

tempore (Mr. MACK) at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 38, REDUCING NON-SECURITY SPENDING TO FISCAL YEAR 2008 LEVELS OR LESS**

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 43 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 43

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 38) to reduce spending through a transition to non-security spending at fiscal year 2008 levels. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Rules now printed in the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to final adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend from Worcester (Mr. McGOVERN). All time yielded will be for debate purposes only.

Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, runaway Federal spending is one of the most significant issues that this Congress is facing. Our national debt has implications for nearly every major challenge that we must confront. It's tied to our economic recovery, it's tied to our national security, it's tied to our ability to deliver on our constitutional mandate for transparent, limited and responsive government.

The time to exercise our power of the purse with discipline and restraint is long overdue. Let me say that again: the time for us to exercise our power-of-the-purse restraint is long, long overdue. We must return to pre-bailout, pre-binge spending levels for funding the Federal Government.

We know that a great deal of hard work and tough decisions lie ahead for every single Member of this institution. We know that a great deal of hard work is there; and we're going to face some very difficult, tough, tough decisions. They are going to be difficult decisions; but, Mr. Speaker, they are decisions that we're going to have to make.

First and foremost, we must get our economy growing and our workforce

expanding again. Strong growth and job creation will increase tax revenues and provide greater resources that are needed; but, Mr. Speaker, that's only half of the equation. Economic growth is critically important. We need to do it so that we can enhance the flow of revenues to the Federal Treasury to deal with those essential items that are there, but it is half the equation.

We can't get back onto firm ground with sound fiscal standing unless we have a leaner Federal budget. Some of this can be accomplished by eliminating waste, fraud and abuse. Everybody is always in favor of eliminating waste, fraud and abuse. And what is the best way to do that? Robust oversight. Robust oversight will allow us to streamline Federal spending and make better use of taxpayer dollars, but we have to acknowledge up front that hard work and painful cuts lie ahead. We all know that this is not going to be an easy task, but it is absolutely essential.

Just as families and small businesses across this country have been forced to cut back during these difficult economic times, we here in this institution are going to have to do the same. That's the message that we got last November that brought people like my Rules Committee colleague, Mr. SCOTT, who is sitting next to me on the floor here, that's the message that has been carried here.

Some Federal programs, Mr. Speaker, are wasteful and duplicative and deserve to be cut. There will be others that have merit, but which we simply cannot afford at the current levels. We have to be honest about that. We have to engage in a responsible debate about what our priorities must be.

□ 1720

What we cannot do is allow this debate to degenerate into false accusations about the other side's intentions. And I'm going to repeat that, Mr. Speaker. We cannot let the kind of free-flowing, rigorous debate that we need to have degenerate into these accusations that we so often seem to hear around here.

There is no one in this body who wants to gut funding for key essential programs, like veterans' programs, or like education, child nutrition. No one wants to gut these programs. So I think it's important for us to state that. And there is no evidence that any proposal out there would undermine things like support for our Nation's veterans.

We are all entering into this debate with good faith, good intentions, and a commitment to responsibly address the need to implement fiscal discipline. We will have to make hard choices, but that process will not be served by unfair or disingenuous accusations.

We also recognize that this will be a lengthy process. We are just beginning what is going to be a 2-year process focused on this.

Today's underlying resolution, the measure that we're going to be consid-

ering through this rule and then on the floor tomorrow, is merely the first step in this ongoing effort to bring our Federal budget back into the black. Our committees will have to conduct extensive oversight, as I mentioned earlier, of Federal programs. We will have to dispense with fiscal year 2011 spending, which the last Congress failed to do, before we can even begin to deal with the coming fiscal year.

The underlying resolution that we have before us today lays down a marker for reducing spending and puts the House on record for its commitment to tackle this issue in a serious way. The hard work will follow.

As this process proceeds, rank and file Members of both political parties, Democrats and Republicans alike, will have the opportunity to participate in our effort to address these very tough decisions.

Through constructive debate, we can finally begin to impose real accountability and discipline in our Federal budget. In concert with pro-growth policies—and I said to me the most essential thing is implementing pro-growth economic policies—but going hand-in-hand with these pro-growth policies, Mr. Speaker, this effort will put us back onto the path of economic recovery and job creation.

Today's rule sets the stage for the start of that effort. I'm going to urge my colleagues to support this rule and demonstrate their resolve to tackle runaway Federal spending in a serious way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule. So much for an open process, and so much for a free flow of ideas. I also rise in strong opposition to the underlying resolution.

Once again, the Republican majority is choosing to ignore the single most important issue facing the American people: jobs. My Republican friends have instead brought forth a resolution, H. Res. 38, that they tout as some sort of spending reduction measure. In fact, the resolution doesn't cut a single dollar—not one dime—from the Federal budget.

If this were a good-faith effort, there would be some numbers in this resolution. Instead, the resolution says that we should "assume non-security spending at fiscal year 2008 levels or less" without defining "non-security" spending or specifying exactly what those levels might be. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this is a budget resolution without any numbers, which is why it is so meaningless.

We are told that the numbers are on their way, that the Congressional Budget Office will tell us on Wednesday of this week what the impact of this resolution would be if it were actually put into place. So why are we here

today debating this issue? Why can't we wait until Wednesday when we have the numbers? The answer is as plain as the calendar on the wall: it's politics, pure and simple.

The Republican leadership has scheduled a vote on the resolution tomorrow just before President Obama addresses the Nation in his State of the Union Address. That way, they'll have a fresh set of talking points for their response to the President. They'll be able to say, "Look how serious we are about cutting government funding," when, of course, they haven't cut anything.

Another problem with the resolution is that it reinforces the terrible precedent that the Republican majority established in their rules package at the beginning of this Congress. Under those rules, a single Member of Congress, the chairman of the Budget Committee, has the authority to determine spending levels for the government for the rest of the year.

Now, like all of my colleagues, I have a great deal of respect for the current chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN. But I strongly disagree with the notion that he and only he should determine something as fundamental as the budget of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we have to vote in this House to change the name of a post office. But we can't have a vote on how much we should spend on education, on food safety, on infrastructure, on environmental cleanup, or on medical research? That's a far cry from the openness and transparency that my Republican friends promised.

Last week in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to this resolution that would have allowed the other 435 Members of the House the opportunity to vote on this critical issue. But my Republican colleagues defeated my amendment on a party-line vote.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the resolution walls off defense spending from the budget axe. We hear all the time from my friends on the other side of the aisle that everything should be on the table. Why then would they take hundreds of billions of dollars of potential savings off the table right out of the gate? Even Speaker BOEHNER on a recent interview said, "I believe there's room to find savings in the Department of Defense." Well, if that's true—and it most certainly is—then why does this resolution treat defense spending as sacred and untouchable?

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the Federal budget, the Republican majority is not off to a good start. Their rules package paved the way for them to add nearly \$5 trillion to the deficit. Last week, they voted to repeal the health care law and add another \$230 billion to the deficit. And now they are rushing a 1-page bill without a single number and without any specifics about how and where they want to cut.

What we are doing today, Mr. Speaker, is not real. There are no tough choices being made today. This is show business, and quite frankly, it dimin-

ishes the legislative process. The American people deserve much, much better. I urge my colleagues to reject this closed rule, and I urge them to reject the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this rule that we are considering.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to one of our new Members whom I mentioned in my opening remarks, the gentleman from North Charleston, South Carolina, my Rules Committee colleague, Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, as a business owner who's only been in Congress for 19 days, I know as a small business owner that if we want more jobs in our economy, we must be serious about spending cuts.

Deficit spending in Washington is burdening future generations. Unborn Americans will have to pay for the benefits that we ascribe to ourselves. During the previous 2 years, Congress has added nearly \$3.3 trillion to the national debt. Is it any wonder then that during the same time period our unemployment rate has skyrocketed from 7.8 percent to 9.4 percent? It's not.

As a small business owner, when I don't have to pay higher taxes, I'm able to hire more people. When I don't have to pay higher taxes, I'm able to invest in more equipment and more services.

