

the folks that take over during hurricane disasters.

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

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

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

Steve Wheeler—fireman, father, fine Texan.

And that's just the way it is.

RECKLESS SPENDING

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

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

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

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

WE MUST WORK TOGETHER TO FIND SOLUTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OPPOSITION TO THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

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

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

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

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

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

FREEDOM AND THE BUDGET

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

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

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

For the young people that are listening, they ought to understand that the impact of this budget today will be far greater on them than it will be on me. Why? Because we are about to embark on a budget that will give us more debt

than at any time in the history of America. And we and those of us who are here will not live long enough to pay it off.

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

HONORING SECRETARY MIKE DIBERARDINIS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 316 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 316

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 0930

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NO FREE LUNCH: SCHOOLS GET TOUGH ON DEADBEATS

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

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

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

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

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

MIXED REVIEWS

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

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

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

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

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

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

"FAMILIES STRUGGLING"

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

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

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

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

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

"DIGNITY AND RESPECT"

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

School officials said the policy was under consideration for some time and parents

were notified last fall. Families with unpaid charges are reminded with an automated phone call each night and notes are sent home with children once a week.

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But what twisted and contorted logic, Madam Speaker, is it to say: Republican deficits were bad, so we are responding by making them four times worse. Is this really the Democratic majority's justification for what it is that we are doing today? Do they really think anyone could be fooled by

such preposterous reasoning? This argument is not just bizarre, it is downright dangerous. It fails to take seriously the impact of exponentially growing debt.

□ 0945

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

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

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

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

tures, but to expand the incentives and opportunities for private expenditures."

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

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

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

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to do so that we will deal with through reconciliation instructions, whether you vote for it or not. And finally, he sets forth a path to broaden access to education and improve its quality.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1000

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

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield my friend an additional minute. If the gentleman would further yield, the fact of the matter is, with this proposal that our

colleagues have, they regularly point the finger of blame at us, that we somehow are trying to hurt the poor by cutting food stamps and nutrition programs, which is just plain wrong. But they fail to recognize that the tax burden, with this energy tax imposed on any family that turns the light switch on, is going to be overwhelmingly strong.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

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

I yield.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. There are several different studies.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time.

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

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

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

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

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

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

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

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

Now, I would suggest that it's further flawed because we have, in the budget, left this element to be worked on by people who want a legend. But this cannot ought to be rejected.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, my friend has just said, this will be worked out later. And in saying this will be worked out later, that cre-

ates a degree of uncertainty as to exactly what the tax will be on working families.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tax compliance: Instead of letting the wealthy get away with huge tax

breaks that hardworking Americans don't get, we actually have a tax compliance feature in this budget that actually makes sure we get \$5 for every dollar invested.

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

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

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

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

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

In light of that—

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

I'm happy to yield to my friend.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. No. Give me the courtesy—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I may—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

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

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

Am I wrong?

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

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

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

I'm happy to yield to my friend.

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

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

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

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

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

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

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I have to confess that it's a little tough

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1030

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. We have no further speakers.

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

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

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

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

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

and public expenditures but to expand the incentives and opportunities for private expenditures."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If you want a different direction, a direction in which we invest in our economy, invest in our health care, in-

vest in clean energy, invest in education and reduce our deficits, then you need to vote for the Democratic budget.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

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