

much more manageable. That is, if we have a plan, it will be manageable. We cannot simply leave it to some open-ended plan. And so what we have proposed here is a plan that will systematically, methodically move the deficit down, down, down by \$1 trillion over the next 4 to 5 fiscal years.

Now, it's a deficit reduction budget. No question about it. But it is not so committed to deficit reduction that it overlooks and postpones other priorities. For example, national defense will grow by 4 percent, a healthy growth rate that means national defense, including what is spent on supplementals for Iraq and Afghanistan, will be \$686 billion next year.

Veterans. Let's not forget our veterans. We appreciate them more than ever. We will be putting \$5 billion more into veterans health care, raising it to \$53 billion.

Health care reform. This budget tackles issues that other administrations have either ignored, dodged, avoided, or failed to implement. Health care reform. Tough nut to crack, but it takes it on.

The environment. Energy independence, critically important. We've seen it with the spike in energy prices over the last year. This is something we need to do and do now. This bill provides for that.

Education. If you want to be able to say to a small child the next time you go in an elementary classroom, You can go to college. Yes, you can. You can go to college like anybody else. Yes, you can, then you should vote for this resolution because it strengthens Pell Grants by more than any bill we've passed in a long time to come.

So this is a deficit reduction bill, which is a bill with a conscience, with priorities, that carefully laid out here and carefully provided for here, and, therefore, I would submit that everyone interested in education, the environment, energy independence should take a close look at this bill.

Now, it's been said that we have substantially increased taxes in this bill. That's not true. Read CBO's report. Over the next 5 years, there is a net reduction in tax revenues of some \$480 billion and \$1 trillion more than that over the next 5 years after that. There is deficit reduction left here. The marital penalty provisions, the middle class, middle-income tax cuts that we passed in 2001 and 2003 are, for the most part, all reenacted and extended by this resolution.

So 233 Members, a very solid majority of the House, listened to the arguments pro and con, read and listened to the debate and decided this is a better way to go. I submit, let's stick with the course we set for ourselves several weeks ago. Let's send this budget on to conference where we can make it an enforceable piece of legislation.

I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

# MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 13, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to S. Con. Res. 13 be instructed, within the scope of the conference, to:

(1) Recede to the Senate on reconciliation instructions by striking title II of the House amendment which includes reconciliation instructions for health care reform to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means and a separate instruction to the Committee on Education and Labor, investing in education.

(2) Recede to the Senate on section 316 entitled "Point of order on legislation that eliminates the ability of Americans to keep their health plan or their choice of doctor" to provide for a point of order against any legislation that eliminates the ability of Americans to keep their health plan or their choice of doctor.

(3) Recede to the Senate on section 202(c) of the Senate resolution, providing that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may not adjust the allocations and aggregates of the concurrent resolution for climate change legislation that would decrease greenhouse gas emissions if such legislation is reported from a committee pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(4) Recede to the Senate on section 310 of the Senate resolution, setting forth a point of order against legislation that increases revenue above the levels established in the applicable budget resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Republicans offered the American people a budget that would not only fund our priorities but also support economic growth and job creation, get the Federal spending and debt under control and begin the critical reforms of our largest and least sustainable entitlement programs. And the Republicans budget did this all without the job-killing tax hikes that are required by the budget that we are here discussing today.

The budget we are here to discuss today, the Obama Democratic budget, exploits the current financial crisis to

rush through a sweeping expansion of the Federal Government. This motion to instruct aims at ensuring this budget resolution doesn't trigger a fast-track process, otherwise known as budget reconciliation, to jam through a government takeover of health care and education or a cap-and-trade tax that will hurt families, kill jobs, and put America at a severe competitive disadvantage with China and other countries.

As a background, the House-passed resolution includes reconciliation instructions for three committees, two of which, Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means, share jurisdiction over health care and cap-and-trade. These reconciliation instructions trigger fast-track procedures limiting debate and amendments on a subsequent reconciliation bill. In other words, it's a way for Congress to sweep this legislation through with very little debate, no amendments, get it into law without the public seeing what is happening.

In the House, reconciliation is much less important because the House has what we call the Rules Committee.

It is critical in the Senate, however, because there legislation can be jammed through with little debate or no amendments. The Senate does not want reconciliation. The Senate-passed budget resolution did not include reconciliation instructions. In fact, it included a number of protections against using reconciliation. This motion to instruct instructs the House conferees to recede to the Senate on four items.

Number one, drop reconciliation instructions from the resolution; number two, block legislation that eliminates Americans' ability to keep their health care plans or choose their own doctor; number three, adopt a Senate provision that keeps reconciliation from being used for cap-and-trade legislation; and, number four, adopt a Senate provision that would prevent taxes from being raised to even higher levels than those that are assumed in this budget resolution.

To reiterate, the Senate does not want reconciliation. This is what Senate Budget Committee chairman Senator CONRAD said yesterday about reconciliation: "Once you have unleashed reconciliation, you can't get it back in the barn. And it could be used for lots of different things that are completely unintended at this moment. People need to think about that very carefully."

Chairman CONRAD is not alone. Twenty-eight Senators wrote Chairman CONRAD urging him not to use reconciliation for cap-and-trade legislation because reconciliation fast-track procedures "would be inconsistent with the administration's stated goals of bipartisanship, cooperation, and openness."

Senator BYRD, the best author we have among us of the budget process, the author of the reconciliation process

said this: "Reconciliation is not designed to create a new climate and energy regime and certainly not to restructure our entire health care system. Woodrow Wilson once said that the informing function is the most important function of Congress. How do we inform? We publicly debate and amend legislation. We receive feedback which allows us to change and improve proposals. Matters that affect the lives and the livelihoods of our people must not be rushed through the Senate using a procedural fast track that the people never get a chance to comment upon or fully understand."

But even more important, Madam Speaker, Americans are concerned about all of the spending that's going on here in Washington. And we should not underestimate how well the people understand. Like just about everybody else, last week I held 25 listening sessions throughout the First Congressional District in Wisconsin. My district falls right in the middle among the political spectrum so it's a good microcosm of the attitudes across the country.