□ 1730

Every dollar taken from me by the government means that I have to go out and earn \$2 more just to break even. That's why I offered the amendment in the Rules Committee for spending even less, even less than the 2008 levels. 2008 levels are just a start. And we need to go much deeper than that. I support this rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me acknowledge the presence of my new colleague who is on the Rules Committee and simply say that, if this were a serious effort, there would be numbers in this bill. There are none. This is about issuing a press release after the State of the Union so that Republicans can have a talking point to go home with. This is not a serious effort. And if it were, there would be real numbers in there. If we were interested in rigorous debate, this would be an open rule.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Here we go again. As my colleague said, if this were a serious proposal on the budget, you would have a budget number in this document. There is no number in this document.

Look, on opening day our Republican colleagues passed a measure that immediately gutted the pay-as-you-go rule that we have in this body and did an end run around the pay-as-you-go law. A few days later, we figured out why they did that, because they added \$230 billion to the deficit over 10 years and \$1.4 trillion over 20 years. Those aren't my numbers, those are the numbers of the independent, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office with respect to the impact of their effort to repeal health care reform instead of doing what we should be doing, which is focusing on jobs.

That measure on opening day also did another thing. It gave the chairman of the Budget Committee unprecedented power to unilaterally pick the budget ceilings, the spending ceilings for this entire Congress. No input from anybody else, no debate, no vote. So all of us thought when this new measure was coming up maybe now we're going to have some accountability. Maybe this body will have an opportunity to vote on the very important spending ceilings for the United States Congress and for the government. But lo and behold hold, when you look at the resolution, there's no number. Where's the beef?

And I have to say to my colleagues that, if you want transparency, why are you hiding the ball? Is the number going to be 100 billion? Is it going to be 80 billion? Is it going to be 60 billion? We hear all different numbers in the press out there, and they haven't put it in the measure. Instead, they've said once again, we're going to allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to decide.

Now, I have great respect for the chairman of the Budget Committee, but none of us should be contracting out our votes and our responsibilities to another Member of Congress. We shouldn't ever do that. Certainly we shouldn't be doing that on something as important as setting the overall budget and spending ceilings for the United States Government. That's irresponsible. And yet that's what this rule will ask every Member to do—contract out his or her vote to one person.

So why are we doing this? Why are we bringing a budget resolution to the floor with no number? As my colleague said, timing is everything here. This is an opportunity to have a press release tomorrow, the day the President's going to deliver the State of the Union address, to create the illusion that they're making progress on the budget number, without a number.

Now, we heard from our colleagues on the Republican side, Well, you know what? We have to wait for the Congressional Budget Office to tell us what their projections are so we can figure out the magnitude of the reductions.

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We asked them, Why don't we have the number? They said, Well, we've got to wait for CBO.

We are pleased to hear the newfound respect for the CBO numbers, but here's my point. That's going to happen within 24 hours of tomorrow. Twenty-four hours. We could have a budget resolution with the beef, with the number, so everyone could decide what the ceilings are going to be. No, we've got to do it tomorrow. Why? State of the Union address. Great press release.

Now, I've heard my colleagues say they've got to do this because there was nothing in place in the House from a budget perspective. Well, in fact, the House last year passed a budget enforcement act. I've got it right here. It's got a number in it. It's got a number in it like these budget documents have.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to ask my friend what was the vote in the House on that budget that my friend was just talking about?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I don't remember the exact vote, but it passed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DREIER. It was deemed. There was never a vote in this institution on it, Mr. Speaker.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. There was a vote on a resolution in the House.

If you want to talk about deeming—

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Listen, what we are doing today is the ultimate example of deeming. We are passing a resolution that deems, in advance, the passage of a number that we don't even know, and it's going to be decided by one person. We are deeming that individual all the authority. And the shame of it is that that's a process that I think we all recognize is flawed. And yet this is deeming on steroids.

So I would suggest that we come up with a real number, put some beef on this, have a real argument, and let every Member vote and take responsibility.

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

Let me say that I think that one of the things that we have to recognize here—and I am happy to engage in rigorous debate, and I'm happy that we have not at this point had any of our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the prospect of starving children, throwing people out of

schools, depriving veterans of access to the things that they need. So I express my appreciation to my colleagues, because when we were up in the Rules Committee, that was the tenor of the discussion that took place upstairs.

One thing that I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that, in 1974, the Congress put into place legislation known as the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act. I happen to believe that that needs to be overhauled, because Democrats and Republicans alike recognize that the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act has been a failure, an abject failure. And I've been working with my friend from Maryland, the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee, and Mr. RYAN, the chairman of the Budget Committee, as well as the chair and ranking member, Messrs. CONRAD and SESSIONS, in the Senate on the notion of our working together in a bipartisan, bicameral way to bring about an overhaul of the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act.

Now, one of the reasons that I believe it is essential is that last year was the first time ever that we have not seen a budget passed. It's the first time since implementation of the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act. And, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the crocodile tears that are being shed so often on this House floor, I think it's important to note that that is why we are in the position where we are today. We wouldn't be here had we had a budget passed.

Now, many people talk about this calendar year, but we are 5 months—we are 5 months—into the fiscal year, and that is the reason that we are in a position where we're having to make the kinds of tough decisions that we are.

My friend from North Charleston, my very, very thoughtful colleague is a new member of the Rules Committee, has been raising with me some very simple and commonsense questions about the process that we have been going through. One of the things that he just said in a meeting that we just participated in was that we need to recognize that we, at this moment, are beginning the process, we are beginning the process of cutting spending. This is going to be a 2-year struggle. So this is not going to be the end of our effort to try and rein in wasteful Federal spending.

I know my friend had some thoughts on that, and I would be happy to yield to him if he would like to either pose a question or offer any comments that relate to either the health care bill and the vote that we just had or any other issue.

I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Question for you: Is it the first time since 1974 that the House has operated without a budget?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, I thank my friend for giving me the opportunity to repeat what I just said so that we can underscore it.

Never before have we failed to have a budget. And yet, for the first time in 36 years, that happened.

□ 1740

That's why I believe that we have a chance to work, Democrats and Republicans together, with our colleagues in the other body to bring about real reform of the Budget Act itself.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When you think about the repeal of the national health care bill, is that not a savings of \$2.7 trillion, at least the elimination of a \$2.7 trillion hole or an abyss on an entitlement program? Does it not reduce the debt by \$700 billion? Are these not real numbers? And if we really wanted a number, if we were looking for the number, would they not have passed a budget last year?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, let me say that my friend is absolutely right.

Throughout the debate that took place last week, we heard that, in fact, repealing the \$2.7 trillion health care bill would end up costing \$230 billion based on the numbers provided to us by the Congressional Budget Office's estimates. We kept hearing that, and in one of the exchanges we had with Mr. PENCE, only in Washington, D.C. can bringing about the elimination of a \$2.7 trillion expenditure actually cost money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the thing that we need to point to is not only the smoke and mirrors that went into the recommendations that were provided, whether it is dealing with the CLASS Act, which the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee has described as a Ponzi scheme—he used that term to describe it, whether it's that—or, to me, the most important thing to point to is the fact that in that measure there is a three-quarter of a trillion—Mr. Speaker, that's three-quarter of a trillion—dollar tax increase that is being posed along with the mandate.

So my friend from North Charleston is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker, when he points to the fact that we were, in fact, saving dollars with the action that we took last week, and we are very committed to ensuring that people have access to quality, affordable health insurance by allowing for the purchase of insurance across States lines, pooling to deal with preexisting conditions, associated health plans so that small businesses can get lower rates, the idea of meaningful lawsuit abuse reform, which the President of the United States talked about last year in his State of the Union message.

I mean, these are the kinds of things that we believe can immediately drive the cost of health insurance and health care down itself and at the same time we can disengage the Federal Government's dramatic involvement in this.

So my friend from North Charleston is absolutely right and I appreciate his, as a small businessman, coming to this body, bringing the common sense that he is sharing with us.

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

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

I am glad my friends on the other side of the aisle are happy that they voted to repeal the affordable health care bill, but I will tell that you there are real people in this country who are benefiting from the real protections in the bill who are quite anxious about the fact that there are people who want to remove the protection, for example, that prohibits insurance companies from discriminating against people with preexisting conditions. There are parents who can keep their kids on their insurance until they are 26 who are not too happy about that repeal. There are senior citizens who are benefiting from the closing of the doughnut hole who are actually feeling some benefits from this health care bill. They're not too happy that the Republicans want to repeal all of that. And on top of that, the CBO said it adds considerably to our deficit.

