

Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
LaTourette
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey

Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Skeltan
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—112

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Bright
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell
Carter
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)

Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Flake
Forbes
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Guthrie
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston

Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Marchant
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul

Pence
Perriello
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuler

Shuster
Smith (NE)
Souders
Stearns
Sullivan
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—21

Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blunt
Broun (GA)
Cardoza
Carney
Gonzalez

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lujan
Miller, Gary

Napolitano
Pascarell
Roybal-Allard
Salazar
Velázquez
Westmoreland
Wu

□ 1207

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 305 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 85.

□ 1208

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 85), with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

Who yields time?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What do I mean by that?

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

was put in place in 2001 under the Bush tax plan.

□ 1215

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

come from the American public rather than the country of China that holds our debt.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MELANCON. Thank you, Representative BOYD.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Environmental Protection Agency, good agency, they do smart, impor-

tant things. In the stimulus bill this year, they got a 92 percent increase in their budget. What does this budget bill propose? Let's give them another 35 percent increase this year in their budget.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It also angers me that section 303 of this bill, it does have an energy tax in there. You can call it anything you want to, but according to MIT, not according to MARSHA, but according to

MIT, \$3,128 per household. Now, that \$8 a week tax rebate that you're going to see in your check certainly goes away when compared with \$3,128.

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I can't speak for her. Let me ask the gentleman this. It's my understanding that that MIT

study comes up with these calculations based on the fact that people are getting rebates to offset the higher energy costs. I think that's right.

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

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I would object to that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

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

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

Mr. NUNES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- ensuring a seamless transition from DoD to VA;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 85, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this budget because, at a time when Americans are looking for

leadership, at a time when they are looking for this new administration to keep our country safe, this budget resolution provides the tools to do just that. It provides increased support for our national security, it increases the funding for the Department of Defense and for the veterans budget. It also funds above the administration's defense request.

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is correct.

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

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

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

I looked at this budget from this prism: Does it help the middle class, the military and military families and vets, and those families with medical

problems, the elderly, and families with kids in school? The answer is a resounding "yes." And that is why I support this budget that supports the middle class.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1315

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield myself 3 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For too long America has been distracted with misplaced priorities such as unnecessary wars, tax cuts for the ultra wealthy, and

spending on unnecessary weapons systems. At the same time, our leaders were often negligent when it came to honoring our solemn commitment to the hard working men and women of America. It will take time to reverse failed Republican policies, but I believe the Democratic budget will lead America in a new direction by providing urgently needed health care reform, bringing back our tradition of progressive taxation, improving our education, and confronting global warming.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If it is not the government who will pump money into our economy, provide tax cuts to

our families and make health care and education more affordable, then who will? We know that our banks are not lending, families are living paycheck to paycheck, and our small businesses and companies are struggling to maintain their payroll. The status quo is not an option.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The House budget makes many of these investments at a lower level of nondefense dis-

cretionary funding than President Obama's original request. I also am pleased that it includes tax relief for middle-income taxpayers and small businesses, as well as an accurate accounting of the costs of our military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 85 Democrat budget resolution. Our economy is in chaos, every day more Americans lose jobs, and our retirement savings are dwindling. The only response Democrat leadership and this

White House seems to have is to spend more. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have forgotten that a successful economy comes from the ground up, not from the government down.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I look forward to our discussion today.

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

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

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

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

Madam Chair, this budget honors our commitment to our nation's children by investing in education. The budget follows on the bold investments made by the economic recovery bill and provides further support for early child-

hood education. The budget supports education at a young age through a range of approaches, including strengthening and expanding early childhood education programs, home visiting programs, and child nutrition programs such as school meals. I am pleased that the budget also would help make college more affordable and accessible for students in New Jersey and throughout the country by increasing funding for Pell grants and providing additional assistance for low-income high school graduates. The budget further would expand our scientific workforce by tripling the number of graduate fellowships in science.

