the government. If you think you can borrow your way, spend your way, tax your way into prosperity, Madam Chair, then that is the budget for you. But if you think America is about rolling up your sleeves, working hard, risking capital and dreaming bold dreams so that people can go to work and find their own future, then there is an alternative, Madam Chair. It is the Republican budget that will be offered tomorrow. And it will give a great Nation a great future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 34 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 4 minutes.

Madam Chair, let me read you a story about a project that is deemed shovel-ready that is getting funded in

the stimulus package in Wisconsin. The town of Arena, it is a beautiful small town in Iowa County, the town of Arena will get \$426,000 to replace the River Road bridge. It averages about 10 cars a day. A quote from the town chairman, "I was surprised as anyone when I got a call that the bridge was going to be fixed. I can tell you that the bridge is a very low priority for us." Stimulus package, shovel-ready project. If you think this is the kind of way we ought to be spending our taxpayer dollars, then vote for this budget, because they are going to do a lot more of this stuff. If you think that is the key to prosperity, borrow that money, build the bridge that gets 10 cars a day that the people from this town say is a low priority, then we are going to do more of that. Vote for this budget.

I want to speak not in numerical terms, not in statistics, but in history and morality. We are the greatest nation on Earth. We are an exceptional nation. And I want it to stay that way. History is replete with episode after episode of great civilizations and great nations not being defeated militarily, but being defeated by themselves, doing themselves in through atrophy and stagnation.

□ 2315

That is what could happen here if we don't watch it. The kinds of borrowing that is being proposed in this is staggering.

I want to ask you, how much money do you think I have in my wallet? I have \$50,000,000,010 in my wallet. I've got 10 U.S. dollars and 50 billion Zimbabwe dollars. Ten U.S. dollars right now are more valuable than the Zimbabwe dollar. This is what happens when a country tries to inflate its way out of its debt. It's worthless.

I'm not saying we're going to become Zimbabwe. Far from it. But I'm saying our greenback is under duress. People are wondering if this is going to retain its value.

The question is, are we going to be able to keep finding people to buy all our bonds if we borrow and borrow and borrow? If, under this Presidency, as this budget proposes, we borrow more money than all prior presidencies combined, are we going to get all these people to give us that money?

And then guess what? Guess who pays for it? The next generation. Our children. Our children already are on a glide path to pay twice the level of taxes we pay today; that's if you don't pass this budget. It gets much worse if you do pass this budget.

We're going to debase our currency if we keep going down this path. Do you know what that means? I know that's wonky stuff. That means people lose their savings. That means senior citizens living on fixed incomes lose their savings. Their standard of living goes down. That means the middle class that's saving for retirement, saving for college, that gets wiped out.

It is getting to that kind of a serious moment in this country where, if we keep thinking we can just borrow and borrow and borrow, tax and tax and tax, spend and spend and spend, we're going to do it in to our own country. I don't want that to happen.

This is the greatest country on the planet. This is the land of opportunity. This is the country that has shown the world that we can reach unprecedented amounts of prosperity, where everybody can climb up that economic ladder.

We want a society where we equalize opportunity for all people. We don't want to pass this budget that says we're going to equalize the results of everybody's lives. We are going to micromanage their affairs.

We want America to succeed and to prosper, and that's why we want to defeat this budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, as Chair of the Joint Economic Committee, I am pleased to speak in the time reserved by the Budget Act for a discussion of economic goals and policies.

I rise today to put our fiscal problems into a broader economic context. Our budget is an important blueprint for getting our economy back on track by making critical investments in health care, clean energy, and education that will create jobs and enhance our global competitiveness. We will also restore fiscal responsibility by cutting the deficit by nearly two-thirds by 2013.

Throughout this budget debate, it has been generally acknowledged that President Obama inherited a fiscal mess. The previous administration had taken office facing a robust economy and a fiscally sound government. President Bush inherited a projected surplus of \$5.6 trillion. We stood poised to deal with the budget challenges posed by the retirement of the baby boom generation, and prepared to invest in improving the future standard of living of our children and grandchildren.

Under President Bush's management, our economy set record after record, but they were all the wrong kinds of records. His administration's policies produced historically poor levels of job growth, the greatest gap between the haves and the have-nots since the 1920s. Record number of uninsured Americans, 47 million in 2006. A record \$10.6 trillion Federal debt when he left office, and the largest single-year deficit in U.S. history, \$459 billion in 2008. And

he left over \$1 trillion in deficits in 2009. Record oil prices, record current account deficits, the broadest measure of our trade deficit, the largest in history, record declines in housing prices and home equity that have left families owing more than their homes are worth.

As you can see on this chart, through a series of disastrous choices and flawed policies, the Bush administration squandered surpluses and left us with record deficits. Here are the projected surpluses, but this is the reality of the actual budget deficits left us by the Bush administration. President Bush presided over a tragic and unprecedented reversal of fortune for our Nation and for our American families.

As this next chart shows, the 8-year tenure of President Bush was a period of the lowest and slowest job growth of any administration in 75 years. His administration left us with a mere 2 million more jobs than when he came into office. Compare that to the 8 years under President Clinton, where nearly 23 million jobs, more than 10 times as many, were created. You can see this small red bar. That's the jobs that Bush II created. Compare that to all the prior administrations that produced many, far many more jobs than this failed administration.

Despite his frequent assurances that his policies were working to make the economy stronger, President Bush earned the dubious distinction of presiding over not one but two recessions. After a jobless recovery from the recession in the first term, the economy fell back into recession in December of 2007, and has been shedding jobs at an alarming rate ever since.

By nearly every measure, the 2001 and 2007 recovery period was among the weakest in the post-World War II period. There were warning signs that all was not well. During the recovery, two important economic variables, growth, and the growth in fixed nonresidential investment, grew more slowly than during the other expansions. Both grew more slowly than they did during the expansion of the 1990s, when taxes were raised, not cut.