At this point I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that my colleague from California brings up the health reform. We were using CBO numbers, actual numbers that were provided by the CBO to say that we have a \$230 billion reduction in the deficit in the first 10 years and a trillion dollars beyond that. We're giving them actual numbers from the CBO to talk about deficit reduction.

But I don't see any numbers on this budget resolution that's on this floor today and tomorrow. I call it the "budget-less" resolution, because it contains no numbers, no specifics, and worst of all, no ideas for job creation or economic recovery, and it doesn't even include a serious plan to reduce the deficit.

This is not the way to manage the budget. It's worse than arbitrary. It's like budgeting with blindfolds on. It gives no thought, no reasons, no real discussion on how the cuts would be made and what the ramifications would be. Worst of all, the Republican resolution continues to ignore job creation and economic recovery. It doesn't even contain a real plan to reduce the deficit.

We gave you numbers with the health care reform that would actually reduce the deficit. This is a numberless budget, nothing at all.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was unclear in my own mind

which was worse, the terrible procedural abuse of this resolution or the serious substantive flaw, but I then realize they come together because it is procedurally outrageous so as to protect a substantive grave error.

First of all, it is a major piece of legislation, and it's not amendable, just like the health care bill. You may remember, Mr. Speaker, what people on the Republican side said about open rules. It will be a fond memory but apparently not a reality.

We have a very important piece of legislation subject to no amendment. I chaired a committee for 4 years and never would I have brought a bill to the floor with such an impact and had no amendments in order whatsoever. But I understand why they don't want an amendment, because it would reveal the grave flaw. This says reduce non-security spending to the level of 2008. In other words, exempt about half of discretionary spending. All security, I assume they mean military spending.

Now we have a war and we have to defend the people who we put out there. I have to say those who talk about shutting the government down—I don't know what they are going to tell the people in Afghanistan who are out there being shot at—but we have got tens of billions that we are spending subsidizing our wealthy allies in Europe and Asia.

The argument that you exempt military spending from budgetary discipline is one of the reasons we are in the terrible hole we are in. Now it is clearly indefensible to argue that you would exempt military spending from budget discipline. So how do you defend it? You defend it by not allowing an amendment that would bring it forward.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are we not able to say, well, not just non-security and maybe non-security shouldn't go down to the level of 2008, but it ought to go down somewhat or ought to be limited somewhat. This is part of a philosophy that puts pressure on all of the domestic spending, everything that affects the quality of life in America.

Now by "security," by the way, I mean police officers in the streets of the cities I represent and firefighters and bridges that won't collapse. But that's not security as it's defined by the Republicans. That's the kind of spending that will be severely cut.

Instead, we have a total exemption for the Pentagon. We have Mr. Gates, a Bush appointee, kept on wisely by Mr. Obama, saying it's time to start to reduce the military. The Republicans have attacked him for that.

So let's be very clear. There cannot be a sensible, comprehensive, balanced approach to deficit reduction when you follow this philosophy, not only totally exempt the military, but don't even allow an amendment that would make it something that you could talk about.

The notion that you give all this power to one person is also very inter-

esting. I guess what we are learning is, then, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has been somewhat more courageous than some others in what he has talked about. I disagree with him.

So apparently what we are learning today is that the Republican Party has the courage of PAUL RYAN's convictions. I wish they had the courage to let us debate whether or not military spending should be included.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume to say to my friend that again this is just the first step in a long process which will allow the kind of free-flowing debate that we are talking about. Now my friend will recall that never before have we gone through the appropriations process the way we did the last 2 years, that being, when my friend and I arrived here in 1981, and when it came to the issue of spending, Members had the opportunity to stand up on the House floor and offer an amendment to the appropriations bill.

And I will tell you that it's our intention to once again have that kind of debate that we had all the way up until the last 2 years. So I can assure my friend that our goal of having a freer flowing debate is important.

The second point I would like to make, and then I will yield to my friend, is that while my friend has continually said that we didn't make amendments in order to this measure, there were no amendments submitted to the Rules Committee that would have given us the opportunity to do that.

We did make an amendment in order that modifies this, that came from Mr. SCOTT in the Rules Committee, that actually said that we should get to '08 levels or less, and it is true. My friend from Worcester did ask to make in order an amendment by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, but, as I said, there were no amendments that had been actually submitted to the Rules Committee.

□ 1750

So that vote was taken by the Rules Committee. That decision was made.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I'm a little puzzled. You said no amendments were submitted, but Mr. MCGOVERN did ask for one on behalf of Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Why did that not qualify?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, what I would say is that amendments submitted to the Rules Committee we do not actually have. I mean my friend knows very well that when it comes to the Rules Committee, when we are getting ready to report out a rule, there are amendments that are submitted. There was one amendment that was proposed by Mr. MCGOVERN. The Rules Committee chose not to make that amendment in order.

There was an amendment that did, in fact, bring us to lower spending—

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DREIER. If I might complete my statement. I think I control the time here.

It is very important to note that we did have an amendment that was considered in the Rules Committee by Mr. SCOTT which actually brought us to lower levels. It said 2008 levels or less.

I am happy to further yield to my friend.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First of all, I think the RECORD will show the gentleman has just amended his statement about amendments because he said no amendments were offered, then he later said—and I would ask people to look at the RECORD tomorrow. He then said, Oh, an amendment was offered. His first statement was no amendments were offered—

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I reclaim my time. I reclaim my time to say the following—and I will yield to my friend again. I want to clarify what it was that I said.

Amendments are submitted up to the Rules Committee. There were no amendments that actually had been submitted to the Rules Committee, and that's the point that I wanted to make.

There is another issue that we need to point to also, and that is there is going to be something that was often denied, I would say to my friend, and that is a motion to recommit with instructions is going to be included in this measure so that, in fact, the minority will have a bite at the apple that was more often than not denied in the past. And so that is a step in the direction towards a more open process.

And again, as I said, this is the beginning. This is the beginning of a process that will allow for consideration of a budget resolution and an appropriations process which will give Members, Democrats and Republicans alike, an opportunity to participate.

With that, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend from San Diego—

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DREIER. Of course. I have yielded three times to my friend, and I know that Mr. MCGOVERN has lots of time.

The gentleman from San Diego has asked to be recognized. I have had an exchange with him. And now I would like to yield 2 minutes to my friend from San Diego (Mr. BILBRAY), and then if Mr. MCGOVERN chooses to yield time to my friend, I am happy to engage in a discussion with him again.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, let me say as somebody who had the privilege for 18 years to be in local government, I think those of us in the Federal Government have to understand that there are jurisdictions and priorities that we need to set.

Some people believe that it is as much a responsibility of the Federal Government to hire police officers as it is to maintain a military. I'm sorry. The constitutional line for those of us

who are mayors and county chairmen recognized that we need the Federal Government to concentrate on our responsibilities—defending our borders, defending our national security. Those of us that served at local government would be able to address their issues much more appropriately and have a lot less burden.

But I really want to speak about the opportunities we have to work in a bipartisan effort. When we talk about budget reduction, rather than denying Americans the right to live in the United States unless they buy certain insurance, why aren't we talking about doing cost reductions like California has done, not exactly a right-wing legislature?

MICRA there has had such an impact on the cost of insurance on physicians that an OB/GYN in Los Angeles pays 30 to 40 percent less for insurance than the same doctor in New York. Now, you can't tell me the cost of living is that much different, except for the fact that Sacramento has recognized that tort reform and limitations of trial lawyers' impact on health care is an essential one. If the legislature of California can agree to maintain that, why can't we work together to address those issues?

If we're talking about wanting to reduce costs, why didn't the health bill allow Americans, rather than taking away the rights to live in the country, the freedom to buy across State lines? That is well within our jurisdiction as a Federal body.

Why didn't we give freedom the answer to be able to reduce costs rather than talking about taking away the rights of Americans to live here? That is a real scary concept that we can't join on tort reform—and let's face it, the liability issue is sort of an interesting one. The Federal Government and States can actually address issues that say that somebody who is—

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my friend 1 additional minute.