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

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

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

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

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

A budget is a moral document that should reflect our priorities as a nation and act as a blueprint for the investments our nation needs to be healthy and prosperous. By this measure, the budget resolution before us is not a perfect document. It does, however, provide

for vital investments in health care, jobs, education, and the environment that will spur both short-term and long-term economic growth and make our country healthier and more humane.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is a plan on the table right now that this House could act on to set up such a na-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[From the Washington Post, March 29, 2009]

HIDING A MOUNTAIN OF DEBT

(By David S. Broder)

With a bit of bookkeeping legerdemain borrowed from the Bush administration, the Democratic Congress is about to perform a cover-up on the most serious threat to America's economic future.

That threat is not the severe recession, tough as that is for the families and businesses struggling to make ends meet. In time, the recession will end, and last week's stock market performance hinted that we may not have to wait years for the recovery to begin.

The real threat is the monstrous debt resulting from the slump in revenue and the staggering sums being committed by Washington to rescuing embattled banks and homeowners—and the absence of any serious strategy for paying it all back.

The Congressional Budget Office sketched the dimensions of the problem on March 20, and Congress reacted with shock. The CBO said that over the next 10 years, current policies would add a staggering \$93 trillion to the national debt—one-third more than President Obama had estimated by using much more optimistic assumptions about future economic growth.

As far as the eye could see, the CBO said, the debt would continue to grow by about \$1 trillion a year because of a structural deficit between the spending rate, averaging 23 percent of gross domestic product, and federal revenue at 19 percent.

The ever-growing national debt will require ever-larger annual interest payments, with much of that money going overseas to China, Japan and other countries that have been buying our bonds.

Reacting to this scary prospect, the House and Senate budget committees took the paring knife to some of Obama's spending proposals and tax cuts last week. But many of the proposed savings look more like book-keeping gimmicks than realistic cutbacks. The budget resolutions assume, for example, that no more money will be needed this year to bail out foundering businesses or pump up consumer demand, even though estimates of those needs start at \$250 billion and go up by giant steps.

Republicans on the budget committees offered cuts that were larger and, in some but not all instances, more realistic.

But the main device the Democratic budgeteers employed was simply to shrink the budget "window" from 10 years to five. Instantly, \$5 trillion in debt disappeared from view, along with the worry that long after the recession is past, the structural deficit would continue to blight the future of young, working families.

The Democrats did not invent this gimmick. They borrowed it from George W. Bush, who turned to it as soon as his inherited budget surpluses withered with the tax cuts and recession of 2001-02. But Obama had promised a more honest budget and said that this meant looking at the long-term consequences of today's tax and spending decisions.

There are plenty of people in Congress for whom the CBO report was no surprise, and some of them have proposed a solution that would confront this reality. Kent Conrad, the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, and Judd Gregg, its ranking Republican, have offered a bill to create a bipartisan commission to examine every aspect of the budget—taxes, defense and domestic spending, and, especially, Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. Congress would be required to vote promptly, up or down, on its recommendations, or come up with an alternative that would achieve at least as much in savings.

In the House, Democrat Jim Cooper of Tennessee and Republican Frank Wolf of Virginia have been pressing a similar proposal but have been regularly thwarted.

The roadblock in chief is Nancy Pelosi, the speaker of the House. She has made it clear that her main goal is to protect Social Security and Medicare from any significant reforms. Pelosi has not forgotten how Democrats benefited from the 2005-06 fight against Bush's effort to change Social Security. Her party, which had lost elections in 2000, 2002 and 2004, found its voice and its rallying cry to "Save Social Security," and Pelosi is not about to allow any bipartisan commission to take that issue away from her control.

The price for her obduracy is being paid in the rigging of the budget process. The larger price will be paid by your children and grandchildren, who will inherit a future-blighting mountain of debt.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 85 (H. Con. Res. 85). This resolution builds on the work of this Congress to put our economy back on track, addressing the current crisis and building for future needs.

A budget is more than just a document, it is a statement of our priorities. This is an especially important budget and comes as our nation faces a number of challenges in our struggling economy. Across the country, millions of families are facing foreclosure or have lost their jobs, savings, or access to health care. We have seen the failure of many of our financial institutions, and a lack of credit that is necessary for our small businesses to grow. In my own state of North Carolina, the unemployment rate has risen to a historic high of 10.7 percent.