They are worried about this new gusher of spending. They are worried about the government taking over health care. They are worried about the increased cost of energy, the effect that it's going to have on our manufacturing jobs. And, in fact, at one of my town hall meetings, a woman in her mid-sixties came up to me and said, Is Congress going to use reconciliation to push through all of this government and health care reform legislation? I was floored by that. I don't think I have ever heard anybody outside the Beltway talk to me about reconciliation.

The American people are watching this process. The American people know what is happening. The American people want a say in this.

Why are we here? We are here to deliberate. We are the people's representatives. Should we take this largest proposal to increase the size and reach and scope of our government, the largest—in the words of the administration—since the New Deal and just sweep it through with almost no debates, with no amendments, stifling the voices of the people's representatives or not?

At the end of the day, we could confiscate about 25 percent of our economy, energy and health care together, with less than a hundred hours of debate and no amendments. It's baffling, it's mind-boggling that this could actually happen. This is not America, this is not the deliberative process, and this is not a process the Senate itself even wants.

So the question is if we're going to have debate about nationalizing the health care system in America, if we're going to have a debate about having a brand-new energy tax, if we're going to have a debate about tax increases and spending increases doubling and tripling our national debt, let's have that debate. Let's not just sweep the thing through.

Unfortunately, the philosophy that is at play here, Madam Speaker, is this—and it's a philosophy that we need to talk about. It's a philosophy that we need to debate. The philosophy behind this budget, with all of its class warfare, with all of its class accusation is basically they are telling the American people in the budget that your station in life is static and we're going to have to grow government to help you cope with it.

We reject that. That is not what America is about. That is not the ideal of this country. People are not stuck with their current station in life.

The goal of this country, the goal of our government is to help people become upwardly mobile; it is to give the people the tools that they need so they can seize the opportunity to make a better life for themselves. We need to protect people's rights to achieve their dreams, to get the opportunities to make the most of their lives and to seek happiness as they define it for themselves so long as it doesn't infringe on another person's right to do the same. That is the philosophy that has taken this country so far, that has made it the most prosperous Nation in the world, the envy of the world, and that is the philosophy that is being debated right here with this budget as to whether it should continue or not.

I think we should have more than just about 100 hours of debate on whether or not we trash this philosophy that brought our country this far. We should have amendments as to whether or not we're going to do all of this government. Do we want Europe, or do we want America? It should be more than a hundred hours of debates. We might want to consider an amendment or two to this philosophy.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

I think it would be useful for everybody, Members in particular, to understand exactly what the Republican motion to instruct is.

There are four items. First of all, they would effectively move to drop, discard the House reconciliation provisions that deal with health care. That's health care reform. That's our initiative we're launching to try to encompass and provide some form of health care to the 46 million Americans unfortunate enough not to have it. This would thwart our plans to move on that front. And education, which basically deals with Pell Grants and guarantees student loans trying to provide them to more students at lower costs, why would anybody want to thwart those objectives?

Secondly, they would remove reconciliation as a vehicle to enact climatic change. Well, that's not even envisioned in the House budget. Cap-and-trade is not mentioned, not in the budget resolution, not in the report accompanying it. It's not mentioned. We took it out. It is not specified.

The reconciliation instructions to which they refer go to the Energy and Commerce Committee and to the Education and Labor Committee and the Ways and Means Committee but not for purposes of dealing with climate change. That is not even briefed as one of the purposes. It's not part of the intention. These instructions go to health care and education.

□ 1415

Thirdly, to retain a Senate point of order against legislation that "eliminates the ability of Americans to keep their health plan or their choice of a doctor." I support that. You support that. We all support that. This budget supports it, the House supports it. It is totally unnecessary. This is creating a straw man and knocking it down by creating an argument as to facts that simply don't exist. We don't have anything in our legislation that would in any way impede the choice of Americans to keep their own health plans or choose their own doctor.

And finally, "to eliminate Congress' ability to develop comprehensive reform packages by restricting future offsets only to spending cuts." In other words, if we wanted to do something worthy, we think, of undertaking and we would propose to pay for it by raising taxes—let me give you an example, cigarette taxes and CHIP, Children's Health Insurance Program. We just passed the second iteration of the CHIP bill that will extend medical coverage to millions of children who never had it, never lived in families who could afford it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

We did that by increasing the taxes on a pack of cigarettes and other tobacco products, a fair tradeoff. But we were only able to do it and say that we were staying deficit neutral and well within the balance of the budget because we were able to use this offsetting revenue to cover the cost of the program. This particular amendment would have thwarted that particular strategy.

So these are four different items they are proposing now, none of which will stand muster. They should be defeated. This motion should be defeated.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his hard work that he has put forth in this budget. And hopefully one day soon we will have an opportunity to vote on the budget that the gentleman has put forward in a clear way.

I want to talk a little bit about what my friend from North Carolina talked about, about Debt Day. You know, it is

pretty interesting. I think we need to make this, Madam Speaker, so the American people can understand exactly what we are talking about when we are talking about tripling the debt over a 10-year period, doubling our deficit. I think we need to understand that in 1998, after 365 days we had a surplus, and this was during the Clinton administration. In 2002, it was not until the second of September that we actually started borrowing money. And if you can imagine, we were coming out of the 9/11. In 2003, it was the 29th of July before we started borrowing money. In 2004, it was the 27th of July before we actually started borrowing money. Madam Speaker, the people will realize this, we had spent by that date all the money we had, and then we started putting it on our credit card.

In 2005, it was August 14. In 2006, it was August 27. In 2007, it was September 9. In 2008, it was the 5th of August. This year it is the 26th of April. So the 26th of April, we will be finished spending the revenues that we have in, and now we are going to start putting everything on our credit card. So understand this, that with just that short of a period of time, we are out of cash.

We are spending way too much money. And I think that that is what the American people need to understand, that we are spending money that we don't have. We are spending money that is our children's. And I used to always say this, that we were putting our children in debt, the next generation. Now I have to include our grandchildren. We are putting our grandchildren in deep debt.