Consumption, net worth, wages, and salaries, and employment also grew at remarkably slower rates during the Bush recovery than during other expansionary periods.

The one bright spot for some in the recovery was the large growth in profits that went to corporations driven, in large part, by the ever-increasing productivity of the American worker. However, the increases did not translate into bigger paychecks for hard-working middle-class families.

Unlike the expansion of the 1990s, under President Clinton, where workers' productivity and compensation grew in tandem, during the 2000 recovery under President Bush, workers' compensation lagged far behind their robust productivity growth. The increased wealth just went to a very few

at the top of our economy, exacerbating the divide between the haves and the have-nots.

As this chart shows, the typical household income, after accounting for inflation, was actually \$324 lower at the end of 2007, leaving them struggling to stay afloat, even before the current recession hit.

It is now all too clear that even the relatively weak economic growth during the Bush administration was not broadly shared and was built on an unstable foundation. The soaring housing prices that helped fuel our economic recovery now appear to have been a classic asset bubble. The disastrous effects of the collapse of that bubble have now spread throughout our entire financial system and around the globe.

When President Obama took the oath of office on the steps of this building just 2 months ago, he immediately inherited a deficit of over \$1 trillion for Fiscal Year 2009, and trillions more in deficits over the next 10 years. He became heir to an economy in the worst crisis since the Great Depression. Almost 4½ million jobs have been lost in the last 15 months.

As this chart shows, in the waning days of the Bush administration, the economy shrank at an astonishing annual rate of 6.3 percent in the fourth quarter of 2008, the fastest rate of contraction in over 25 years. In 2008, the final year of the Bush administration, \$11.2 trillion of wealth simply vanished into thin air as housing prices fell almost 20 percent.

Our gross Federal debt stands at more than \$10.6 trillion, nearly \$35,000 per person in America. That is how much every person in America owes to the Federal debt. And as a share of our economy, that's the highest level since 1955, when we were still paying off debts from World War II.

This is the fiscal mess President Obama inherited, and we have our work cut out for us to clean it up. One year ago I stood here in this same spot, as part of this same process, and pointed out that when our opponents were asked how to address our financial problems, their answer was, to cut benefits for middle-class families and cut taxes for the wealthiest few. And our opponents still offer the same solutions.

We propose a different course. Restoring growth is key to getting our economy back on track, and spurring growth takes investment. Congress has worked closely with President Obama in his first 70 days to develop an integrated and multipronged attack to revive the economy.

Under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we have provided relief to middle-class, middle-income taxpayers, invested in infrastructure, renewable energy, and education to create and save millions of jobs and extend unemployment benefits for millions of jobless Americans.

Congress has also acted, with President Obama, to reauthorize and expand

the Children's Health Insurance Program, so that it now covers 11 million low-income children.

□ 2330

The economic recovery packages we passed were aimed at boosting demand in the short term because consumers are reluctant to spend, but we were careful not to enact provisions that will exacerbate our long-term deficits and debt. This budget builds on those policies by making important additional investments that will strengthen our economy, invest in the future and put us back on the path of fiscal responsibility.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, "rising costs for health care [are] the single greatest challenge to balancing the Federal budget." Clearly, containing health care costs is critical to addressing the country's long-term fiscal challenges, and we must act now. That is why a key priority of our budget is health care reform, which will expand coverage, improve the quality of care and address those skyrocketing costs of care that are weighing down our economy and are putting pressure on family budgets.

During the last administration, the growing cost of care pushed the number of uninsured Americans to record levels. At the end of the recovery in 2007, there were 46 million uninsured Americans, 7.2 million more than when President Bush took office.

I would like to thank Chairman SPRATT and the Budget Committee for including a deficit-neutral reserve fund in the budget resolution for the 9/11 health programs, consistent with last year's budget conference agreement. This will provide some legislative flexibility for the Energy and Commerce and Judiciary Committees to pass H.R. 847, the 9/11 Health and Compensation Act, and to ensure it is fully paid for under PAYGO rules. H.R. 847 would provide medical monitoring and treatment to World Trade Center responders and to community members whose health has been impacted by Ground Zero toxins in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. We have a moral obligation to care for the heroes and heroines of 9/11, and this reserve fund is an important step toward fulfilling that obligation.

Our budget makes investments in education a priority so that every child has the opportunity to receive a quality education. According to a report by the Education Trust, the United States is now the only industrialized country where young people are less likely than their parents to earn a high school diploma.

Improving education and training will prepare our children to compete and win in the global economy. This budget builds on investments with further support for early childhood education, setting high standards and providing the tools to achieve them for elementary and secondary school students. This budget reaffirms our com-

mitment to making college affordable for every American by raising the maximum Pell Grant award to help more students obtain a college education.

Our budget also embraces the President's goal of increasing America's energy independence and energy security. Record gas prices last summer left Americans at the mercy of the gas pump. We build on the funding and tax incentives in the Recovery Act by expanding our investments in renewable energy and energy efficiency that will reduce America's dependence on foreign energy, and we provide new training opportunities to prepare workers for green jobs in a clean, green economy. Our budget is the blueprint for strengthening our economy and for putting people back to work. After 8 years of misguided policies, we must be mindful of the future as we take steps to rebuild our economy.

President Obama has called on us to address the systemic challenges facing our economy by making investments in accessible, affordable health care, energy independence and quality education. The investments we make now will pay off later as we emerge from this current crisis stronger and better prepared for challenges of the 21st century.

Thank you, and I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I would yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, this evening reminds me of my first session of Congress in 1997. It was a night like this, and we were struggling with a budget that was out of control. We had a Democrat President and a Republican Congress, and while it was a hard fight and we had to make a lot of tough decisions, Republicans in this House and President Clinton together passed a balanced budget agreement that succeeded. It got spending under control. It lowered taxes. It didn't raise them. Not only were we able to balance the budget, but we were able to pay off almost a half a trillion dollars worth of national debt.