This budget begins to reverse the Bush Administration's failed policies and restore America's economic strength. H. Con. Res. 85 invests in priorities like health care, education, and energy independence to create jobs and get our economy back on track. As the former Superintendent of Schools in North Carolina, I know that the best investment we can make is in our children. I am pleased that H. Con. Res. 85 strongly supports early learning, including the President's initiatives to help strengthen and expand early childhood education and school meals initiatives. This budget also makes college more affordable and accessible by increasing Pell grants and providing additional assistance to help more low-income high school graduates attend and complete college. Education is the key to economic growth, future success, and access to opportunity for our citizens.

The legacy left by the previous administration includes mounting debt and economic decline and we must return to a fiscally sustainable path. In addition to education, this budget makes investments in health care, energy independence, and other areas in a fiscally responsible way. This budget cuts the deficit in half over four years and bolsters PAYGO, the rule requiring Congress to find revenue to offset spending proposals. As a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am also pleased that this budget supports \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts for low and middle income families.

This Budget Resolution provides a strong blueprint for our economic future. I support H. Con. Res. 85, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to the majority's Budget Resolution.

CAP AND TRADE

The majority and President Obama's budget proposal calls for the passage of Cap and Trade legislation.

The President estimates that the auction associated with Cap and Trade will bring in more than \$640 billion.

The administration admitted that number would be more like \$1 trillion and possibly as high as \$2 trillion.

Cap and Trade is a regressive tax because those with less income spend more of their paychecks on energy.

This plan will raise taxes on an average family by \$1,600 annually.

Furthermore, if the United States acts without the support of China and India, Cap and Trade will only force more jobs out of the country.

Beyond the loss of jobs, Cap and Trade will tax every American for using energy.

SIZE OF DEFICITS/NATIONAL DEBT

If raising your taxes by \$1,600 a year wasn't enough; President Obama and the Democrat Majority's budget resolution will increase your share of the national debt by more than \$20,000 in four short years.

Today, every American's share of the National Debt is \$36,000.

By the end of President Obama's first term in office, the national debt will have exploded to \$54,000 per American.

This is a picture of my grandchildren. If you want to saddle your children and grandchildren with this type of debt then I would encourage you to vote for the majority's budget resolution.

If you do not, there is an alternative way forward. The Republican budget alternative taxes you less, spends less and borrows much less.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chair, I rise this morning to state my strong support for the budget resolution.

I'm excited to see that American working families will once again be prioritized.

It is a sight for sore eyes to see the President present an honest budget, putting an end to years of masking the costs of things we have to pay for, like the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This is good news for working and middle-class families who have been struggling to keep their heads above water. For far too long, these families have been bearing the brunt of misplaced priorities, above all, the ever-rising cost of healthcare.

Too many never see a doctor until they visit an emergency room. The cost to employers, local, state and the federal government is unsustainable.

It is shameful that while the United States spends more than every other nation in the world on health care, we fail to care for everyone.

This budget makes a down payment on health care reform, invests in working families, and sets America on a fundamentally new course. I urge my colleagues to support this critical investment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chair, adequate investment in our transportation and other public infrastructure is the foundation for future economic growth, and in these troubled times, it is needed more than ever.

The Budget Resolution before us today recognizes the importance of infrastructure investment—investment that will not only jumpstart our economy now, but continue to pay dividends for many years into the future.

The Resolution provides a solid foundation for the surface transportation authorization act that must be completed this year. If the Resolution is applied over the six-year period from fiscal year 2010 through fiscal year 2015, it provides a base allocation of \$324 billion for highway, highway safety, and transit programs. Importantly, this allocation restores \$82 billion of highway contract authority that had been eliminated from the baseline because of FY 2009 rescissions that the baseline assumed to recur in all future years.