Mr. BILBRAY. Let me point this out. I know this because I was at the county running a health care system and supervising the health care system for over 3 million people.

The Federal Government has special protection for physicians if they're in community clinics that we do not give to other physicians. The Federal Government accepts the situations where somebody on Medicaid has more right to sue their physician than the men and women in uniform in this country. And I challenge you to tell me how it's justifiable that, if somebody doesn't pay for their medical costs in the military, they don't get to sue their doctor, but somebody who is on welfare and public assistance, they get to sue them. Can we talk about bringing those issues together and addressing the ability for a lawyer to get into an operating room is not as important as the right or the need of physicians to be able to do their job that is so essential?

And I want to close with this. We have not been talking about health care in the last year. We've been talking about health insurance. And the crisis that's coming down this pike is that in 10 years you may be able to call the health insurance people, but you won't be able to find a doctor unless you call 1-800 and get it over the phone.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, although it has really nothing to do with the bill we're talking about here today. And our concern about this budget bill before us is that there's no number in it, and it essentially is a press release, I guess, to be able to talk about tomorrow after the State of the Union.

I also want to clarify what happened in the Rules Committee. I did offer an amendment that was rejected on party line that said that Members of Congress ought to have the ability to vote on this magic number that the chairman of the Budget Committee will come up with. That was rejected.

There was also an amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida which would have allowed Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who is our ranking member on the Budget Committee, a substitute. That was rejected. And there was also an amendment for an open rule so that we could have a free and open debate, and that was rejected. So there were amendments that were offered, and they were rejected.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for a point of clarification.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. First, I want to address this notion that police officers in our local streets pale in significance to the military. We have troops in Western Europe where our Western European allies are cutting their military budgets. And yes, I do think that funding police officers and firefighters in our cities is more important than allowing Germany and England and our European allies to reduce their military budgets because we subsidize them.

Secondly, I will say to the gentleman from California that I am somewhat disappointed. He did say there were no amendments offered. We have now just heard three were offered. If he meant that there were none on paper previously submitted, maybe he should have said that, because it would have been of real great relevance. The fact is amendments were offered, and they were rejected.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. No. The gentleman wouldn't yield to me at the end when he—

Mr. DREIER. Of course I will. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield my friend 30 seconds.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Regular order.

The gentleman from California wasn't happy with what he said. He didn't want to continue the debate; so I won't continue it either.

I would just urge people to read the RECORD tomorrow. Read his statement that no amendments were offered and read what the gentleman from Massachusetts said and see where the truth lies.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say what it is that I said. What I said is there were no amendments submitted to the Rules Committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we meet this afternoon, there are 15 million Americans without a job. And this debate represents yet another wasted opportunity for us to come together and address the real number one issue of the country, which is putting people back to work.

The debate also represents a curious lack of clarity as to what exactly the majority is proposing. And there are words in this resolution, but there aren't numbers. So I did some research of my own about numbers. Let's take FBI agents, for example. Now, the resolution says that security spending is exempted, but it doesn't define security spending. When we passed the budget for FBI agents here, that budget is under the Commerce, Justice, Science budget, so I don't know whether this is within security spending or not.

But here is what I do know. Here is what I do know. In the present fiscal year, if we maintain the budget that we've been living under since October 1, we are on track to spend \$7.6 billion on FBI agents. If we do what the resolution says, which is to go back to what was spent in 2008, we would spend 22 percent less than that, or \$6.5 billion.

□ 1800

If you look at the average salary of an FBI agent, that would mean we would have to make do with 1,720 fewer FBI agents than we do today.

Now, I would be happy to yield to the sponsor of the resolution for him to tell me whether or not that is true. If this passes, are we going to have that level of reduction in FBI agents?

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Obviously, and it has been indicated early on, we are not going to see across-the-board spending cuts. The goal, I would say to my friend, is to get to '08 levels, and I believe that we can preserve the FBI.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the chairman has said we won't have across-the-board cuts. That, of course, means that we will have to find larger cuts than 22 percent in other areas of the Justice Department budget. The court system? Enforcement of the im-

migration laws? The other things that the Justice Department does? The resolution says nothing about what those would be, so I think we can be critical on another area.

For the budget year that we are in, we are spending about \$5.8 billion a year on cancer research at the National Institutes of Health. If we do what the resolution says, we will cut by 22 percent and spend \$4.6 billion on cancer research. The average cancer research grant is about \$350,000. That means that we would have 3,628 fewer cancer research grants. If we are not going to have an across-the-board cut, I would again say: Where else in the National Institutes of Health will we cut? Research for Alzheimer's? Research for diabetes? Research for other areas? The resolution says nothing.

And here is what a prominent American has to say about resolutions like this:

"You can't fix the deficit or the national debt by killing NPR or the National Endowment for the Humanities or the Arts. Nice political chatter, but that doesn't do it. And I'm very put off when people just say let's go back and freeze to the level 2 years ago. Don't tell me you're going to freeze to a level. That usually is a very inefficient way of doing it. Tell me what you're going to cut, and nobody up there," meaning Capitol Hill, "yet is being very, very candid about what they are going to cut to fix this problem."

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. The author of that quote is not a Democratic Member of the House. It is not a White House spokesman. The author of that quote is retired Secretary of State Colin Powell who said yesterday: "Tell me what you're going to cut."

The minority doesn't want to grapple with that problem, which is why there are no amendments made in order, no numbers in the bill, and no reason to vote for this amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself a minute and-a-half to respond to my friend with a couple of comments.

First, this is about job creation and economic growth. Today we live with an economy where there is a tremendous degree of uncertainty, and we know right now that there are job creators, investors, who have resources on the sidelines. I don't believe that there is anything that we could do—well, there are a number of things that we could do that may be as important, I mean, reducing the tax burden on job creators, opening up new markets around the world. But one of the things that I think is critically important for us to do is to begin getting our fiscal house in order so that that will provide an incentive for job creation and economic growth.

The next point I would like to make is that while I congratulated my

friends, Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for not engaging in the sky-is-falling threats about what might happen down the road, or actually determining what would happen, I have to say that I was a little concerned and I have come to the conclusion that if one can't prioritize, Mr. Speaker, they resort to demonizing.

The fact of the matter is that we are beginning a process that will see us for the first time in 2 years have a free-flowing debate on appropriations. When my friend mentioned both the National Institutes of Health and the FBI, I believe those are important priorities that Democrats and Republicans alike want to fund.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

My friend has concluded that somehow he knows exactly what will be cut based on this resolution. My friend has concluded that he knows exactly what level is going to be cut when it comes to the National Institutes of Health and the FBI. There are, as we move ahead with this appropriations level debate, debate that is going to be coming in the next several months, we obviously will be in a position where we will be able to, Democrats and Republicans alike, establish our priorities.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. First of all, I am most assuredly not demonizing the gentleman. I think the gentleman speaks with great sincerity.

What I am saying is that the gentleman said I know exactly what is going to be cut. No one knows exactly what is going to be cut.

Can you tell us, Mr. Chairman, where in the NIH budget you are going to make up the difference for not cutting cancer research by 22 percent?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, let me say that obviously it does not have to be done within the National Institutes of Health, the notion of saying that it has to be cut there. We have seen a doubling in the level of funding under President Bush for the National Institutes of Health, Mr. Speaker, and I think that there are areas where we can bring about cuts.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

We can do that without in any way jeopardizing the important priorities that we have.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairman, and he is correct that in the NIH



budget it could come from Labor or Health and Human Services. And I would ask him: In that bill, where will you make up for not cutting the cancer research by 22 percent?

I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

What I would say is that this is the beginning of a process which will allow us, with a free-flowing debate on appropriations, to do just that. The country survived at 2008 levels.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, this is what General Powell was talking about: tell us where to cut, and we get verbiage, but no real answer.

Mr. DREIER. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 9½ minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out one of the reasons why these questions are coming up is because when this resolution was brought before the Rules Committee, the chairman of the Budget Committee didn't show nor did the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. And there are no numbers in this bill. So we are very, very concerned about what numbers might exist out there. I think people in this House, Democrats and Republicans, ought to know what the real numbers are.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say that this resolution did not emerge from the Budget Committee. This is a resolution of the House Rules Committee. We are the committee of jurisdiction for H. Res. 38.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I appreciate the gentleman for making that point of clarification. However, what we are talking about is setting the spending levels for this House which directly impacts the chairman of the Budget Committee and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. So if there are questions about how deep these cuts are going to be and where they are going to come from, it is because we have no clarity.