And so what are we doing? I keep listening to the opposition, the majority party talk about that this is something that we've got to do. And they keep talking about the Bush administration and the deficit spending. Two wrongs don't make a right. Let's do something for the American people. Let's have some fair, open, honest debate and make this to where we can have some amendments.

I represent approximately 750,000 people in Georgia's Third Congressional District, yet I am not able to offer any ideas that the people from my district may have about the budget and too much spending.

Madam Speaker, this is not the way to run a railroad. We need to do things to open up the process rather than to close the process. And we need to make sure that the people understand that we are spending our future.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank him for his really extraordinary leadership as we work our way through a very difficult process.

I want to speak first obviously in opposition to the motion to instruct, and I am going to focus primarily on the implications for that with respect to the Committee on Education and

Labor. But before I do, we should be clear; the argument that is made by our friends on the other side of the aisle is very much a situational argument. I do not recall in 2001 or in 2003 or in 2005, when the Republicans used reconciliation to push through policies that increased our deficit over 10 years by about \$1.8 trillion, I don't remember them saying that they needed to "jam this through," I don't remember them saying that they needed to "rush it through," I don't remember them characterizing it as "sweeping it through." They felt that they were passing legislation that was responsive to the American people. We feel we are passing legislation that is responsive to the interests of the American people.

Let me speak with specific reference to education. We intend to enact policies that will save \$47 billion over 5 years and allow us to use that money to help students and families, particularly needy students and families so that they can get their slice of the American Dream so that college attendance can be a realistic and realizable aspiration for them.

Who wants to argue against increasing the Pell Grant maximum? Who wants to argue against indexing that maximum to the rate of inflation plus 1 percent so that it preserves its buying power? I certainly don't, and I would hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle don't want to either.

I would hope that we can look at a low or moderate income student and say that you have every chance to have the same access to higher education as a student in the top 1 or 2 percent of our Nation's wealth. This budget resolution and the legislation that we will need to pass to put in place the legislative underpinning for these policies will allow us to do that.

And who doesn't want to save \$94 billion over 10 years, \$47 billion over 5 years by having the government take over a student loan program that they can run, that we can run every bit as efficiently, every bit as effectively as the privately run program now, and do it in a fashion that will be invisible to students, and do it, as I say, by saving taxpayer money to the tune of \$47 billion over 5 years and taking that money and putting it into the hands of needy students? That is a worthy aspiration. That is an aspiration that deserves the support of every person in this Chamber, and hopefully we will realize that.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, we have two different budgets before us. The Democratic budget, again, it spends too much—the largest budget in American history; taxes too much—national energy tax, tax on small business, tax on capital gains;

borrow too much—greatest amount of debt in our Nation's history. We are going to run up more debt in the next 10 years than in the previous 220. Budget deficit up tenfold in just 2 years under their watch. A crushing level of debt that I don't know if the next generation will ever recover.

It borrows too much, it spends too much, it taxes too much. And then, Madam Speaker, it gets worse from there. It gets worse from there. This thing called reconciliation, kind of this inside-the-beltway term of art, is really nothing more than a budget sleight of hand that will facilitate cramming through policies that need to be debated on this House floor and in the Senate under regular order.

The Senate itself, Madam Speaker, apparently doesn't want this in the budget. Again, Senator CONRAD, the Democratic Budget Committee chairman, has said, "Once you've unleashed reconciliation you can't get it back in the barn. It could be used for a lot of different things that are completely unintended at this moment." That's the Democratic budget chairman. Senator BYRD—frankly, the author of reconciliation—said, "not designed to create a new climate in energy regime, and certainly not to restructure our entire health care system."

I mean, reconciliation means that the American people are going to have to reconcile themselves to a new national energy tax imposed by the Democratic majority through this budget sleight of hand. It means that the American people are going to have to reconcile themselves to more job loss as American small businesses are taxed even more and have to lay off even more workers. It means that the American people are going to have to reconcile themselves to rationed health care with a Federal Government bureaucrat helping choose their health care provider and whether or not they even receive the health care that they desire. That's what reconciliation in this context means.

Now, it was meant for something different. And it has been used on a bipartisan basis to actually save jobs, to actually save hope, actually save the future of the American people and be used for budget savings. It is being used for a completely different purpose. And if these ideas of the Democratic majority are so meritorious, then why can't they be debated in regular order? That's what I question. Why use this budget sleight of hand? We need to reject that and accept this motion.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. I thank my friend, the chairman, Mr. SPRATT.

Madam Speaker, I am always intrigued by the rhetoric that comes when we start talking about budgets. And I am so grateful for a gentleman like Mr. SPRATT who is not a rhetorical person, but he is a person who wants to

practically get things done and get a budget that makes sense for the American people and how we collect and spend and do our government functions.

Madam Speaker, a budget is supposed to be a roadmap that shows where you are going, how you are going to get there, what your priorities are, how you are going to pay for those priorities. Unfortunately, over the last 8 years, under the leadership of the previous administration and the other party, we didn't have that. A budget was used as a sort of rhetorical tool to say we are going to balance the budget, but then they would come back a day later and say, well, we have got all this emergency stuff that we didn't put in the budget, but we knew all along we needed to do.

For the first time in 8 years you have before you an honest document, which is an honest roadmap that explains our situation and lays out an avenue to get to a better place. Now, honestly, it's not a pretty picture, but it is an honest picture. We haven't had an honest picture in 8 years. It is an ugly picture when it comes to the numbers. But the numbers are honest, and it lays out a roadmap to get us out of this economic mess that President Obama has inherited. I am proud of Mr. SPRATT and the work that he has done, and the House of Representatives, and their work in passing this budget.

Now, what does that roadmap say and what does it do? It says, first of all, we are in an economic mess; revenue collections are going to be down, economic activity is down, we all know about that. That wasn't the fault of this sitting President; he inherited that mess. But what it does is say, these are the problems that exist and have to be resolved for us to come to a better place.

President Obama believes strongly in a couple of things, and we are trying to outline how we deal with those things in this budget.