I remember because almost no Democrats voted for that. They claim credit now for balancing the budget, but they voted against the law that balanced our budget and allowed us to pay off that national debt. Tonight feels like that because, I think, we have the opportunity, unfortunately, to go the other direction. My worry is that this Obama-Democrat budget guarantees red ink for decades and that we may never see a balanced budget in our lifetimes if this budget passes.

The Americans I know, the Texans I know, are growing increasingly worried about our unprecedented spending spree. You know, the President's budget and the Democrat budget we're talking about tonight raises taxes. It explodes spending, and it heaps on mountains of new debt for the next decade. It's clear America's finances are on the wrong track. We need to change the

path now. We need to change it today or risk never seeing a balanced budget in our lifetimes, and I worry from an economic standpoint that all of this new debt is going to drag our economy down further and that, eventually, it will lead to higher inflation, which really hurts and hits families and their paychecks by eroding those paychecks and their nest eggs.

We can't spend, tax and borrow our way back to prosperity. Congress has a responsibility to get on a more responsible path that leads back to a balanced budget, and we've got a Republican alternative, a Republican Study Committee alternative as well, that, I think, starts us down in that direction.

I oppose strongly the budget that's proposed today that increases spending by \$3 trillion over the next decade. Just think about it: Federal spending under this Democrat budget would increase nearly \$1 trillion in the next year alone. \$1 trillion in the next year alone. Think about that. Economists tell us that \$1 trillion is represented by this: If you'd started a business on the day Our Lord was born and you'd lost \$1 million every day since, we still would not be to that first \$1 trillion. We're going to add more than that in new spending just in the next year. We're going to spend twice as much as that in new debt added to the Federal debt. Those are staggering numbers, amounts of debt I never dreamed I would see in my lifetime. It gets worse. Under this budget plan and budget path, over the next 10 years of debt held by the public, it will triple to over \$17 trillion. Again, it's an amount that most people never dreamed we would see.

According to the Joint Economic Committee, the debt, as a share of our economy, will almost double during that period. Some economists think it will go up even faster. According to a recent study of many financial crises by Professors Kenneth Rogoff and Carmen Reinhart, it has become an instant classic. U.S. national debt can be expected to increase by \$8 trillion to \$9 trillion just over the next 3 years. During that period, inflation of 8 to 10 percent, something most of us haven't seen since the '70s, is more than likely the way the government will end up paying for this huge run-up in Federal debt. These economists compare the coming economic environment to the '70s, which had rising inflation, weak economic growth, rising unemployment, and what we called the misery index. Unfortunately, that may be what we're heading for.

Because this budget and the President's budget cooks the books and uses faulty economic assumptions in its forecast, it has a variety of accounting gimmicks that really hides the true cost of these dangerous budget priorities. As the Washington Post said last week—and it's not exactly a conservative newspaper—"In this budget, Congress deals a blow to honest budgeting."

The Democrats now are attempting to shoehorn expensive administrative proposals based on unrealistic economic assumptions, and the budget uses gimmicks to mask spending. So we're going to see much higher debt and, eventually, higher taxes. The fact is the U.S. can't afford to engage in this spending spree on top of a stimulus, on top of a budget just passed, huge spending on top of the new bailout dollars, and now this budget hitting Americans straight in the face. You would think we'd be listening to warnings from China and from others of our creditors to remind us that there are limits to the appetite for U.S. Treasury securities.

We are on a dangerous path. What we see in this budget are tax increases on small businesses, on professionals, on exporters, and on entrepreneurs. We see huge, new cap-and-trade taxes and costly new entitlements that will drive us deeper into debt and that will really raid the pocketbooks of most American families.

Before I reserve my time, the question is: Who pays for all of this? Because there's no free money in Washington. Someone eventually has to pay for it, and it won't be just the wealthy.

It's going to be the middle class. It's going to be professionals. It's going to be hardworking families. It's going to be the elderly. We're going to see higher capital gains and dividends taxes, a lot of which our seniors live off of in their retirement. They've already seen their retirement portfolios devastated. Now we're going to tax them if those gains go back up.

There will be tax hikes on charitable donations. At a time when more and more people need local charity services and contributions are down, we're actually going to discourage our professionals and small businesses from giving to our local charities. I guess they think they can use the money more wisely here in Washington.

You're going to see a carbon tax, an energy tax, that in Texas will drive energy bills up 100 percent in some areas, 50 percent in others. It will be a huge cost to families on their utility bills. The taxes on small business in a number and in a variety of ways are going to destroy jobs. The marriage penalty comes back in a major way. You're going to increase the income taxes on professionals and small businesses by at least 20 percent. What's interesting is this small group of professionals and small businesses makes up about 5 percent of the taxpayers in America. They already pay 60 percent of the taxes. They carry 10 times the load. This budget is going to tax them more.

So the signal we're going to send to people is, if you go to college and get a degree, if you develop a skill, if you start a new business, if you build up your life, we're going to punish you for it. We're going to punish you for it in higher taxes. We're going to discourage you.

This budget brings back the death tax. Can you imagine working your

whole life to start a business or to run the family farm, and at the very end, Uncle Sam swoops in and takes up half of what you've earned? You intended to give it to your children or to your grandchildren, but Uncle Sam comes in and takes it. It's the number 1 reason most small businesses aren't able to hand their businesses down to their children. It's the number 1 reason family farms don't survive. Today, we're seeing more women-owned and minority-owned businesses that are facing the same death tax. They aren't going to survive. The death tax needs to go away permanently as it did under President Bush and the Republican tax relief measures.

Finally, coming from an energy State, we see unprecedented increases on America's energy industry. The very people who develop our oil and gas. Onshore, small and independent energy companies will face devastating tax increases, including one where it actually punishes them and treats them like they're foreign investors. It punishes them for drilling and for exploring here in America. It makes no sense at all.

At this point, we have several members of the Joint Economic Committee and others who would like to share their thoughts on this budget and on the condition of America's financing.