As a point of comparison, the budget resolution proposed by the Senate Committee on the Budget does not restore this \$82 billion of highway contract authority. I will insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a state-by-state chart comparing the FY 2010 highway contract authority apportionments under the House and Senate budget resolutions (assuming the current law programs and formulas), to illustrate how devastating the Senate proposal would be for many States.

In addition, the House Budget Resolution establishes a Reserve Fund to allow the base allocation of \$324 billion to be adjusted upward as necessary to accommodate higher funding levels to the extent they can be supported by the Highway Trust Fund. This Reserve Fund provides the flexibility necessary to accommodate surface transportation authorization legislation as it is developed and shaped by Congress this year.

For the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), the Resolution provides the full amounts authorized by H.R. 915, the "FAA Reauthorization Act of 2009", as ordered reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on March 5, 2009. Specifically, the Resolution allocates \$4.0 billion for AIP in FY 2010, increasing to \$4.1 billion in FY 2011, and \$4.2 billion in FY 2012. This funding will allow the AIP program to keep pace with inflationary cost increases, and begin to address the investment gap in airport safety and capacity needs.

For passenger rail, the Resolution accommodates the President's proposal for a new Federal commitment to high-speed rail transportation by increasing investment to \$1 billion in FY 2010. Building on the \$8 billion for high-speed rail provided in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, this additional funding will lead to the creation of several high-speed rail corridors across the country linking regional population centers.

For environmental infrastructure, the Resolution assumes \$2.4 billion for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program in FY 2010, consistent with the President's budget and H.R. 1262, the "Water Quality Investment Act of 2009", as passed by the House on March 12, 2009. I welcome and strongly support the President's proposal to significantly increase Federal support for restoring and maintaining the nation's water quality. It is indeed a refreshing change from the previous eight years, which saw some of the lowest funding levels requested by any administration since the creation of this program.

Finally, the Resolution rejects the Office of Management and Budget's proposal to change how programs funded by contract authority are treated for budget scoring purposes. This proposal, had it been adopted, would have converted the mandatory contract authority that currently funds our highway, highway safety, transit and airport grant programs to a simple

authorization of appropriations for budget scoring purposes. I am pleased that the Resolution continues to recognize the unique nature of

trust-funded programs by rejecting this misguided proposal.

I thank Chairman SPRATT and the Committee on the Budget for their strong support

for transportation and infrastructure programs, and I urge my colleagues to support the Resolution.

FY 2010 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY CONTRACT AUTHORITY COMPARISON OF HOUSE BUDGET RESOLUTION AND SENATE BUDGET RESOLUTION