□ 1430

Number one is he thinks that you can't really fix the economic mess until you deal with the health care issue. Health care accessibility is a problem in this Nation when you have 48 or 50 million people who cannot access the health care system, and it's also a problem in that costs are rising at the rate of 3 to 5 percent above inflation. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that doesn't work too long.

It only carries us deeper into the economic mess. So he says we got to deal with that problem, and this budget lays out that avenue, that blueprint to deal with that problem.

Secondly, and this is another important factor relative to how we got into this economic mess, and that is the energy crisis, the energy situation. When you got a run up in the cost of oil to \$145 a barrel when it traditionally had been below \$30, that was one of the

catalysts that took us into this economic collapse. And we have known for a long time as a Nation that we had to deal with this energy crisis, climate change, energy, all sort of interconnected.

So this budget also lays out an avenue or a roadmap to get to this energy legislation. It doesn't go into details. The President hasn't even talked too much about details. He wants to leave that to Congress.

I do know one thing. To solve those two problems, Madam Speaker, it has to be a bipartisan work. Madam Speaker, Mr. RYAN knows that every major piece of legislation that has ever come out of this Congress to be effective must be bipartisan. We need bipartisan cooperation and support. We need constructive ideas.

We, as a minority, need to be inclusive, but the majority party, when it comes to the table, needs to be constructive and not obstructive. And I think that's what we, as Blue Dogs, who consider ourselves the most fiscally conservative, constructive folks in the Congress, 51 of us—and I serve, have been a part of that group for a long time—we would like to work with the people on the other side of the aisle in a constructive manner. But up to this point our attempts have been thwarted.

So we again thrust out that olive branch to work on both sides of the aisle to solve these problems. You can't get out of this economic mess without dealing with the health care problems and the energy crisis that we have in this Nation.

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

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

Mr. BOYD. So in that process the President believes in health care reform, he believes in energy reform, he believes in education reform, and, fourthly and most importantly, fiscal responsibility.

As the folks, Mr. RYAN and others have said consistently, we have to get back to being fiscally responsible. It's something we completely threw out the window over the past 8 years. We have to go back to a path that leads us down to a balanced budget.

Can't get there overnight, but this budget developed by Mr. SPRATT, which we would like to get in a conference mode, will do that. And I want to be a part of that.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The gentleman from Florida, I agree with much of what he said. He and I are friends. We both love turkey hunting. We have a lot in common.

And the gentleman was right when he said that they are using honest numbers. They are being candid with their numbers, that's correct.

The Congressional Budget Office is showing that this budget resolution doubles our publicly held debt in 5½ years and triples it in 10½ years. This

budget resolution raises taxes on the American people by \$1.5 trillion, the largest tax increase in American history. This budget resolution brings the size of our government to levels we haven't seen since 1945 at the end of World War II.

And the gentleman is right where he says to get big things done we ought to do it with bipartisanship. All the more reason, Madam Speaker, why we should not have reconciliation.

What is reconciliation? It's a method by which the majority can fast track legislation through to law without any participation from the minority.

In order to have bipartisanship, you have to have collaboration. Both sides of the aisle sit down, hammer out compromises, work together to pass legislation.

That is not what reconciliation is being used for here. Reconciliation is saying one-party rule, one party can do it all.

In the Senate, no filibuster, 50 votes plus one can get it through, no amendments, 100 hours of debate, done. No involvement from the minority party. It is the prerogative of the majority party to do that.

The majority party has the power and they can do it. And apparently they are not supportive of this motion to instruct to make sure that that reconciliation doesn't occur, to make sure that we agree with the Senate, with the majority party and the Senate that we don't do reconciliation.

Unfortunately, I think the truth of this matter is being revealed here today. And where we are seeing this majority in the House is basically saying no, we are not going to follow the Democrats in the Senate. We are not going to have a bipartisan procedure. We are going to ram this stuff through with reconciliation.

Mr. BOYD. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BOYD. You make a fair point, but I would remind the gentleman again that reconciliation is probably being insisted upon because of the obstructive nature, the "just say no" nature of the minority party.

And what we would like to see is some constructive engagement in the process about how we solve some of these problems.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, and I believe the gentleman from Florida is very sincere on what he says in that, and I believe he is true to that.

I would like to insert into the RECORD a question and answer I had with the chief counsel of the Budget Committee and the majority staff during our markup where the majority counsel said that if, in fact, reconciliation instructions do go to the Commerce Committee—which they do in this budget reconciliation—nothing stops that from going toward cap-and-trade legislation.

MARKUP OF THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2009

The Committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:40 a.m., in Room 210, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. John M. Spratt, Jr. [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Spratt, Schwartz, Kaptur, Becerra, Doggett, Blumenauer, Berry, Boyd, McGovern, Tsongas, Etheridge, McCollum, Melancon, Yarmuth, Andrews, DeLauro, Edwards, Scott, Langevin, Larsen, Bishop, Moore, Connolly, Schrader, Ryan, Hensarling, Garrett, Diaz-Balart, Simpson, McHenry, Mack, Conaway, Campbell, Jordan, Nunes, Aderholt, Lummis, Austria, Harper.

Chairman SPRATT. For simplicity, just simply address your question to the staffers at this time.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I will begin. I do not know if we are going to take a lot of their time because we realize we have a lot of amendments. It is going to be a long day and we want to get to it. And we have had a good chance to pore through this budget.

I do have a question, I guess for you, Ms. Millar (Gail Millar, majority staff General Counsel), on reconciliation. The Chairman's mark includes reconciliation instructions of three Committees, to each produce one billion in deficit reduction over the six-year period from 2009 through 2014, to the Ways and Means, the Energy and Commerce, and the Education and Labor Committees, under the subsection including healthcare and investing in education.

Here is my basic question. Am I correct that the only binding aspect of these instructions is that each of the Committees are directed to produce \$1 billion in deficit reduction in their jurisdiction?

Ms. MILLAR. That is correct.