With that, I would like to reserve, Madam Chair, the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, as we consider the budget proposal for the coming year, we are facing, really and truly, one of the most important votes in recent memory. We can choose now to honor the pledge we made to the American people in the last election and begin the process of health care reform, make investments that will lead to energy independence and invest the needed funds to reinvigorate our educational system or we can follow the same failed policies that brought us to the crisis we find ourselves in now. Our budget builds on our integrated approach to lifting us out of the recession, and it returns us to fiscal discipline by cutting the deficit by nearly two-thirds by 2013.

□ 2345

Now, the gentleman mentioned our tax plan. Well, I am very proud of the Democratic plan. Our plan makes permanent the \$800 Making Work Pay tax cut while preserving all dedicated payroll taxes that go to Social Security and Medicare. This is a new tax cut President Obama promised in his campaign.

The Democratic plan expands the child tax credit helping millions of families with children. It makes the \$2,500 opportunity tax credit permanent to make college more affordable. This is a new tax cut President Obama promised in his campaign.

It permanently protects millions of middle-class families from being hit by

the alternative minimum tax. It expands the earned-income tax credit by providing tax relief to families with three or more children and increasing marriage penalty relief. It provides for automatic enrollment in IRAs and 401(k)s and expands the current tax credit for saving for retirement. It eliminates capital gains on small businesses, cuts taxes for 95 percent of American workers, cuts spending—non-defense discretionary—over 10 years to its lowest level as a percent of the economy in nearly half a century. It cuts the deficit in half over 4 years, grows nothing but jobs and ends an era of irresponsibility and gimmicks.

I would like to inquire, Madam Chairman, as to how much time remains on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 21 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MALONEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chairman, I would yield 5 minutes to a member of the Joint Economic Committee for more than 6 years, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RON PAUL.

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

You know, they say so often that there is not enough bipartisanship around here. We hear that complaint a lot of time. But, you know, when I look at it, I see that there's been too much bipartisanship in creating the problem we have had. And it hasn't been the last—this crisis that we're in the midst of, this financial crisis, didn't pop up here in the last 60 days. It didn't pop up here in the last 8 years, but it's taken several decades to get to this point where we are today dealing with a budget that is just totally out of control and a monetary and economic system that is uncontrollable as well.

It is said that this budget is going to be \$3.6 trillion with a \$1.1 trillion deficit. An amazing thing is that \$1.1 trillion deficit is going to be \$400 billion less than this year. I will wait and see if that really comes out because that probably won't work out that way. Matter of fact, characteristically, the statistics that we hear when we talk about the budget are never reliable, especially when you're in a recession. In a recession, nobody can protect the revenues. The revenues are going to be a lot lower than they said and the expenditures are going to be a lot higher.

So I am making a prediction that the spending will be over \$4 trillion this year and that the deficit is going to be over \$2 trillion and that the picture that we are looking at today is much worse than we're willing to admit.

Matter of fact, I think the problem we face today is not so much a budgetary problem. It's much different. I think we talk a lot about the budget. Just think about how many hours we talked about it today. But the budget

and the deficit is a symptom of something much more serious. And that is, what have we allowed our government to become? I think it has been the loss of respect by us here in the Congress to understand and take seriously article I, section A. If we did that, we wouldn't be doing all of these things that we're doing.

If we understood the tenth amendment, we wouldn't be doing all of this. We wouldn't have a deficit. If we understood monetary policy, we wouldn't have a monetary system that encourages all of this that gets us off the hook because conservatives like to spend a lot of money, and liberals like to spend a lot of money. And they don't have to worry. We raise taxes. We borrow it. And we do it, and we've been doing it for decades and getting away with it. But it's coming to an end because we've always been dependent on the Fed to come in and monetize the debt.

Now, have they backed off in any way? No. They are expanding it. Not only do they buy in the market, they are buying it directly from the Treasury. They're only encouraging us to do even more of this.

We have endorsed, as a Congress and as a people, a welfare/warfare State. And that is not part of what America is supposed to be. And it encourages the spending and the borrowing and the deficits and all of the inflation.

And we take—for instance, we were supposed to get a lot of change with the new administration. One thing I was hopeful about is that they might look at this overseas wild expanding and expansion of the war going on in the Middle East, but the military budget, the war budget, is going up 9 percent. And as long as we have the expansion of the war, the dependency on the spending overseas, we're spending over \$1 trillion over a year maintaining the world empire at the same time we have runaway spending here on welfare here at home. It is unsustainable.

We have a debt that will not be paid. We know that when it reaches a certain level, it cannot be paid. But it is always liquidated.

Now, if an individual or a company goes into debt, it can be liquidated in the old-fashioned way of bankruptcies. Countries don't go bankrupt. What they do is they default on a debt. That doesn't mean they won't pay it. They pay it off in bad money. And literally, that is the purpose of the Federal Reserve right now is to lower the real debt. So if you destroy 50 percent of the value of the dollar in the next year or two, the real debt has gone down 50 percent.

Literally, the Federal Reserve board is praying for, encouraging inflation to lower the real debt because it can't be sustained.

But who does that hurt? It hurts the people who save, the people who save get 1 percent on their earnings, and we tax the little bit they get, and the people who are doing the right thing are being punished the most.

So the ones who live beyond their means get bailed out. And it's a very bad, bad system that we have. And we have to decide what the role of government ought to be.

You know, we do blame the banks and we blame the business people and everybody. But you know, I have a lot of people that come to my office and say, Cut his, cut his, but don't cut my program.

So we have to decide as a people what should the role of government be. And if we think the role of government is going to be, and should be, the policeman of the world and to run the welfare State, this budgetary problem will never be solved.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chairman, I would like to grant 30 seconds to Mr. PAUL to conclude.

Mr. PAUL. I thank you for yielding.