State	House Budget Resolution (H. Con. Res. 85)	Senate Budget Resolution (S. Con. Res. 13)	Difference
Alabama	\$750,502,172	\$516,451,803	—\$234,050,368
Alaska	439,554,461	302,479,599	—137,074,861
Arizona	734,391,521	505,364,622	—229,026,899
Arkansas	491,318,142	338,095,044	—153,223,098
California	3,429,330,000	2,359,845,892	—1,069,484,108
Colorado	519,743,051	357,654,101	—162,088,950
Connecticut	488,622,768	335,995,383	—152,627,385
Delaware	163,152,846	112,271,703	—50,881,142
Dist. of Col.	145,767,381	100,307,258	—45,460,123
Florida	1,895,296,186	1,304,234,359	—591,061,827
Georgia	1,279,712,245	880,623,534	—399,088,711
Hawaii	166,547,342	114,523,644	—52,023,698
Idaho	285,381,912	196,383,095	—88,998,817
Illinois	1,296,279,966	892,020,673	—404,259,294
Indiana	951,906,101	655,046,481	—296,859,621
Iowa	451,070,541	310,397,616	—140,672,924
Kansas	376,911,793	259,176,473	—117,735,320
Kentucky	652,507,863	449,017,053	—203,490,810
Louisiana	657,198,643	452,242,292	—204,956,351
Maine	174,639,887	120,551,562	—54,088,325
Maryland	596,761,038	410,652,679	—186,108,360
Massachusetts	604,230,800	415,488,222	—188,742,578
Michigan	1,037,618,157	713,504,389	—324,113,768
Minnesota	625,566,887	430,476,787	—195,090,100
Mississippi	466,071,827	320,721,163	—145,350,663
Missouri	889,273,176	611,943,309	—277,329,867
Montana	366,277,284	252,050,954	—114,226,329
Nebraska	286,487,562	197,142,114	—89,345,448
Nevada	311,525,651	214,373,365	—97,152,286
New Hampshire	166,488,270	114,483,223	—52,005,047
New Jersey	972,008,432	668,876,265	—303,132,167
New Mexico	364,249,524	250,653,966	—113,595,557
New York	1,660,321,081	1,141,694,643	—518,626,438
North Carolina	1,039,925,752	715,614,469	—324,311,283
North Dakota	241,653,208	166,290,394	—75,362,815
Ohio	1,321,137,088	909,125,872	—412,011,216
Oklahoma	570,787,695	392,779,712	—178,007,984
Oregon	456,610,251	314,209,806	—142,400,446
Pennsylvania	1,623,581,576	1,116,433,610	—507,147,966
Rhode Island	193,230,364	135,659,996	—57,570,368
South Carolina	620,987,972	427,326,829	—193,661,143
South Dakota	268,773,569	184,953,497	—83,820,072
Tennessee	824,732,715	567,531,810	—257,200,905
Texas	3,168,619,579	2,180,458,508	—988,161,071
Utah	313,958,483	216,047,035	—97,911,448
Vermont	168,547,458	115,983,429	—52,564,030
Virginia	976,733,110	672,128,732	—304,604,378
Washington	633,569,542	435,980,466	—197,589,075
West Virginia	416,728,500	286,769,231	—129,959,270
Wisconsin	734,296,976	505,300,612	—228,996,364
Wyoming	257,349,706	177,091,532	—80,258,174
TOTAL	37,527,938,057	25,824,428,808	—11,703,509,249

* This table is based on Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) technical assistance, and illustrates the estimated distribution of FY 2010 contract authority under the House and Senate budget resolutions (assuming current law programs and formulas). To have sufficient funds to meet all criteria of the Equity Bonus calculation, as in effect in FY 2009, an estimated \$39 billion in contract authority would be required for apportioned programs. To perform the calculations with the amounts provided by the House and Senate budget resolutions, FHWA altered the funding floor element of the Equity Bonus calculation by lowering the 121 percent floor that is in effect for FY 2009 to 117.5 percent for the House resolution, and 80.8 percent for the Senate resolution.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chair, I rise to voice my concern over this proposed budget. As many of my colleagues have said, it taxes too much, borrows too much and spends too much.

And it will raise taxes during a recession when we shouldn't even be discussing tax hikes. Why do they want to raise taxes? Not to pay down the deficit but instead to fund another massive expansion of government. This plan, as proposed by the Administration, would place an immense burden on middle-class families.

They want to raise taxes on homeowners by limiting the mortgage tax interest rate deduction. We're facing a wave of foreclosures and should be encouraging responsible homeownership. Instead, this tax will discourage homeownership and further weaken the economy by delaying housing recovery efforts.

The proposal also furthers the Administration's plan to raise taxes on charitable contributions, discouraging Americans from donating to charities and nonprofits. This comes at a time when these organizations are needed most by struggling families. We should be encouraging Americans to help one another, not the opposite.

Madam Chair, the budget also paves the way for higher taxes on small businesses by reversing cuts to the death tax, punishing thrift, discouraging entrepreneurship and devastating family-owned small businesses.

This is certainly change, and not for the better.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Chair, one of the most momentous votes I have cast as a Member of Congress occurred in my first year of service. It was a vote for President Clinton's budget, which made some difficult choices—among them, cutting spending and raising taxes to balance the federal budget. While controversial, I knew the Clinton budget charted the best course for the U.S. economy over the long run.

It came as no surprise, but my support for the Clinton budget became the primary issue in my first reelection campaign, which I won by only a whisker. Many of my colleagues were not so fortunate.