Mr. RYAN. And so while the Budget Committee can make assumptions about policies, education, healthcare, energy, we cannot bind these Committees to certain policies? It is up to those Committees to determine what policies are within those instructions and they simply have to meet that goal of achieving one billion in deficit reduction; is that correct?

Ms. MILLAR. That is correct, sir.

Mr. RYAN. Okay. So serving on Ways and Means, that is how we always interpreted it. I just want to make sure that the reconciliation discussion we are having here is consistent with what it has always been in the past which is these Committees are free to do what they choose to do, they have just got to meet that \$1 billion number?

Ms. MILLAR. That is correct.

Mr. RYAN. All right. Thank you. That is really all I have.

So let's be very clear here. Reconciling to the Commerce Committee—

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

It means the Commerce Committee can choose to put in that reconciliation package anything within its jurisdiction, cap-and-trade, health care, whatever the case may be.

The point is this, reconciliation in the past has been used to reduce government, to reduce taxes, to reduce spending, to contain the growth of entitlement programs. That's not what it's being used here today.

Reconciliation is being used here today in a new and unique way to dramatically increase the size and cost of government, to dramatically increase

the level of taxation, to dramatically increase the liabilities upon future generations.

That's not its intent. Don't listen to me, listen to Senator BYRD, one of the Democrat leaders who helped write the law in the first place. Listen to Senator CONRAD, the chairman of the Budget Committee, who is saying this is not what reconciliation was ever intended to be used for.

Please, we are simply saying join us in agreeing with the Democrats in the Senate to not have reconciliation, so that we can have the people's representatives speak their mind so we can really truly have a collaborative process, have amendments, have open debate. That's why we are trying to do this.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I thank the chairman again for his extraordinary work as Chair of the Budget Committee.

Let's be clear what we are talking about here. I mean, a lot of us, I think, to those who might be listening don't really quite understand what a motion to instruct is and what reconciliation language is.

Simply put, what we have before us is a decision. Are we going to tackle health care reform, energy independence and an educated repaired workforce in the next year. We are going to make significant progress. The budget allows us to do that.

There is no question that we would like to see it done in a bipartisan way. The budget sets out language that says let's work on this in a bipartisan way. It sets us even out till September, gives us most of the time to do that.

And all we hear from the other side is, no, let's not do this. Let's not do anything about the high cost of health care for American families, the high cost of health care for our businesses, the fact that it affects our economy and job growth.

We have all heard from businesses that say I would hire another employee, a small businesswoman said to me, but I can't afford to pay for their health benefits. Story after story of families that can't pay for needed health care.

We know it is time to find a truly American solution to containing costs, improving access to health care for all Americans. It has long been a moral imperative. It is now an economic imperative as well for our Nation's people and our Nation's businesses.

Let me say what we hear from the other side is just let's not do it. Let's not do it. They would rather discuss process. And instead of debating the issue, which we could do, they are busy discussing process.

We heard over and over again—and let's read the language in the reserve fund. It's revenue neutral. We are going to find the money to do this.

We are going to debate this. Our committees are holding hearings, we are talking to our constituents.

It is time for us to finally set out the path to do this. Let's be clear. In the first 8 weeks of this administration, we did more on health care than the prior 8 years before, and I am proud of what we have done.

We had little cooperation from the other side to get it done in spite of our President and our leadership and many of us reaching out to the other side.

What did we do? We made sure that 11 million children of working families, whose parents simply cannot afford or have access to health care coverage, have health care coverage for their children, 11 million American children.

I think that's great. We should make sure that every child in this country has access to health care coverage, and we can.

We moved ahead on funding for NIH, for health information technology, to do stem cell research, to find the cures and the treatments that all of us know family members need for their future. We made sure that those who are recently unemployed, who can't afford health care coverage, get a subsidy the next 9 months, the first time we have ever done that.

It is clear that we have before us a choice. Do we actually tackle the health care costs for Americans, do we tackle it for economic competitiveness. This is the decision we are making. We say we should move forward.

The other side is simply saying "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This budget that we are considering steals our grandchildren's future. We are spending too much, we are taxing too much, we are borrowing too much, and it has to stop.

My dear friend, Mr. BOYD from Florida, said we have to be fiscally responsible as a Nation, and I could not agree more. But this budget is being forced down the throats of the American people. It's a steamroll of socialism being shoved down the throats of the American people, and it's going to strangle the American economy. It's going to slay the American people, choke them to death economically, and we have got to stop it.

The majority is using this reconciliation in a dictatorial manner to try to force their philosophy of big government, of socialist government, of total control of everything.

I am a medical doctor, and the health care issues that we hear, the speaker just prior to me, was talking about offering health insurance to 11 million children. I want to see everybody in this country have health care provided to them.

In fact, they can today, but the health care policies that are being fostered by the Democratic majority are

going to destroy the health care system. The cost is going to be enormous. The quality of care is going to go down. We are going to have tremendous rationing of health care all over this country.

It's going to take the decisionmaking process out of the hands of doctors and patients, and it's going to put it in the hands of Federal bureaucrats who have no medical training, and it's morally wrong. We have got to stop this.

I rise today in objection to this Democratic process and to this Democratic budget, a budget proposed by the administration that is going to destroy our economy.

We have got to stop this steamrolling. We have got to put up speed bumps and stop signs. This steamroll is going to roll over doctors and patients, and it's going to smash them, and it's going to destroy the health care industry.

It's going to force through the cap-and-tax policies of this administration. And this Democratic majority is proposing it is going to send jobs overseas. It's going to markedly increase the costs of all goods and services in America, food, drugs. Every single good and service in America is going to go up because of the policy that's being forced down the throats of the American people.

The American people need to rise up and say "no" to this budget, to this process. It's totally wrong. We are stealing our grandchildren's and our children's future.

We have got to stop this. We need to be fiscally responsible. The Bush administration was not—but this markedly forces things down the throats of the American people, and we must stop it.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 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 Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Several million Americans have lost their jobs since the fall. We are saying let's get to work to try to fix that problem.

The minority is saying no, not now, not this way. Wages have gone up only one-third as fast as health care costs have gone up for the typical American family in the last decade or so. And we are saying let's get to work together to fix that problem and, in the process, let's say to people who are working in convenience stores and gas stations and mowing lawns and store clerks, that they have to have health insurance too for themselves and their children.