At this point I would yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, as those of us on this side of the aisle have said, we need to focus our efforts on job creation and getting the economy going. I know that the chairman said that is what this bill is all about, but let's look at what the Bipartisan Commission on Deficit and Debt Reduction said. They said two things: one, absolutely we need to put our country on a sustain-

able path toward deficit reduction, and we should work together to get that done.

But they also said another thing. They said draconian cuts right now would, in fact, reverse the economic progress that we are making, and that it would threaten the fragile economic recovery and it would hurt job creation in this country, which is one reason we would like to know what the number is, and I would yield immediately if you can tell me whether it is going to be \$100 billion this year, \$80 billion, \$60 billion, whatever it will be, because there is no number. And if you've got it, it should have been in here.

Let me get to the other issue the gentleman raised. We have pointed out that if you do the \$100 billion cut, which is what you all talked about in the fall, right now in the immediate moment, it results in approximately 20 percent across-the-board cuts. Now, all of you say, whenever we raise specifics like cutting research for treatment and cures at NIH, no, no, no, we're not going to cut that. Then we say, okay, you're going to cut the FBI budget because that is not a part of the protected budget. No, no, no, you say, we're not going to cut that. You keep moving stuff off the table.

You know what that does to the rest of the budget? It means it goes from a 20 percent cut to 30 percent to 40. Who knows what it is.

But the point we are making is you haven't given us the starting point number; so you don't have a clue, and of course we don't either. But you don't have a clue because you haven't come up with a number. And we know there has been a lot of discussion on your side of the aisle—it's no secret—about what that number will be, you amended this rules provision, but if you've got the number, put it in here now, and if you're going to get it the day after tomorrow, on Wednesday, wait 24 hours, and let this body vote on it.

□ 1810

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself 1 minute to say to my friend that it is very interesting to have this debate, and I am happy to be standing on this side, saying that we got the message of last November 2, and I know the 87 new Members on our side who have come to this institution have made it very clear: The goal of moving in a direction of bringing about spending cuts is critically important.

Now, my good friend has just become the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and I know that it is a new assignment for my friend, but I'd like to take just a moment to explain what the budget process consists of.

We are going to see your committee proceed with establishing the broad 302(a) allocations, and that big number will be determined. In this institution, Democrats and Republicans alike—and, again, we haven't seen it in the last 2 years, unfortunately, because we shut down the appropriations process; but

we are this year going to allow Members the opportunity, allow Members under a privileged resolution on the appropriations bills, to actually participate in establishing those priorities. That is going to be a joint effort.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself 15 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

Our priority is to get the economy back on track and create jobs. We know very well that getting our fiscal house in order is going to be essential if we are going to have the job creation that both Democrats and Republicans want.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for his very useful guidance, but let me just tell you this: The fact of the matter is, in the spring, we will begin the budget process in the Budget Committee. We are now dealing with fiscal year 2011.

As the chairman knows, there was a budget resolution in effect at the end of the last Congress that had a number in it. You chose not to extend it. Now, for the first time ever, you have asked this House—every Member—to surrender his or her responsibility on the number to one person. That is budget malpractice, and it also cedes our responsibility as Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman's dramatically raising the level of a simple two-paragraph House resolution that is the first step in a process that will allow the Budget Committee to do its work, to allow the appropriators and, through the appropriators, the full House—Democrats and Republicans alike—to establish those priorities.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I will yield in just a second.

So I would say to my friend that we do very much want, Mr. Speaker, to have a chance for this institution—and I hope Democrats will join in support of H. Res. 38 when it's voted on tomorrow—to go on record, demonstrating the institution's commitment to having heard the message from the American people.

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

Mr. DREIER. Out of respect for my friend, I yield myself 15 seconds and I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. My question, Mr. Chairman, is simple: Do you think it makes a difference to the process whether the number that ends up being here is \$120 billion, which may mean a 30 percent across-the-board cut, or do you think it matters that it's \$100 billion or \$80 billion?

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, I will say, Mr. Speaker, that across-the-

board cuts is not something that is being considered here. We are pursuing 2008 levels, and I believe that that's what this resolution says. We hope very much that we can get to lower levels of spending, and I suspect that some Members on the other side of the aisle will want to join us in working together in that effort so we can get our fiscal house in order.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. I would remind my colleagues, when they read the resolution, it is 2008 levels or less, so it muddles the number even more.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I oppose this resolution. I oppose it because I think its provisions with respect to our own economic recovery and the production of jobs is offset tremendously by its passage.

But I want to focus my time on the limited question but the very important question of what is in and what is not in security funding, because security funding, as has been pointed out, is exempted from the requirements to go back to fiscal year 2008 functions or less.

The chairman of the Rules Committee, when asked at the Rules Committee whether foreign assistance, diplomacy, and development were part of security—was that part of the exemption?—he said no.

My definition—me, DAVID DREIER, chairman of the Rules Committee, out of which this resolution comes—is as we have outlined in here: This is discretionary spending—that is non-security spending—other than defense, military construction, VA, and homeland security.

I assume the gentleman's interpretation is one he still holds to less than a week later.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I will say to my friend that that is the definition of "security spending": defense, homeland security, VA, and military construction.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. BERMAN. Thank you.

Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman for reaffirming that position. Now let's take a look at what that means.

That means not exempt from these drastic cuts are: weapons in training to build the capacity of key partners in the fight against terror in Yemen, in Pakistan, in the Philippines. That's all part of our security assistance package, part of our international affairs budget; financing for the purchase of U.S. military equipment to ensure Israel's qualitative military edge; defense items and services that enable other countries to cooperate with us on counterterrorism.

In Afghanistan, they're cuts that would mean an end to the civilian

surge. It would force the military to perform civilian jobs. The reductions would harm four Provincial Reconstruction Teams and forward operating bases, security forces and police training, explosive ordnance disposal, counternarcotics and poppy eradication programs.

In Iraq, the state programs that would be harmed by virtue of the gentleman's definition of "non-security funds" that have to be dramatically cut back are: training for Iraqi police and security forces to take over when the U.S. troops depart; funding for our Special Inspectors General in Iraq and Afghanistan to ensure that programs are designed to achieve maximum impact and are properly managed and implemented.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 15 seconds.

Mr. BERMAN. Everything the gentleman has stood for in his years in Congress is going to be undermined by virtue of what he is proposing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, which provides for consideration of a resolution to reduce what is being called "non-security" spending to 2008 levels.

That resolution, H. Res. 38, sends a very damaging message that the Congress will not stand up to protect those programs that are absolutely essential to jobs and the economy. It also rejects a key principle that military leaders and Presidents of both parties have clearly recognized: Foreign assistance and diplomacy are essential to United States national security.

That principle has been honored on a bipartisan basis ever since the tragic events of September 11, 2001. On that terrible morning, Americans woke to the realization that while the Cold War was over, their safety and security could be threatened by much less sophisticated means. The ideologies and the weapons of terror could not be thwarted by military power alone.

In 2004 the Republican-controlled Congress passed the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act by a vote of 336-75. It was supported by all the Members who are now in positions of leadership in this body. The Speaker, the Majority Leader and the Budget Committee Chairman all voted for it.

The bill, now Public Law 108-458, states: "Long-term success in the war on terrorism demands the use of all elements of national power, including diplomacy, military action, intelligence, covert action, law enforcement, economic policy, foreign aid, public diplomacy, and homeland defense."

It continues: "To win the war on terrorism, the United States must assign to economic and diplomatic capabilities the same strategic priority that is assigned to military capabilities."

In fact, the portion of the bill that makes these findings is known as the "9/11 Commission Implementation Act of 2004." It states: "The legislative and executive branches of the Government of the United States must commit to robust, long-term investments in all of the tools necessary for the foreign policy of the United States to successfully accomplish the goals of the United States."

All of the tools necessary—that includes diplomacy and foreign assistance, which would be slashed under this resolution. The 9/11 Commission Implementation Act of 2004 goes on to say that these investments "will require increased funding to United States foreign affairs programs."