And let me just close by saying the greatest danger I see right now is the placing of the blame for the crisis that we're in is that we had too much freedom, too much capitalism, not enough regulation. And they did this in the 1930s. They are doing it even more now.

Instead of saying that we overspent, overtaxed, overregulated, we have lost our confidence. And if we don't change that attitude and if we accept this notion, accept international regulation, believe me, we're in big trouble. We will lose our freedom, and we will lose our sovereignty as well.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would like to address the deficit that the gentleman mentioned and point out that President Obama inherited deficits over \$1 trillion. The Obama administration inherited an economy deep in recession and a projected annual deficit of well over \$1 trillion. This deficit didn't arise out of the blue.

President Bush inherited a \$5.6 trillion projected 10-year budget surplus, which he dissipated on misguided fiscal policies and choices. That surplus represented an opportunity to address some of the major issues confronting our country, including preparing for the needs of the retiring Baby Boom generation.

The Democratic plan cuts the deficit by more than half. The President sets a firm goal of cutting the deficit in half over 4 years, and this budget does just that. It takes the record deficit that President Obama and the 111th Congress inherited in 2009, and cuts the deficit from \$1.7 trillion in 2009 to \$586 billion in 2013.

And it also makes more realistic deficit estimates. To provide for a more realistic accounting of the government's financial position, our budget—like the President's plan—includes likely foreseeable costs that have been omitted from past budgets. These include costs of our overseas deployment, Medicare reimbursements to physicians, and emergencies such as natural

disasters that can't be predicted with precision but that occur every year. These were all off-budget during the Bush years. We have put them on with more transparency.

And I would like to say that very importantly, the Democratic plan begins to address health care. It begins to address rising costs. It sets us on a path to increased coverage for the 46 million who do not have medical coverage. It aims to improve the quality of care. And Republicans have no real plan for addressing rising health care plans and health costs. And the Republican plan for health care, including Medicare, is to give everyone a voucher and deregulate the insurance market.

So I say the Democratic plan is better in terms of reducing the deficit, and it also invests in health care, energy independence, and education and to long-term goals and needs of our young people and of our citizens who need to compete and succeed in the global market.

I would like to inquire as to how much time remains on my side and the other side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. MALONEY. I reserve my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentlelady is right. The President did inherit a \$1.2 trillion deficit, but he inherited it from a Democratic Congress that had the purse strings for the past 2 years. In fact, the Democratic Congress didn't even send President Bush a budget because they wanted to spend more than he did. So just because—I will tell you, Republicans, we didn't do a good job with controlling spending. When we left control, the deficit was about \$160 billion. The deficit under this budget will be 10 times that much. And ours is bad enough. This is unthinkable.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes to another member of the Joint Economic Committee and an expert in health care reform, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I can't help but notice this seems to be an all-Texas Joint Economic Committee on our side tonight. Ranking Member BRADY is very good to allow me the time to speak in opposition to the budget resolution that's on the floor this evening.

You know, I think back to the late 1980s in Texas and it was a tough, tough time. We had the savings and loan collapse, we were in the middle of our own recession, energy prices collapsed literally overnight, real estate that collateralized loans was suddenly worth near zero. Loans were being called. It was a true mark-to-market phenomenon.

□ 0000

And what happened during that time? Well, you saw families tighten their belts. You saw businesses not ex-

pand, not borrow money, and they were dark days and they were tough times. And we lost some businesses, and people had to leave the area.

But I don't recall at any point during that time anyone from the Federal Government coming down with a big bag of money and saying, gee, can we help you out of these tough times; can we perhaps buy you out of this recession in which you find yourself.

No, what I recall the Federal Government sending me was the Resolution Trust Corporation that absorbed a bunch of assets and sold them off to foreign holdings, and it really wasn't all that helpful. In fact, if the Federal Government had shown up, I don't know that I would have welcomed their presence, but we got through that.

Those dark days quickly gave way to sunshine and light and 25 years of expansion and growth in the North Texas area. In fact, it is only very recently where my part of North Texas has begun to feel the effects of the recession that has gripped the country for the last five quarters.

Now, Ranking Member BRADY talked about the fact that the budget deficit is going to grow by \$8 trillion to \$10 trillion over the next 3 years, and I would just simply ask rhetorically—and I will not yield time but I'm going to ask rhetorically—at what point over the next 3 years during the expansion of the deficit by \$8 to \$10 trillion do we begin to accept some responsibility on the other side and from the new administration? Surely, at some point over the next 3 years, this ceases to be a George Bush problem and becomes a Barack Obama problem. Surely, sometime over the next 3 years, this ceases to become a George Bush problem and becomes a NANCY PELOSI problem.

But, Madam Chair, the American people don't want us to point fingers at each other, but they do appreciate facts, and let me share a few facts.

Here is a graphic representation of the budget deficits for the last several years prior and on into 10 years into the future. The last year over which we had control over the appropriations process, the budget deficit was \$160 billion. It was outlandish. In fact, we lost the majority because we were spending too much, and the budget deficit was \$160 billion.

And where do we find ourselves a little over 2 years later? As Ranking Member BRADY pointed out, it's now 10 times that much. It is no accident that we're having this debate at midnight on April 2, so that the American people maybe won't notice what has happened because surely when they wake up in the morning and find out that this budget deficit has now increased 10 times since the beginning of fiscal year 2007, that they're going to have some serious questions.

And, Madam Chair, I would also point out, that at this point when the budget deficit was so high under Republicans at \$160 billion, we put \$100 billion right before the end of that fis-

cal year into the gulf coast of Louisiana and Mississippi because of Katrina and Rita. We had to help a recovering Indonesia from the tsunami, and oh, yeah, we were still fighting two wars as Dr. PAUL pointed out, and we had supplemental appropriations of \$60 billion and \$80 billion during that cycle as well. And that's why our budget deficit was so high at \$160 billion.

Well, we had a big hurricane last September, and we've given \$12 billion to the good people of Galveston. That's a scandal in and of itself.