□ 1445

We are saying let's get to work on that. The minority is saying no, not now, not this way.

We all suffered the ravages of \$4-a-gallon gasoline last summer. It will

probably go back up again because we are so addicted to imported energy from overseas. We're saying let's get to work on solving that problem, on building windmills and hydrogen engines and solar farms and other ideas. The minority is saying no, not now, not this way.

There are American families whose sons or daughters are going to come home from school today and receive the thick envelope that says they got into the college they've always wanted to go to. And the parents are going to have to say no, not now, not this way because we can't afford the cost of a college education. We say let's get to work on solving that problem by moving \$94 billion away from corporate welfare to student financial aid. Let's get to work on that. The minority says no, not now, not this way.

This is a choice between "yes" and "no." It's a choice between optimism and pessimism. It's a choice between working on the country's problems and just watching them metastasize. We can do so much better. We should do it together. But we should do it.

So I would urge a vote against this motion to instruct. I would urge that we work with the other body and get started on this budget and get started on solving these problems.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. SPRATT, for the courtesy in permitting me to speak on this, and thank you for your leadership, providing to the House of Representatives a budget blueprint that was reflective of the challenge that President Obama laid before us all a scant 3 months ago in his first State of the Union speech.

The budget outline we have before us is an opportunity to do something constructive for those who want to legislate. There are some that say some Members of the House shouldn't be legislators; they should just be communicators, throwing up speed bumps and ignoring the reality of the problem that we face that the President inherited from a former dysfunctional administration that was enabled by my Republican friends when they were in charge: massive budget deficits, serious problems hollowing out the economy, a housing bubble that burst, problems overseas, and ignoring climate change not just in this country but global leadership. What we have seen in 3 short months is an opportunity in this Congress to do something about it.

There is a positive choice that is brought forth in the budget resolution that would be undercut by the motion to instruct to give almost \$100 billion over the next 10 years to students instead of bankers, to students instead of bankers. In States like mine with an unemployment rate of over 12 percent, and I know my colleague and friend

from South Carolina has a high unemployment rate, we have a chance to help students and their families that are struggling, putting more money in their pockets, not into the pockets of bankers. This budget resolution gives us more leverage to deliver on that promise. It is a blueprint to work with the President and the legislators here who want to legislate, not just talk, to provide alternative choices to American families dealing with health care.

Already in the first 100 days of the President, we have acted to extend health care to 11 million children across the United States. We have dealt in the economic recovery package with bridge financing to help them keep their health insurance if they are laid off. These are things that are part of a constructive program that's available to all who take seriously their responsibilities to roll up their sleeves and legislate.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate that.

Madam Speaker, there is a concern that is talked about time and time again about reconciliation instructions dealing with climate change. I'm one of the people that would like to have strengthened the hand of the House of Representatives in this vital debate on the future of the planet and the health of our economy to give more leverage to deal with carbon pollution and to put more green jobs into the economy and money in the hands of consumers, not utilities that are polluting. But that's not there.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to reject this motion as they rejected an ill-considered 5-year freeze on some of the most important spending on behalf of our constituents that the Republicans offered up. We rejected that, wisely, and I'm pleased that many Republicans voted against it because it was so ill considered and draconian. It is time to reject this motion and get to work.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Let me see if I can go at it in a different direction.

Under reconciliation, the total debate on the reconciliation bill here, 4 hours on a bill, 1 hour on a conference report. In the Senate, 20 hours on a bill, 10 hours on a conference report. That means total debate on reconciliation in Congress, 35 hours. Let's assume that they break up the bill into three reconciliation vehicles, as could be the case with this, 105 total hours, total hours, of debate between the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

Wow, 105 total hours of debate in this Congress to determine the largest and the most sweeping transformation of our Federal Government we have not seen since the New Deal. These aren't my words. These are words from the



administration who claimed that that's the ambition of this budget.

We are being presented with a new budget with such awesome ambition, with such an enormous increase in spending, taxing, and borrowing, a virtual takeover of 25 percent of our economy in just the health care and energy sectors alone, the largest tax increase we have seen ever in the history of this country, the largest debt increase proposed under this Presidency than all prior Presidencies combined, all rushed through with a simple majority vote in as little as 35 hours and no more than 105 hours of debate. Is that democracy? No. Is that what reconciliation was meant to be? No.

Reconciliation, the spirit and the idea behind it, was to get our fiscal house in order, was to get spending and borrowing under control, not out of control.

Unfortunately, this rule is being twisted, contorted, distorted to achieve these ends as quickly as possible to ramrod it through Congress without giving many voices to it, without having any bipartisan collaboration, and just moving through the gauntlet.

This is the problem with this, Madam Speaker, which is when the American people voted for change, and I heard this at my 25 listening sessions, I don't think a lot of them thought this was the kind of change they were voting for. They didn't think they were voting for the kind of change to more mortgages on their children's future. They didn't think they were voting for a brand new national energy tax on their livelihoods, on their heating bills, on their gas bills, on their electricity bills. They didn't think they were voting for a new tax on the manufacturing jobs in America when our own competitors in China and India will not do this to themselves. They didn't think they were voting for the largest tax increase in history. They didn't think they were voting for the kind of change that gives us a sea of red ink, a mountain of debt, a government that is the biggest we have seen in a generation.

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

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

The whole idea of ramming all of this government, this gusher of spending and taxing and borrowing through, in as little as 105 hours of debate is not democracy. It is not the way this House is supposed to work. Unfortunately, that is precisely what the majority aims to do. And that is why we agree with the Democrats in the Senate to stop that from happening.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, H. Con. Res. 85 builds on the work this Congress has

started on to get our economy back on track, address the current crisis, and build for future needs.

Just so folks will understand, a budget in Congress is not like the budget we think about. It really is a framework. It's a blueprint.

I'm sure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about all the things that are in it, but what they don't say is this doesn't do any of the things they are talking about. We'd like for our friends across the aisle to join us. This really should not be a partisan issue. The issue of getting our economy on track shouldn't be partisan. The issue of investing in education for our children's future shouldn't be a partisan issue. The issue of fixing health care for the American people, in my home State one of the largest numbers of people unemployed are in North Carolina because our unemployment rate right now is fourth in the Nation. These people don't care who gets it for them. They want health care fixed. And certainly I remember \$4 a gallon of gasoline that got us where we are. We need to fix that.

This bill lays out a plan to cut the deficit by nearly two-thirds by 2013 and create jobs with investments in those areas I have just talked about: health care, clean energy, and in education.

And, yes, reconciliation is about getting a budget in balance. That's what the Democrats have used it for, what we used it for last time. And I think it's appropriate when it's used that way. But I will remind you that a budget is more than just a document. It is a statement of our Nation's priorities and our values. And this budget is about that. It's about the future. It's about the people's needs, and it's about creating jobs with investments and reform in health care, clean energy, and education to make sure that we are prepared for the 21st century economy.

Our efforts in this budget are about protecting families. And it's really about three things and three things only: jobs, jobs, jobs. We have to remember that. At the end of the day, there are a lot of people in this country who are looking to us to help. Yes, the business community needs our help, and we are going to try to do it. It takes the first step in restoring America's financial strength. And we will get there by growing our economy in areas like health care, education, and energy, which will pave the way for a sustained recovery and get our people back to work and our economy back on track. And, yes, I am very pleased that this budget makes room for those areas. But it makes room for critical investment in education in the future of our children and not just children but for those who want to go to college and, yes, for those who want to go back to school and make a difference as the economy changes and get an education so that they can make a way for their family.

I would encourage you to vote for this resolution and vote against the motion to instruct.

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

Education is the key to economic growth, future success, and access to opportunity for our citizens, and this Budget Resolution makes a clear statement that education is a top priority.

We are a nation of great resources that has proven time and again that we are the world leader in innovation and progress. With time, and with continued effort, we will break with the failed policies of the recent past and restore our strength and global competitiveness.

□ 1500

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield one of the remaining minutes on my side to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, just as I listened to this debate, and it is a debate, and while the other side is primarily debating process and the concerns they have about how much they will be able to be heard, I would suggest that they be heard on their solutions for energy independence, for fiscal responsibility for our Nation, and for growing those jobs through health care reform and education.

This is a moment when in fact the American people did call on us to take action on this these critical issues. They understand the enormous challenges facing their own families, their communities and our Nation. And they are calling on us to take action, to do it in a fiscally responsible way, but to face America's challenges, to make the investments in our future.

That is what this budget does. It sets out a path for us to tackle these major challenges. That is what we want to do. We would like to do it in a bipartisan way. We are certainly going to have hours and hours of debate, both here in Congress, in our committees and at home. And that is what we should do. The American people and American businesses are counting on us.

Vote for this budget, vote to proceed and vote for America.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me clarify just a few things, because we have heard repeated on the floor today arguments made several weeks ago when the concurrent resolution first came to the floor that this was the biggest spending bill in the history of the country.

The truth of the matter is simply this: spending is unprecedentedly large. The reason is we are in the midst of one of the worst recessions since the Great Depression and we have taken remedial steps which have been costly to the Federal Government, quite a few

of which were launched under the Bush administration. So that has swollen the total spending and the total deficit for this year.

But listen to this: total outlays for 2009, fiscal year 2009, total outlays, the whole budget, is \$3.8 trillion. Next year under this budget total outlays will be \$3.5 trillion. You have heard it said repeatedly over there that spending is going up. It is coming down. It will come down further, just as will the deficit, because this is a deficit reduction budget resolution which reduces the deficit from \$1.752 trillion to \$533 billion in 3 or 4 fiscal years. That is a matter of truth.

If you care to take the time and pick up a copy of the committee report, you will see on page 5 this simple sentence about the tax situation: "This budget resolution calls for reducing the revenues provided under CBO's baseline forecast, reducing them by \$613 billion between 2009 and 2014 and by \$1.48 trillion between 2010 and 2019."

These are facts. They haven't been refuted. Every time we have asked that their arithmetic be explained to back up their rhetoric, we have not gotten an answer.

Now, let me say a word or two about reconciliation. Reconciliation has been since the outset of the budget process in 1974 an essential part of making a budget. If you listened to the argument here on the floor, what you heard were a lot of red herrings.

For example, it was suggested that this is going to be an impediment to choice; this is going to get in between patients and their doctors or patients and the insured and the insurance companies in choosing health insurance. There is nothing in here, nothing whatsoever that even breathes a word about either of those subjects.

There is talk here that this would in fact deal with cap-and-trade, even though we took cap-and-trade out of the President's budget request, removed it completely. It is not spoken of or mentioned there. And you heard EARL BLUMENAUER just on the floor a minute ago. He would love to see it there, but it is not. He made an honest examination of it. It is not there. But you wouldn't know it to listen to the other side.

You will also however thwart the passage of some things that we think are worthy and vital. Certainly we want to improve higher education and the access to higher education for all children in America, thinking that it is their birthright if it is something they can attain.

And we definitely, decidedly, clearly need to do something about 46 million Americans who do not have health insurance. If we were to pass this resolution and then take out the reconciliation provision, we would have a very difficult time ensuring ourselves that legislation to that effect would be produced on a timely basis.

That is what reconciliation is all about, simply this: we can say that the

committees of jurisdiction on the Budget Committee through action on the floor by a certain date do a certain thing to raise a certain sum of money or to lower revenues by a certain sum. That doesn't get the bill off the floor. You still have to command a majority on the floor. That doesn't get the bill out of conference. You still have to confer with the Senate, work out your differences and get it passed again by both Houses. And that doesn't get you past go. You still have got to get the President to sign the bill. All those hurdles are still in place. It is not like we are going to go off running to the races if we adopt this. We simply assure ourselves that by a date certain, certain action will be taken.

Finally this: there is some seemingly simple language here about offsets, saying if you want to increase a program, you have got to actually cut spending to offset it. There is nothing wrong with that.