Today, the country is again in a perilous economic position—much more so than in 1993. And a new President is again outlining an ambitious economic agenda that could transform American society.

As in 1993, I intend to support the budget. President Obama inherited an economy and

federal balance sheet in total disarray. He has made the difficult decision to prioritize long-delayed investments in health care reform, clean energy, and education, and to pay for them with responsible reversals of Bush Tax cuts for the most fortunate among us. I believe he has done so in an honest manner by, among other things, putting the costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan on budget for the first time.

The budget isn't perfect—no budget is. I would prefer more deficit reduction in its out years. But the President has his priorities right, and is making the investments that this nation has put off for too long. This Congress should support him and pass this budget.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, as the House of Representatives begins to consider the President's Fiscal Year 2010 Budget, I would like to highlight a number of priorities. First, I would like to begin by saying President Obama has inherited an extensive deficit from the previous administration—the result of mistaken policies, misplaced priorities and an era of profound irresponsibility. This was no April Fools joke. Our budget deficit is a real problem with real consequences for the American people.

For too long, we have ignored the tough choices we needed to make and failed to address the big challenges our economy faces.

This lack of responsibility has left our nation with an economy in recession and an untenable fiscal situation—\$1 trillion a year deficits on average over the coming decade.

The FY2010 budget submitted by the President is up front and honest about the challenges we face. Unlike the previous administration which assumed revenue from the Alternative Minimum Tax overwhelming the middle class and not accounting for the Medicare doctor's fee fix and the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, there are no budget gimmicks in President Obama's budget to cover up the mess we're in.

I urge the President to include funding for summer jobs for youth. Our youth, and individuals that have opted not to go to college or institutions of higher learning, need to be engaged and employed. Employment will provide them with skills and aptitudes that are necessary to be productive in society. I urge funding for our youth.

I support the President's call for healthcare reform. I urge the Budget Committee to account for the cost of healthcare reform to ensure that the 45 million uninsured Americans (four million of which are children) have access to quality and affordable healthcare.

In addition, I urge the Committee to account for the following:

Funding the Minority AIDS Initiative at \$610 million this year (an increase of nearly \$200 million) to build capacity among minority run non-governmental organizations and to conduct outreach services among minority communities.

Funding the Ryan White CARE Act at \$2.8 billion this year (an increase of \$578 million) to support care and treatment programs at the local level to address the needs of people living with HIV/AIDS.

Funding the CDC Prevention activities for HIV, STD, TB and Viral Hepatitis at \$2.28 billion (an increase of nearly \$1.2 billion) to fund testing initiatives and support innovative prevention efforts at the local level.

Funding for Housing for people living with HIV/AIDS (HOPWA) at \$360 million (an increase of \$50 million) to provide supportive housing for people with AIDS.

Zeroing out funding for ineffective abstinence only until marriage programs to recover \$99 million in funding. These programs have been proven to be ineffective.

Funding for comprehensive sex education programs that will be authorized by the REAL Act with at least \$50 million this year to reduce spread of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases and reduce unintended pregnancies.

A \$200 million increase in funding for the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities at NIH.

Reserve funding (\$3.5 billion) for the Health Equity and Accountability Act (not yet enacted).

I commend the President for requesting an increase of \$15 billion for the Department of State and other international programs in FY2010, which is a 40% increase over the FY2009 level. I urge the Budget Committee to include this increase in the budget resolution. I am hopeful that these additional funds will go towards the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; USAID; migration and ref-

ugee assistance; peacekeeping efforts in Darfur; education, healthcare and cultural exchange programs; child survival and health programs; and development assistance.

As the President begins to withdraw troops from Iraq, I also urge the Budget Committee to account for the need to increase Iraqi humanitarian assistance by \$1.17 billion in FY2010.

I support the robust funding for our troops and America's national defense. I support reducing funding for the failed Ballistic Missile Defense program and reallocating those funds within the Defense Department to fund increases in shipbuilding, troop readiness, military and civilian pay, cancer research, and mental health services.