Well, spending money to get out of a recession did not work in the 1930s. It certainly didn't work for Japan in the 1990s. And I certainly don't intend to be part of that today.

We've heard some talk this evening about jobs and job creation. Well, what better way to continue a recession than to kill job creation, and that's exactly what this budget proposes to do by instituting what's going to be known as a cap-and-trade, or really, what we should honestly call a carbon tax. And what is that carbon tax going to do? It is going to be used to offset the expansion in health care in this country.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield Dr. BURGESS an additional 30 seconds to conclude.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chair, it is no accident that the cost of expansion of health care in this country at \$1.2 trillion estimated by the Congressional Budget Office is almost exactly the amount of money that will be raised with this egregious carbon tax of \$1.5 trillion. If you want to kill jobs, if you want to drive jobs overseas, tax energy. That's a proven way to do it, but I don't recommend it.

I hope when the American people wake up tomorrow they can turn on a light without the feeling that when they turned that light on they just paid for their neighbor's health care.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chairman, my good friend on the other side of the aisle mentioned energy policy, talked about taxing energy. Well, the Democratic plan makes critical investments in energy, with \$1 billion more in appropriated funding for 2010 than the 2009 level of regular appropriations.

It also includes a deficit neutral reserve fund for legislation to promote energy independence, spur the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and help businesses, industries, States, communities, and households adjust to an economy with reduced emissions levels.

It provides job opportunities in the new energy economy and relief for Americans. It creates green collar jobs to help address rising unemployment and keeps jobs in America, provides tax incentives for renewable energy, funds weatherization to help low-income

families save \$350 per year, on average, on their energy bills.

But very importantly, going forward, we need to improve fiscal discipline through statutory PAYGO, pay-as-you-go, rules, and the Democratic budget improves fiscal discipline by requiring House passage of statutory pay-as-you-go rules as a condition for making current policy adjustments to the baseline for tax cuts and the Medicare physician payment system. Statutory PAYGO was critical to turning the budgets around in the 1990s, but the Republican Congress and the Bush administration allowed it to expire in 2002, contributing to the deep deficits they accumulated.

As one of its first acts, the 110th Democratic Congress instituted a tough new House PAYGO rule. The resolution would reaffirm and strengthen the commitment to pay-as-you-go by providing for action on statutory PAYGO to enforce a realistic baseline.

It also is very important about oversight and accountability and enforcement. Our budget generates valuable savings by expanding oversight activities and large benefit programs, more aggressively pursuing fraud, and increasing tax compliance and enforcement activities to ensure taxpayer dollars are spent wisely. It is a wise plan, with wise investments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I rise tonight to oppose the budget under consideration.

We hear a lot of talk about PAYGO, but PAYGO is routinely waived here on matters such as the recent stimulus package. On a \$790 billion piece of legislation PAYGO did not apply. I think we need to point that out.

But this budget I think is problematic for a number of reasons. First, it imposes higher taxes on income, investment in energy, and yes, the death tax comes roaring back. The national debt doubles in 5 years. The national debt triples in 10 years. Let me repeat that. The national debt will double in 5 years and will triple in 10 years. It took 43 Presidents 232 years to accumulate \$5 billion in debt. This budget gets us to \$5 billion in 5 years. In short, this budget spends too much, borrows too much, and taxes too much.

On energy, users of electricity, gasoline, petroleum, natural gas will all pay more. Let me translate that. We will all pay more, the American taxpayer. We are going to pay more because of these so-called cap-and-trade or, as my colleague Mr. BURGESS from Texas said, cap-and-tax. Well, this is simply a carbon tax, an energy tax on every American who consumes energy, and again, that is just about every American I know. You know, according to the CBO, we expect that this cap-and-trade tax will cost every household at least \$1,600 again in higher energy

costs, and actually, there are studies out there that say it will cost even more than that. This will also result in the loss of at least 3 to 4 million jobs, according to NAM, National Association of Manufacturers.

So, in short, I would say to everyone here tonight, because of these higher taxes on income and energy, the very people we're asking to get us out from under this very difficult recession, small business people are going to pay more. Small manufacturers that use natural gas in a very big way, they will be punished because of this. The death tax punishes them, too. It makes it harder for them to pass these businesses on to their children and to their grandchildren.

This is an ill-advised budget. The income tax that we will see go up here, too, will also punish many small businesses because they're organized. These Subchapter S companies, partnerships, and proprietorships, they will pay the bill.

So let's think about this. This budget is ill-advised. It is not in the best interests of the American people. I strongly urge that it be rejected.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. May I inquire on the time, please, on both sides of the aisle.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, this budget, the Democratic budget, invests heavily in education. This budget embraces the President's goal of furthering investments in education for Americans from early childhood through post-secondary education and training. Our budget provides a fiscally responsible plan to improve American education and train a workforce that is prepared to compete and succeed in the global economy.

A highly educated and skilled workforce is critical to the overall success of our economy. The benefits to investing in education include higher earnings, higher graduation and employment rates, less crime, decreased need for special education and welfare services, and better health.

In 2008, the unemployment rate for workers with a bachelor's degree was 2.8 percent, while the unemployment rate for workers with a high school diploma was double at 5.7 percent. For workers with less than a high school diploma, the unemployment rate was 9 percent. So if we want to attack unemployment, prepare our young people for the future, we should invest in education. That's what this budget does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to a distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a member of the Small Business Committee himself.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Chairman, parliamentary inquiry?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. GOHMERT. We have been talking about the time. When I came in, I understood the gentlelady across the aisle had yielded 10 minutes of her time to Mr. BRADY. Was there a different understanding from the Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understood the gentlewoman from New York to be reserving her time and inviting the gentleman from Texas to yield a 10 minute block of his time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Oh, when she said I'm yielding 10 minutes to my friend from Texas, the Speaker took that to mean I'm reserving my time? Okay. Thank you.