In May of this year, Admiral Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote to then-Speaker PELOSI regarding proposed cuts to the international affairs budget. The opening paragraph stated: "We are living in times that require an integrated national security program with budgets that fund the full spectrum of national security efforts, including vitally important pre-conflict and post-conflict civilian stabilization programs."

He was reinforcing a message that had also been communicated, on several occasions, by Secretary Gates, when he wrote: "The diplomatic and developmental capabilities of the United States have a direct bearing on our ability to shape threats and reduce the need for military action. It is my firm belief that diplomatic programs as part of a coordinated strategy will save money by reducing the likelihood of active military conflict involving U.S. forces."

Admiral Mullen penned a personal note at the end, which read: "The more significant the cuts, the longer military operations will take, and the more and more lives are at risk!"

President Bush, when sending up his war-time supplemental request in FY 2006, integrated diplomatic and military spending. He asked Congress to provide "the Resources to Win the War on Terror."

The message from our military leadership, this Congress, and even former President Bush is clear: U.S. civilian agencies must be fully resourced to prosecute the fight against terror effectively. A cut to the 150 budget harms U.S. national security and puts American lives at risk.

And yet, the Chairman of the Rules Committee explained, during consideration of this resolution, that "security spending" does not include diplomacy and development. He said, "No, my definition, my definition is, as we have outlined in here, this is discretionary spending other than defense, military construction, V.A. and homeland security." The resolution itself does not define what is security or non-security, but the authors say they do not consider diplomacy and development part of our national security budget.

Before voting on this resolution, I would urge my colleagues to think about what the practical implications would be of major cuts in the international affairs budget.

In 2008, the vast majority of U.S. assistance to Iraq was provided by the military. This year, at long last, we are withdrawing the remainder of our troops, and handing over the job to civilians. If we cut our diplomatic and development budget for Iraq, then all the investments we've made, and all the American lives that have been lost, will be in vain.

The civilian presence costs only a tiny fraction of what we were spending on the military. But this resolution would make that civilian presence impossible. The proposed cuts will mean snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

Returning to the past would also mean violating our Memorandum of Understanding with Israel, under which we pledge to help Israel maintain its qualitative military edge against



those who seek its destruction. Do my colleagues suggest we renege on our commitment to Israel?

In Afghanistan and Pakistan, we cannot defeat violent extremism by military power alone. As Secretary Gates recently said, “without development we will not be able to be successful in either Iraq or Afghanistan.” Our military strategy in Afghanistan is often described as “clear, hold, and build.” How can we succeed if there is no one to do the holding and the building?

Foreign assistance programs protect us even outside the areas of active combat or potential conflict. Our efforts to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS and other deadly diseases, counter the flow of illegal narcotics, prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, reduce human misery and halt environmental destruction, all help to protect the safety and security of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we can't afford to go back to the isolationist, unilateralist policies of the past. Cutting spending to 2008 levels takes us back to a period when America's standing in the world was at an all-time low.

Whether it's finding new markets for U.S. goods and services, addressing climate change, sharing the burden of peacekeeping, enforcing sanctions against Iran, or improving travel and communications, we need to build strong international relationships.

We all remember the period when the United States tried to go it alone, unwilling to cooperate with other countries and demonstrate global leadership.

We've finally begun to turn that all around. Let's not go back to the bad old days when the U.S. turned away from the rest of the world, and lost so much of its influence and respect.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the very difficult budget and economic situation that confronts us. There is no doubt that well-crafted reforms will help us to use our foreign assistance dollars more effectively and efficiently, and ensure that aid reaches those who need it. That is why I am continuing my efforts to develop legislation to modernize our foreign assistance policies and programs.

But what we need to do, as one conservative blogger has suggested, is to “mend it, not end it.” Comparatively speaking, diplomacy and development don't cost much, and save us money over the long run.

International affairs funding helps promote U.S. exports and saves U.S. jobs. Our economy can't grow without creating and expanding new markets abroad. Our diplomats help to identify export opportunities, help American companies navigate foreign political systems, and level the playing field for American products around the globe.

We should also keep in mind that international affairs accounts for just one percent of the budget. Even if we eliminated such spending entirely, it wouldn't balance the budget and it wouldn't make a dent in our national debt. But it would devastate our economy and our national security.

As Secretary Gates said last fall, “Development is a lot cheaper than sending soldiers.”

In places like Haiti and Sudan, we provide assistance not only for purely humanitarian reasons, but also because a failure to do so could lead to chaos and bloodshed that would be far more costly in the long run.

Going back to 2008 levels of global AIDS funding would mean ending antiretroviral treat-

ment for people who are currently receiving it. It would mean abandoning pregnant women who run a high risk of transmitting HIV to their newborns. It would mean fewer orphans and vulnerable children will get care and support, and fewer people in poor countries will get HIV counseling and testing.

President Bush made clear not only the need to not cut funding, but to make greater investments in these programs when he wrote, just a few months ago, “there are millions on treatment who cannot be abandoned. And the progress in many African nations depends on the realistic hope of new patients gaining access to treatment. . . . On AIDS, to stand still is to lose ground.”

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the most obvious and damaging implications of reducing the international affairs budget to 2008 levels. This resolution would set the stage for reckless cuts that endanger our national security, abandon our national interests and throw Americans out of work, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members will suspend.

Members should bear in mind that the Official Reporters of Debate cannot be expected to transcribe two Members simultaneously.

Members should not participate in debate by interjection and should not expect to have the reporter transcribe remarks that are uttered when not properly under recognition.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my friend that I very much appreciate his recognizing the commitment that I have had to security through foreign assistance programs and to make it very clear that, again, we are just beginning a process today. We are beginning a process today that will allow this House to work its will. It is obvious that going to 2008 levels is not going to gut all of the very important national security aspects that we have of foreign assistance programs. My friend knows very well, Mr. Speaker, that it is essential that we get our fiscal house in order, and this is the first step on a road towards doing just that.

With that, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1820

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying that this is not the way we should deal with the budget. And transparency, I will tell my Republican friends, means

knowing what the budget number is. I don't know why that's such a radical idea. And accountability means that everybody in this House should be able to vote yes or no on whatever that number is. It shouldn't be up to one person to unilaterally determine that number. This budget process that the Republicans have put together politicizes unnecessarily a budget process and sets, I think, a lousy precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will modify this rule to provide that immediately after the House passes this rule it will take up an amendment to exempt cuts in funding for the FBI's counterterrorism program. My Republican colleagues said they won't cut programs that protect our Nation's security, but the resolution itself doesn't even bother to define “non-security spending.” And the definition I have heard from the other side of the aisle would not include the FBI's counterterrorism program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a “no” vote on the previous question will allow the House to consider an amendment exempting cuts in funding to the FBI's counterterrorism program, an amendment that will ensure we do not sacrifice our Nation's security in this post-9/11 world.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “no” on the previous question so that we can ensure that we continue to protect this Nation from terrorism.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this institution, Democrat and Republican alike, knows full well that the American people are hurting. We have an unemployment rate that is at 9.4 percent. We have, in my State of California, a 12½ percent unemployment rate. I see my friend Mr. LEWIS here on the floor. In the Inland Empire of California, the unemployment rate is 15½ percent. People are out there making very, very tough decisions, and the economic uncertainty that exists today is playing a big role in diminishing the kind of investments that we need to create jobs.

This resolution is a very simple one. It says that we shouldn't spend money we don't have. We shouldn't spend money we don't have. That's what we're saying as we begin this process. Those are the decisions that families are making all across this country. They're not spending money they don't have. In fact, we've seen, because of this economic downturn, lots of families today saving more than they have

in the past because they don't want to get themselves into this position that the Federal Government is.

We're going to have to make some tough choices around here. It's not going to be easy. No one is saying that it's going to be easy. But this resolution that we're going to debate tomorrow, H. Res. 38, simply says that we are going to go to 2008 levels or less, because frankly 2008 levels, as far as I'm concerned, were too high. I believe that we need to cut back even more.

Now we continue to hear this argument that we are going to decimate research into very important diseases out there. We began the debate, as I said in the opening, not going there, but we did go there. And, as I said, if you can't prioritize, you end up demonizing and creating this great deal of fear that is out there. Or the FBI is going to close down if we go to '08 spending levels. Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously that is not the case. This institution is not about to undermine the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But we do know that with adequate oversight—which is our constitutional responsibility—and focusing, yes, on those three things that Democrats and Republicans alike say—waste, fraud and abuse—we will be able to rein in this behemoth.

Again, it's going to be tough, but this resolution is just the first step in a 2-year process to get our economy growing, create jobs, and to rein in the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government so that we can encourage individual initiative and responsibility.

So Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule. And tomorrow, when we bring the resolution, H. Res. 38, to the floor, I urge their support of this measure. I hope very much that we will have Democrats joining with Republicans for this very commonsense approach to do exactly what these 87 new Members on our side of the aisle—and I suspect even some of the nine new Members on the Democratic side of the aisle—have come here to do, and that is to rein in this wasteful government spending that we have seen.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H. Res. 43, "A rule providing for consideration of the Republican Budget-less Resolution."

Through the American Recovery Act of 2009 (stimulus bill), Congress threw out a massive lifeline to save Americans who were on the verge of losing their jobs and to create jobs for those who were unemployed. We have received numerous reports from our constituents and the Administration of the positive impact the stimulus funding is having on our economy. Yet, we know there is still more work to do. This bill will undermine and erode the many sacrifices Americans have made to adjust to the downturn in the economy. This bill is turning America backwards in the wrong direction.

The new proposal of the House Republican Study Committee (RSC) to cut and then freeze non-defense discretionary spending at 2008 levels from 2012 through 2021 would mean cuts of more than 40 percent in edu-

cation, environmental protection, law enforcement, medical research, food safety, and many other key services.

For example, the U.S. Environmental Protection Administration (EPA) funding at the FY2008 enacted level instead of the FY2010 enacted level would result in a decrease \$2.83 billion—\$7.46 billion enacted for FY2008 vs. \$10.29 billion enacted for FY2010. The majority of this decrease below the FY2010 appropriations would be the result of a \$2.04 billion decrease within the State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) account, and a \$665.8 million decrease within the Environmental Programs and Management (EPM) account.

The decrease within the STAG account would be attributed primarily to funding for capitalization grants for the Clean Water and the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds (SRFs), although numerous other grants also are funded within this account. The SRF funding specifically supports local wastewater and drinking water infrastructure projects, such as construction of and modifications to municipal sewage treatment plants and drinking water treatment plants, to facilitate compliance with the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act, respectively.

Furthermore, the EPM account funds a broad range of activities involved in EPA's development of pollution control regulations and standards, and enforcement of these requirements across multiple environmental media, such as air quality and water quality.

This proposal would represent the deepest annual cut in funding for these programs in recent U.S. history. It would remove substantial purchasing power from a weak economy, thereby costing hundreds of thousands of jobs and raising risks of a double-dip recession.

If imposed across the board, such a cut would mean 42 percent less for healthcare for veterans; 42 percent less for K–12 education; 42 percent less for protecting the environment; 42 percent less for the FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration, and border security; 42 percent less for the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 42 percent less for food safety and inspection; and so on.

Specifically, in my Congressional District, the 18th Congressional District of Houston, Texas, two active Light Rail construction projects are underway. These projects exemplify urban mobility, jobs, economic prosperity, energy independence and sustainable growth for the city of Houston. The projects are commonly referred to as the North Corridor Line and the Southeast Corridor Line. It is critical that these projects continue so that the construction can proceed and the benefits of the new service can be available to the traveling public as soon as possible. In the FY2011 appropriations legislation that passed the House of Representatives, we were able to secure \$150 million for Houston METRO. However, we were unable to preserve this funding in the legislation that passed the Senate, which resulted in the Continuing Resolution passed by Congress at the end of last year not including this funding or any other funding for specific New Starts projects for Houston METRO. I want to ensure that my constituents are in a position to feed their families, to secure employment and further his or her education by preserving this important funding.

I represent an international energy hub and global business city. Twenty-six companies on

the 2010 Fortune 500 list maintain their headquarters in Houston and many more have administrative operations located in Houston. More than 3,000 firms conduct international business in over 200 countries, making Houston a truly global city. Houston is also a burgeoning leader in the information technology, nanotechnology, aerospace, and health care industries.

To adopt this resolution would be crippling my District and eliminating the guarantee through these projects of thousands of jobs for Houstonians. It is factual that Houston's expertise in global business and energy will provide the southwest region with an economic boost that will ensure the United States remains an international economic leader.

Consequently, the House majority, of course, could decide to meet its overall target for non-defense discretionary spending while protecting one or more of the programs and services listed above. But, a cut of less than 42 percent in, say, education or environmental protection would necessitate even more draconian cuts in, say, food safety and border security.

Our Border States are frustrated and in need of targeted assistance. Over the last year, I attended a number of different hearings, meetings with local and state officials, and press conferences on immigration, combating the drug trade, and improving the border, and in almost all instances, I have heard the same comment: Border States are frustrated. The deeply misguided Arizona Law, (SB 1070) for example, is an expression of that frustration. Unless we want to see more of a backlash, we in the federal government must do more to help our Border States, which are vital to securing our nation and upholding our immigration laws, and helping local and state officials secure our Border States.

The United States continues to fight the battle against the powerful drug trafficking organizations that have plagued our sister cities just across the border with violence. We have been fortunate thus far that for the most part the violence has not spilled over into the United States, but we cannot depend on being insulated forever. Instability abroad, especially on the border, is a danger to stability at home, and we have a vested interest in helping our neighbors to the southwest combat the criminal organizations that have threatened the safety of their citizens and brought drugs into our country.

First of all, we need to provide more "boots on the ground" to help secure our borders. While deterrence through additional personnel is essential to improving security, several members of the law enforcement community have also stressed the importance of providing more resources for investigators and detectives, who can help to ferret out and dismantle the criminal activities taking place on our borders.

Moreover, while federal agencies have improved their coordination with the Border States, communication within local and state authorities continues to be problematic. Communication in disperse rural areas presents a particular challenge. At a hearing on the Merida Initiative, I heard the moving testimony of a rancher from rural Arizona, Mr. Bill McDonald. He pointed out how a lack of resources and a rapid turnover rate make communication extremely important, but extremely

lacking. These rural areas, and the people who live there, are in many cases the most vulnerable to human traffickers and drug traffickers.

There is a desperate need for Border States to receive the necessary support to effectively secure our borders from threats and ensure a safe and stable environment for our border residents. More robust, well funded, and well resourced law enforcement systems are exactly what our Border States and residents demand.

It is quite disappointing that we cannot accurately evaluate this resolution because it does not really provide a clear breakdown of the \$100 billion in cuts it claims for the 2012 budget. The first \$80 billion in savings would be to "Replace the spending levels in the continuing resolution (CR) with non-defense, non-homeland security, non-veterans spending at FY 2008 levels." That, obviously, is incredibly vague.

This legislation would end federal subsidies for Amtrak, which basically means the end of train travel in the United States. This resolution would end federal involvement in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which would, as Ezra Klein says, likely plunge the mortgage securitization market into chaos and send housing prices skidding again. It would repeal the federal support for state Medicaid budgets that has plugged the gap for many states with budgets hit hard by the recession, meaning many poor people would likely lose their access to medical care.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposition to H. Res 43.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, which provides for consideration of a resolution to reduce what is being called "non-security" spending to 2008 levels.

That resolution, H. Res. 38, sends a very damaging message that the Congress will not stand up to protect those programs that are absolutely essential to jobs and the economy. It also rejects a key principle that military leaders and Presidents of both parties have clearly recognized: Foreign assistance and diplomacy are essential to United States national security.

That principle has been honored on a bipartisan basis ever since the tragic events of September 11, 2001. On that terrible morning, Americans woke to the realization that while the Cold War was over, their safety and security could be threatened by much less sophisticated means. The ideologies and the weapons of terror could not be thwarted by military power alone.

In 2004 the Republican-controlled Congress passed the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act by a vote of 336–75. It was supported by all the Members who are now in positions of leadership in this body. The Speaker, the Majority Leader and the Budget Committee Chairman all voted for it.