I have consistently fought for funding to weed out waste, fraud and abuse within the Department of Defense. The Defense Department has already saved an estimated \$89 billion between FY01 and FY07 by implementing 1,682 of the Government Accountability Office's recommendations. President Obama's FY2010 Budget Overview reflects a similar commitment, as has the House Budget Committee under Chairman Spratt's leadership.

As the economy continues to worsen, I urge the Budget Committee to account for the increased need for income security programs, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Unemployment Insurance, Medicaid, and the Recovery Act's COBRA subsidy.

I urge the President to consider including the necessary budget authority to account for the cost of increasing the federal minimum wage and indexing it to inflation. In addition, the Committee should consider the cost of reforming current asset tests for economic assistance. As more and more Americans lose their jobs, it makes little sense to force families to drain their savings to the extent necessary to qualify for certain temporary economic assistance programs.

Finally, the President should also consider the cost of redefining the Federal Poverty Level, which is currently \$22,050 for a family of four (100%). I urge the creation of a Decent Living Standard Threshold to determine the amount of annual income that would allow an individual to live beyond deprivation at a safe and decent, but modest, standard of living.

The housing crisis lies at the center of the economic problems we face today. After the series of TARP bills, the Congress has just found out that bank executives have used over \$100 million in TARP funds to pay for executive bonuses and other forms of compensation. I urge the President to reverse eight years of underfunding of the nation's affordable housing programs and we are pleased that the Administration has proposed a HUD budget that increases funding for the Department by 19 percent. I urge the President to match this aggressive budget authorization and to support large investments into the Community and Regional Development and the Income Security functions in order to account for increases in Affordable Housing programs.

Specifically, the President should consider including the necessary budget authority to fund the Section 8 public housing operating subsidy at 100% of need. In addition, the President must also consider providing sufficient budget authority for the renewal of all Section 8 vouchers currently in use.

Although the public housing capital fund received an injection of \$4 billion in the recent

stimulus package, this only represents 12.5 percent of the estimated \$32 billion backlog in deferred capital needs. The President should include sufficient budget authority to allow housing authorities to address ongoing and deferred maintenance needs.

In addition, I urge the President to support the Administration's proposal to fund the National Affordable Housing Trust Fund at \$1 billion and to fully fund the Community Development Block Grant program. I also urge full funding of HUD's housing programs for the elderly, disabled, and Native Americans, as well as for those programs that prevent homelessness. I support an increase in funding for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, which allows states, localities, and nonprofits to buy up and rehabilitate abandoned and foreclosed properties.

I urge the President to account for funding efforts to combat and reduce juvenile crime and efforts to rehabilitate ex-offenders. I strenuously urge the full funding of the Second Chance Act, which provides transitional assistance to assist ex-offenders in coping with the challenges of reentry. Removing barriers to reentry has proven to reduce recidivism, which in the long run reduces crime. In addition, the President should account for much needed increases in youth crime intervention programs. Research has shown that targeting funding towards intervention rather than incarceration is more effective at reducing crime and saving the taxpayer money in the long run.

I have long supported efforts to increase funding for the Justice Assistance Program, the Juvenile Justice Program, Civil Rights Enforcement, the COPS Program, the Byrne Justice Grant Program, and State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance. I urge the President to account for sustaining many of the important increases for these programs that was included in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

As the Chairwoman of the Children's Caucus, I support the President's efforts to reform and expand the Pell Grant program. Pell Grants are way to make education affordable to disadvantaged youth. This is very important to me.

I would like to see continued and sustained increases in education funding, especially for Title I and IDEA. Even though Congress is to consider the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act this year, the Budget Committee should still account for the need to address the substantial funding shortfalls of this program over the last eight years. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act made substantial increases, but I urge the President to account for sustaining many of these new investments.

The President must also account for needed increases in funding for Head Start, TRIO (including Upward Bound), GEAR UP, Youth Build, and vocational education programs. In addition, I urge the President to account for funding for expanded grants to states for workplace and community transition as authorized in the Higher Education Opportunity Act. These grants will better assist and encourage incarcerated individuals who have obtained a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent to acquire educational and job skills.