The gentlewoman from New York reserved her time and signaled that the gentleman from Texas should yield his time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Oh, I see. So when she said I yield my friend from Texas 10 minutes, that meant she was reserving her time? All right. Thank you for the clarification.

I did want to take up a couple of things that were mentioned. First of all, my friend across the aisle had indicated that opponents had wanted to cut benefits to the middle class and reward the wealthiest few and even held up a chart showing the kind of deficits that were run up in 2007 and 2008. And this is the same kind of mantra we've been hearing and actually heard that in 2005 and 2006.

And the fact is there was too much money being spent after President Bush took office. When Republicans had the White House, the House of Representatives and the Senate, too much money was being spent, and that's why before the Democrats took office or took the majority, there was a \$160 billion deficit that was run up.

□ 0015

It was too much money. It was too much deficit. And that's why the American public said: Enough. We're going to put the Democrats in charge. We don't want another \$160 billion deficit.

And so what did we get in 2007 and 2008? We got the numbers that the jobs were falling, we got a problem economy, and the runaway spending went wilder than ever. Now, just in 2 months—and I was objecting back then, I'm objecting louder now—because now they're going to increase that 10 times teams. We spent nearly \$800 billion on a spendulus bill in January, February. Then we had another—they got the other \$350 billion of the \$700 billion from last year.

Going nuts spending money—\$1 trillion dollars? That would pay for an entire year of every individual taxpayer getting back every dime they have.

So when we hear that this party—these people on this side of the aisle—want to make benefits to the wealthiest, you can look at the bill I filed. It was for a tax holiday to let those who were paying taxes get their money

back. That's a solution. That gets the economy going.

This cap-and-tax on energy, that is going to penalize the people that are just struggling to pay their gasoline bill. And then to hammer the deductions for charities and mortgages, that also hammers the people in the middle class trying to get by. And it brings home the point that this majority is about the GRE—government running everything.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GOHMERT. I have a bill that I filed the last Congress, I'm filing again, that would have no increases. A level spending bill. No automatic increases. And they're running that up like crazy.

The Federal Government has been too busy trying to run everybody else's business, telling Detroit, telling Wall Street, telling the lenders, the banks what to do, that they forgot that their job was to provide a defense against enemies foreign and domestic, like Madoff, the cheaters. We should have been after them. That's the job of this government—not telling everybody how to run their business.

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Over the last 8 years, through fiscally reckless policies, President Bush squandered the Clinton-era surplus and left behind a legacy of debt and deficits. He made a number of records, but they were the wrong kinds of records. Record deficit, record trade deficit, record debt.

Over the 7 years from 2002 to 2008, those surpluses from the Clinton years would accumulate to \$3.2 trillion. Instead, under President Bush, the government ran 7 straight years of budget deficits totaling \$2.1 trillion. When President Obama was inaugurated in January, he inherited from President Bush an estimated deficit of \$1.5 trillion—the worst budget deficit in history. And trillions more in deficits over the next 10 years.

Now the Democratic budget resolution begins the process of turning around the Republican budget legacy of deep deficits, mounting debt, an economic decline due to the Bush administration's reckless fiscal policy. It takes steps to put the budget back on a fiscally sustainable path by restoring fiscal responsibility and substantially reducing the deficit.

The President set a firm goal of cutting the budget deficit in half over 4 years, and this budget does just that. It takes a record \$1.5 trillion deficit that President Obama and the Congress inherited in 2009, and cuts the deficit from \$1.7 trillion in 2009 to \$586 trillion in 2013.

Our budget makes strategic investments in health care, education, energy independence, areas critical to a strong economic future. For these and other key priorities, it includes deficit neutral reserve funds that will accom-

modate legislation in these areas consistent with the pay-as-you-go principle.

Our budget generates valuable savings by expanding oversight activities and large benefit programs, more aggressively pursuing fraud and increasing tax compliance and enforcement activities to ensure taxpayers dollars are spent wisely.

It is a balanced and fair budget that makes investments in critical areas.

I would inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MALONEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. At this time I'd like to yield 2½ minutes to a gentleman on the Armed Services Committee, an engineer—he knows his numbers—the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. I think that it's kind of interesting. People have said that America is becoming a socialized Nation, just like the countries over in Europe, a socialized Nation. But that's not a fair thing to say because with this level of debt, the Europeans wouldn't even accept us as part of the European Union.

I've noticed tonight that we have spent more time blaming President Bush than talking about the positive solution of a Democrat budget. And that's not a good sign when we spend—at midnight—talking about how bad Bush is when we're supposed to be debating a Democrat budget.

I don't think the Democrats are proud of this budget. And if I were the Democrats, I wouldn't be proud of the budget either.

While we're talking about President Bush though, I have got some numbers so we can just do a direct comparison and just see what is the difference here.

Just in the last couple of months—we're only just finishing up March—we've got the second half of the Wall Street bailout. That's about \$350 billion. We burned through the economic stimulus—or the porkulus bill—\$787 billion.

Now if you were to add will of the cost of the war in Iraq, all of the cost of the war in Afghanistan, and add it altogether, it would be less than this thing. Then you've got the omnibus deal. Hey, we're starting to spend some real money.

Let's take a look at a comparison. If we want to talk about Bush, we can blame the hurricane on him. We've already done that. It's really bad when a President brings a hurricane in.

Let's talk about this annual budget deficit. This is the average annual deficit under Bush—\$300 billion. We're not proud of that. But the current President's budget—this is what they're proposing—has got him beat two to one. I'm not sure I'd be proud of that number.

Here's the highest deficit when the Democrats were in the House under Bush, \$459 billion. But, oh, President Obama, his projection is \$1.2 trillion. Clear winner by more than two to one. Then, the increase in national debt, \$2.5 trillion, \$4.9 trillion. Again, a two to one.

When you take a look at it, here's what it looks like. Every one of these lines going down is a deficit. Now does anybody see something disturbing in this pattern?

Now we have heard the gentle lady from New York is bragging about the fact that given some time, this number here, the low number, is going to be cut in half. That doesn't give me any sense of satisfaction at all. If I looked at that, I'd say, Holy smokes, I'm moving to some other country. These people in America have been smoking funny cigarettes. What in the world are they doing with this deficit?

Mrs. MALONEY. I reserve the balance of my time for a closing statement.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I would yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, let me thank the gentle lady from New York, the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, for not just the tone of tonight's debate, but the tone of your leadership on the Joint Economic Committee. I truly enjoy serving with you.

While we're sitting here, I got an e-mail from a constituent who asked, How do you make debt go away by spending 10 times as much? Are they trying to sell America magic beans?

Sounds funny, but the truth of the matter is this isn't funny times. America's finances are on the wrong track. We need to change that path now or we risk never seeing a balanced budget in our life time.

We can't spend, tax, and borrow our way back to prosperity. The Republican alternative I like focuses on job creation through small businesses; doesn't raise taxes—it lowers them; it creates incentives to hire and keep workers; encourages private investment rather than bailout; and it starts whittling down this debt so that we will see a balanced budget again.

Madam Chair, we are at a historic moment in America's history. We have a path of bigger debt and higher taxes and huge loads on our children. Or we can get back on the right path again. The Republican alternative does that.

We urge a "no" on this fiscally irresponsible Democrat budget. Let's work together—both parties—to get back to balance the budget. The first start is the Republican alternative.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, the policies advocated by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been tried and we are all living through the disastrous results. Our budget is an important blueprint forgetting our economy back on path that restores confidence, produces growth, and puts people back to work.

We make critical investments in health care, clean energy, and education that will create jobs and enhance our global competitiveness. We will also restore fiscal responsibility by cutting the deficit by nearly two-thirds by 2013.

A budget is fundamentally about priorities—and our priority is to strengthen the economy and help struggling families regain their footing. Americans are optimistic by nature, and I am optimistic that the investments we make now will pay off later and that together we will emerge from this current crisis stronger and better prepared for the 21st century challenges that we face.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Chair, it's only fitting that we begin consideration of the Democrat budget resolution on April 1st. Like April Fool's Day itself, this budget is full of mischief and sleight of hand that will have Uncle Sam dipping his fingers into your pocket as if your wallet was his very own personal ATM.

The President's budget request proposes huge spending increases now with only intentionally vague promises to make hard choices to cut spending in the future. All of this spending is couched in the same soothing rhetoric we heard during the stimulus debate—while kicking the can down the road on many tough decisions.

As Daniel Hannan, a Member of the European Parliament, said in remarks last week, "Perhaps you would have more moral authority in this House if your actions matched your words. The truth is you have run out of our money."

While the House majority portrays their spending plan as a reduction from the President's request, the fact is this budget resolution represents more spending, more taxes, and more debt. The only proposed cuts in this plan are within the area of national defense, an ill-advised course of action as our country continues to engage in the Global War on Terror.

Since Democrats assumed control of Congress, they have proposed increases of at least nine percent each year for non-defense discretionary programs. For next year, they propose yet another 11 percent increase and a 27 percent boost over the next five years.

The proposed surge of federal spending represents the largest non-war government expansion since the New Deal. Domestic discretionary spending—including the spending in the stimulus package—has been hiked over 80 percent since just last year. As a result, Washington will run a budget deficit of 12.3 percent of GDP, by far the largest since World War II.

Some in the majority will justify this out-of-control spending as a necessary, temporary response to a recession. But there's nothing temporary about it. After harshly criticizing budget deficits under President Bush—which averaged \$300 billion annually—President Obama has proposed a budget that would run deficits through the roof for a generation or more.

Three expected developments—the end of the recession, the withdrawal of troops from Iraq, and the phase-out of temporary stimulus spending—would by themselves cut the deficit in half by 2013.

The President's budget shows deficits averaging \$600 billion a year even after the economy recovers from the recession and even after our troops come home from Iraq. That's not good enough. Between 2008 and 2013, the budget will add \$5.7 trillion, or \$48,000 per household, in new government debt. The annual interest alone would equal nearly the entire U.S. defense budget by the year 2019.

On top of this mountain of debt, consider the unsustainable costs of paying Social Security and Medicare benefits to 77 million retiring Baby Boomers.

Without real reform, the result is likely to be devastating tax increases for decades to come.

These higher debt levels will accelerate an increase in interest rates. Higher interest rates will slow down the economic recovery by making it more expensive for businesses to invest and more difficult for families to afford homes and auto loans. This isn't economic, recovery, this is economic madness.

To quote again from Daniel Hannan from the European Parliament, "You cannot spend your way out of recession or borrow your way out of debt."

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MALONEY) having assumed the chair, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Acting 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

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1256.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 1, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to Section 841(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 101-181), I am pleased to appoint The Honorable Christopher Shays of Connecticut, to the Commis-

sion on Wartime Contracting. My previous appointee, Mr. Dean G. Popps resigned in October 2008, creating a vacancy.

Mr. Shays has expressed interest in serving in this capacity and I am pleased to fulfill his request.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Republican Leader.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEVIN (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mrs. SCHMIDT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of an illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, April 2, 2009, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1116. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting notification of several violations of the Antideficiency Act in the Department's Maritime Administration's Operation and Training Account, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b) and 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1117. A letter from the Vice Chair and First Vice President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1118. A letter from the Vice Chair and First Vice President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1119. A letter from the Acting Chair, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's report on the amount of acquisitions made by the agency from entities that manufacture articles, materials, and supplies outside of the United States for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 109-115, section 837; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1120. A letter from the Deputy Chief Human Capital Officer and Director for Human Resources Management, Department of Commerce, transmitting notification that the Department continues to utilize hiring flexibilities such as category rating, in addition to traditional rating, in order to increase its opportunity to select the best qualified candidates in support of Human Capital strategies and succession planning; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1121. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, transmitting a report pursuant