The bill, now Public Law 108–458, states: "Long-term success in the war on terrorism demands the use of all elements of national power, including diplomacy, military action, intelligence, covert action, law enforcement, economic policy, foreign aid, public diplomacy, and homeland defense."

It continues: "To win the war on terrorism, the United States must assign to economic and diplomatic capabilities the same strategic priority that is assigned to military capabilities."

In fact, the portion of the bill that makes these findings is known as the "9/11 Commission Implementation Act of 2004." It states: "The legislative and executive branches of the Government of the United States must commit to robust, long-term investments in all of the tools necessary for the foreign policy of the United States to successfully accomplish the goals of the United States."

All of the tools necessary—that includes diplomacy and foreign assistance, which would be slashed under this resolution. The 9/11 Commission Implementation Act of 2004 goes on to say that these investments "will require increased funding to United States foreign affairs programs."

In May of this year, Admiral Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote to then-Speaker PELOSI regarding proposed cuts to the international affairs budget. The opening paragraph stated: "We are living in times that require an integrated national security program with budgets that fund the full spectrum of national security efforts, including vitally important pre-conflict and post-conflict civilian stabilization programs."

He was reinforcing a message that had also been communicated, on several occasions, by Secretary Gates, when he wrote: "The diplomatic and developmental capabilities of the United States have a direct bearing on our ability to shape threats and reduce the need for military action. It is my firm belief that diplomatic programs as part of a coordinated strategy will save money by reducing the likelihood of active military conflict involving U.S. forces."

Admiral Mullen penned a personal note at the end, which read: "The more significant the cuts, the longer military operations will take, and the more and more lives are at risk!"

President Bush, when sending up his wartime supplemental request in FY 2006, integrated diplomatic and military spending. He asked Congress to provide "the Resources to Win the War on Terror."

The message from our military leadership, this Congress, and even former President Bush is clear: U.S. civilian agencies must be fully resourced to prosecute the fight against terror effectively. A cut to the 150 budget harms U.S. national security and puts American lives at risk.

And yet, the Chairman of the Rules Committee explained, during consideration of this resolution, that "security spending" does not include diplomacy and development. He said, "No, my definition, my definition is, as we have outlined in here, this is discretionary spending other than defense, military construction, V.A. and homeland security." The resolution itself does not define what is security or non-security, but the authors say they do not consider diplomacy and development part of our national security budget.

Before voting on this resolution, I would urge my colleagues to think about what the practical implications would be of major cuts in the international affairs budget.

In 2008, the vast majority of U.S. assistance to Iraq was provided by the military. This year, at long last, we are withdrawing the remainder of our troops, and handing over the job to civilians. If we cut our diplomatic and development budget for Iraq, then all the investments we've made, and all the American lives that have been lost, will be in vain.

The civilian presence costs only a tiny fraction of what we were spending on the military.

But this resolution would make that civilian presence impossible. The proposed cuts will mean snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

Returning to the past would also mean violating our Memorandum of Understanding with Israel, under which we pledge to help Israel maintain its qualitative military edge against those who seek its destruction. Do my colleagues suggest we renege on our commitment to Israel?

In Afghanistan and Pakistan, we cannot defeat violent extremism by military power alone. As Secretary Gates recently said, "without development we will not be able to be successful in either Iraq or Afghanistan." Our military strategy in Afghanistan is often described as "clear, hold, and build." How can we succeed if there is no one to do the holding and the building?

Foreign assistance programs protect us even outside the areas of active combat or potential conflict. Our efforts to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS and other deadly diseases, counter the flow of illegal narcotics, prevent proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, reduce human misery and halt environmental destruction, all help to protect the safety and security of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we can't afford to go back to the isolationist, unilateralist policies of the past. Cutting spending to 2008 levels takes us back to a period when America's standing in the world was at an all-time low.

Whether it's finding new markets for U.S. goods and services, addressing climate change, sharing the burden of peacekeeping, enforcing sanctions against Iran, or improving travel and communications, we need to build strong international relationships.

We all remember the period when the United States tried to go it alone, unwilling to cooperate with other countries and demonstrate global leadership.

We've finally begun to turn that all around. Let's not go back to the bad old days when the U.S. turned away from the rest of the world, and lost so much of its influence and respect.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the very difficult budget and economic situation that confronts us. There is no doubt that well-crafted reforms will help us to use our foreign assistance dollars more effectively and efficiently, and ensure that aid reaches those who need it. That is why I am continuing my efforts to develop legislation to modernize our foreign assistance policies and programs.

But what we need to do, as one conservative blogger has suggested, is to "mend it, not end it." Comparatively speaking, diplomacy and development don't cost much, and save us money over the long run.

International affairs funding helps promote U.S. exports and saves U.S. jobs. Our economy can't grow without creating and expanding new markets abroad. Our diplomats help to identify export opportunities, help American companies navigate foreign political systems, and level the playing field for American products around the globe.

We should also keep in mind that international affairs accounts for just one percent of the budget. Even if we eliminated such spending entirely, it wouldn't balance the budget and it wouldn't make a dent in our national debt. But it would devastate our economy and our national security.

As Secretary Gates said last fall, “Development is a lot cheaper than sending soldiers.”

In places like Haiti and Sudan, we provide assistance not only for purely humanitarian reasons, but also because a failure to do so could lead to chaos and bloodshed that would be far more costly in the long run.

Going back to 2008 levels of global AIDS funding would mean ending antiretroviral treatment for people who are currently receiving it. It would mean abandoning pregnant women who run a high risk of transmitting HIV to their newborns. It would mean fewer orphans and vulnerable children will get care and support, and fewer people in poor countries will get HIV counseling and testing.

President Bush made clear not only the need to not cut funding, but to make greater investments in these programs when he wrote, just a few months ago, “there are millions on treatment who cannot be abandoned. And the progress in many African nations depends on the realistic hope of new patients gaining access to treatment. . . . On AIDS, to stand still is to lose ground.”

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the most obvious and damaging implications of reducing the international affairs budget to 2008 levels. This resolution would set the stage for reckless cuts that endanger our national security, abandon our national interests and throw Americans out of work, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the debate on the reduction of non-defense and security spending, a visit to recent history reveals a telling connection between our soaring debt and the two wars our country is waging.

The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation estimates that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost the average American family of four almost \$13,000 last year. We know from our constituents when we return to our districts that the average American family of four cannot afford that. They cannot afford to pay for wars that undermine our national and moral security. Many families can barely afford to stay in their homes.

Nobel Prize winning economist and author of *The Three Trillion Dollar War*, Joseph Stiglitz, says that there is “no question that the Iraq war added substantially to the federal debt. This was the first time in American history that the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by borrowing. The global financial crisis, he says, was due at least in part to the war.”

If this sounds familiar, it is because we are pursuing the same policies today. The ramifications of our spending on the Iraq War—soaring oil prices, federal debt and a global economic crisis—were during a time when the resources dedicated to Iraq were much greater than those being dedicated to Afghanistan. The commitment of an additional 30,000 troops and a continually slipping withdrawal date commits us to an endless war and an endless stream of borrowed money. It commits us to seemingly endless economic insecurity.

Moving past the costs of waging war, there are the costs of providing returning veterans with the care they need. When these costs are factored in, the costs of health care and benefits for veterans significantly increases the \$3 trillion price tag to nearly \$5 trillion.

It is time to question the way we enhance our national security and our economic secu-

urity. It will be a grave mistake to miss this opportunity.

The facts tell us that the policies we have been pursuing in recent years have led us further from the very goals we claim to be working toward. The facts tell us that it is fiscally irresponsible to continue defense spending at current rates.

By ignoring this responsibility—by pretending that it doesn’t exist—we fail to heed the lessons from our economic decline. The costs of maintaining the status quo are great. The moral and human costs are even greater.

The material previously referred to by Mr. McGOVERN is as follows:

Strike the last sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following:

“The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their respective designees; (2) an amendment if offered by Representative McGovern of Massachusetts or a designee to ensure that FBI Counterterrorism funding is considered security spending, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.”

(The information contained herein was provided by Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Repub-

lican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair until 6:30 p.m., a period not longer than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MACK) at 6 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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