I was one of the sponsors of and supporters of, and still am, of something we call PAYGO. But if we want to provide that everything must be offset by commensurate spending decreases, you will kill the opportunity we have had to pass programs like CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program, the expansion of which, the creation of which, was allowed by use of tobacco taxes and cigarette taxes.

So this motion to instruct is unnecessary, unwarranted, and it will impede the passage of what we believe is a good budget resolution. Therefore, we would urge all Members to vote against it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to start off by, first of all, saying, and I comment on this a lot, I have tremendous respect for the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT. He is an admirable man who has a very difficult job.

I would like to hear back to a day where bipartisanship on the budget worked, the year before I came into Congress, and Mr. SPRATT was a key part of this. That was the 1997 budget agreement. That is when reconciliation was used for its intended purpose. In that 1997 budget agreement, where you had a Democratic President and a Republican House, they came together in bipartisan fashion to reduce spending and to reduce taxes, and it is that budget agreement that paved the way for the surpluses that then occurred and followed that helped us pay down debt.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, that both parties should claim credit for that job and that improvement in our fiscal situation, for bringing those surpluses, for balancing the budget and for having a substantial contribution to debt reduction. Both parties did that. Both parties should get credit for that.

But here we are today, taking this process that has been used to good effect in the past, fulfilling the spirit of the process, and we are just turning it upside down.

Let's review the contents of this. We very well might have, with as little as 35 hours of debate between the two Chambers and no more than 105 hours of debate because of this fast-track procedure, the greatest transformation of our Federal Government since the New Deal. Let's review the issues.

Taxes: What this budget proposes to do is to impose a new national energy tax on everybody who consumes energy: a tax on manufacturing, a tax on coal-burning States like my own, a tax that is bad for our economy. Higher taxes on small businesses. Higher taxes on investments. Higher taxes in a recession.

We proposed an alternative in our budget. We said, no, let's not raise taxes in a recession. Let's make our businesses more competitive in the global economy so we can create jobs in this recession. That was rejected. Now there they are steamrolling these tax increases through with very little debate and very few amendments.

Let's talk about cap-and-trade. The chairman gave an articulate defense for how cap-and-trade is not happening here. It is not in this budget. Well, then why on Earth is the Commerce Committee marking up cap-and-trade legislation next week? They are having hearings right now, and they are marking this bill up next week, and they are bringing it to the floor.

Here is the problem with cap-and-trade. We don't think it works. Even if you think you have a carbon problem, hitting our economy with this while our very competitors in China and India won't do it will not even reduce carbon in the atmosphere. It will actually increase carbon, but from China and India. For every one ton of greenhouse gases we reduce in America, China increases theirs by three or four tons. We lose our manufacturing jobs. They get the jobs. They emit carbon in the atmosphere. There is more carbon in the atmosphere and America has fewer jobs. How is that a good idea?

We proposed an alternative in our budget. We said let's drill for oil and gas in our own country, where we have a lot of it; and let's invest the proceeds of it in a clean energy trust fund so we innovate our way toward a clean energy system, so we innovate our way for nuclear, clean coal, renewables, biomass, wind, solar, all these things, fuel cells.

Americans are innovators. Let's not hit ourselves with a huge energy tax that costs jobs. Let's innovate our way out of this problem through a cleaner energy economy. That is our alternative. That was rejected. Now this cap-and-trade thing could get swept through with as little as 35 hours of debate.

Let's talk about health care. I just came from the Ways and Means Committee, another committee I serve on,



before coming to the floor here today, where they are discussing how in the budget reconciliation they are going to have a new health care plan that has a government-run plan option. The problem with the government-run plan option is it quickly becomes a government-run plan monopoly.

One of the leading health insurance actuaries in America, the Lewin Group, is telling us that as many as 120 million Americans would lose their private health insurance under this government-run plan option. This is government-run health care. It may not say it in name, it may not be what it says it is going to do tomorrow, but it is clearly what all the actuaries and the economists are telling us what it becomes.

The advocates in the Ways and Means Committee are already telling us, why have private health insurance in the first place? Let's just have the government run it all. So clearly the intention is being made known, and this confiscation of 17 percent of our economy will run through Congress with as little as 35 hours of debate.

This is what we are talking about. Should we have a government takeover of health care in America? Let's have a debate about that. Let's not have 35 hours of debate.

Should we impose the largest energy tax in the history of this country on our manufacturers, on seniors, on the upper Midwest where we have cold winters, or should we just ram this thing through with 35 hours of debate?

Should we hit our economy in the middle of a recession with the largest tax increase in history, ram it through with no amendments with as little as 35 hours of debate?

Should we transform the Federal Government, the largest transformation we have seen since the New Deal, with as little as 35 hours of debate?

We think no. And we agree with the Democrats in the Senate who agree with us that the answer should be no.

Let's concur with the Senate Democrats. Let's pass this motion to instruct and let's give America democracy and debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin's time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 1679 and H.R. 586;

Motion to instruct on S. Con. Res. 13; and

Motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 957.

The vote on H. Res. 247 will be taken tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

## HOUSE RESERVISTS PAY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1679, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1679.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 432, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

YEAS—423

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Adler (NJ)  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boccieri  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bright

Brown (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Cao  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castle  
Castor (FL)  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Childers  
Clarke  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson

Cummings  
Dahlkemper  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis (TN)  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Driehaus  
Duncan  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge

Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gordon (TN)  
Granger  
Graves  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Halvorson  
Hare  
Harman  
Harper  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Heinrich  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Himes  
Hincheey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Inglis  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan (OH)  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kilroy  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kirk  
Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
Kissell  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Kosmas  
Kratovil  
Kucinich  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NY)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis

Lynch  
Mack  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey (CO)  
Markey (MA)  
Marshall  
Massa  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMahon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minnick  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler (NY)  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Nye  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olson  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Perriello  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pitts  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Pollis (CO)  
Pomeroy  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Quigley  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney

Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schradner  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skeltan  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Teague  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Walz  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)