I urge this body to account for fully funding the historic increases in funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority

Serving Institutions authorized in the Higher Education Act reauthorization enacted last year.

I support the President's efforts at increasing spending for infrastructural projects. The President's priorities are reminiscent of the New Deal where this country invested in building up our Nation. The President has made a significant effort at achieving this by his signing of HR 1, the Stimulus Act.

In the Stimulus Act, the President authorized money to be spent on infrastructural projects that were shovel ready, i.e., ready to be started within 120 days. I know that America could use this money.

Indeed, Houston would benefit. Houston's Metro Rail needs to complete its RAIL service in certain quadrants of Houston. The project has been twenty years in the making. I have worked with Leadership and Chairman OBERSTAR to ensure that METRO Rail projects get the funding that they need to be completed.

Completion of this mobility project would decrease congestion and pollution as Houstonians would travel via rail instead of using their cars. This would increase Houston mobility and the health of Houstonians as they would be forced to walk around instead of using their private transport.

The House Budget Committee has shown a commitment to increased funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs. I commend the President's budget for including a \$25 billion above baseline increase for the VA over the next five years.

Other Priorities: Fully fund the Community Development Block Grant;

Increased funding for the Public Housing Capital Fund to continue to address eight years of stagnant funding under the Bush Administration; fully fund the Child Care and Development Block Grant; fully fund the Social Services Block Grant; increased funding for HOPE VI; fully fund the Neighborhood Stabilization Program; increased funding for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund; support for the creation of a National Infrastructure Bank; continued funding for Hurricane Katrina recovery and rebuilding efforts; increased funding for the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program; increased funding for the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom program at the National Park Service. This is important to me. I worked to get funding for urban parks in the Stimulus bill. This increases the health and overall well being of constituents. It is necessary in urban meccas like Houston.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 85) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 and 2011 through 2014, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPRATT. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 85.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 316 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 85.

□ 1329

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 85) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 and 2011 through 2014, with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 85

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009 and for fiscal years 2011 through 2014.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House.

Sec. 202. Reconciliation in the Senate.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 301. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care reform.

Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for college access, affordability, and completion.

Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence.

Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and servicemembers.

Sec. 305. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for certain tax relief.

Sec. 306. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for a 9/11 health program.

Sec. 307. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for child nutrition.

Sec. 308. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for structural unemployment insurance reforms.

Sec. 309. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for child support.

Sec. 310. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

Sec. 311. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for home visiting.

Sec. 312. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program trigger.

Sec. 313. Reserve fund for the Surface Transportation Reauthorization.

Sec. 314. Current policy reserve fund for Medicare improvements.

Sec. 315. Current policy reserve fund for middle class tax relief.

Sec. 316. Current policy reserve fund for reform of the alternative minimum tax (AMT).

Sec. 317. Current policy reserve fund for reform of the Estate and Gift Tax.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Adjustments for direct spending and revenues.

Sec. 402. Adjustments to discretionary spending limits.

Sec. 403. Point of order against advance appropriations.

Sec. 404. Oversight of Government performance.

Sec. 405. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.

Sec. 406. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 407. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.

Sec. 408. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE V—POLICY

Sec. 501. Policy on middle-class tax relief and revenues.

Sec. 502. Policy on defense priorities.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

Sec. 601. Sense of the House on veterans' and servicemembers' health care.

Sec. 602. Sense of the House on homeland security.

Sec. 603. Sense of the House on promoting American innovation and economic competitiveness.

Sec. 604. Sense of the House regarding pay parity.

Sec. 605. Sense of the House on college affordability.

Sec. 606. Sense of the House on Great Lakes restoration.

Sec. 607. Sense of the House regarding the importance of child support enforcement.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2014:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2009: \$1,532,571,000,000

Fiscal year 2010: \$1,659,525,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$1,933,072,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,190,099,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,361,429,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014: \$2,507,846,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows: