



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 2012

No. 51

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARPER).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 28, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GREGG HARPER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### THE TIME TO REBUILD AMERICA IS NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation winds down from its military engagements overseas, it's time for America to do some nation-building here at home.

A \$1.2 trillion investment in rebuilding American roads, bridges, transit, and water systems would create 27 million jobs over 5 years. In the first year alone, the economy would add 5.2 million new jobs and grow by over \$400 bil-

lion. In the second year, unemployment would be reduced to 5.6 percent. These are among the findings of the New America Foundation report, "The Way Forward."

Nearly every expert agrees that America's infrastructure is broken and is in need of immediate repair and replacement. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave America a D grade for infrastructure quality. It is estimated that \$2.2 trillion is needed to bring our Nation's infrastructure to good repair. The World Economic Forum ranks the United States 23rd in infrastructure quality. Transportation for America reports that there are 69,000 structurally deficient bridges nationwide, including 2,000 in New York and 99 in western New York alone.

In fact, every second of every day, seven cars drive on a bridge that is structurally deficient. Dangerous road conditions were a significant factor in one-third of all traffic fatalities last year, and Americans spent 4.2 billion hours stuck in traffic due to congestion, costing \$78 billion, or \$710 for every American motorist.

The 1987 collapse of the Schoharie Creek Bridge in New York killing 10 people and the 2007 collapse of the Minneapolis bridge killing 13 people are tragic reminders of the human costs associated with deteriorating infrastructure.

The economic costs are staggering, too. The United States Chamber of Commerce says that the Nation will lose \$336 billion in economic growth in the next 5 years due to inadequate infrastructure. One local example: in January, the New York State Department of Transportation closed a crucial bridge in Springville, New York, due to concerns about its safety, and the weeks-long closure was devastating to local businesses.

The time to rebuild America is now. Actually, it's right now. The cost of borrowing money is at a historic low

rate. The interest rates on 5-year debt is less than 1 percent. The Treasury Department is considering negative interest rates, meaning that investors will actually pay the Federal Government to buy United States debt.

The question is not whether to undertake this work. Public infrastructure is a public responsibility. The question is when to undertake this work. The cost acceleration of delaying road and bridge repair increases by 500 percent after only 2 years. Put simply, a \$1 million road repair project today not undertaken will cost \$5 million in 2014; a \$5 million bridge repair project will cost \$25 million in 2014. What's more, a 5-year \$1.2 trillion program would create such robust economic activity that it would generate an additional \$600 billion in Federal tax revenues, that is to say that our country would be purchasing \$1.2 trillion in investment for infrastructure for nearly half off.

The United States has spent \$76 billion rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan, a population of 30 million people, and \$63 billion rebuilding Iraq, a population of 27 million people. Both of these nation-building efforts were deficit financed. And as they took money out of the American economy, they actually undermined American economic growth and employment.

And for America, a population of over 300 million, the House is considering a 5-year \$260 billion transportation bill, or \$52 billion each year for the next 5 years, on average. That's less in any given year than we spent in both Afghanistan and Iraq.

Rebuilding our Nation's roads and bridges will support private sector American businesses. Construction trade jobs average approximately \$70,000 a year, and these jobs can't be outsourced to China or Mexico.

HELMETS TO HARDHATS

Mr. HIGGINS. I began this morning by talking about the wars in Iraq and

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1643

Afghanistan. Let me now say something about our returning veterans.

The unemployment rate for returning veterans under the age of 24 is an unacceptably high rate of 38 percent. A good and grateful Nation owes it to these veterans to ensure that they return home to economic opportunity.

The Department of Defense sponsored a program back in 2002 called Helmets to Hardhats to accelerate apprenticeship training and job placement for these returning veterans. Helmets to Hardhats is now a nonprofit organization working with 15 construction trades and over 80,000 American businesses.

Mr. Speaker, it is the right time to make a robust investment to repair our outdated and failing infrastructure. There's a lot of work to be done, and a lot of Americans need to be put to work.

#### BULLYING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening, I was watching the weekly Fox television program entitled "Huckabee." Bullying was the featured issue.

Mr. Speaker, bullying has become a severely significant issue in some schools across our country.

Bullies, with limited exception, select their targets or victims in this manner: the victims are smaller in physical stature than are the bullies and are usually younger in years.

The victims of bullying become depressed and embarrassed, resulting in physical and emotional damage. One young lad became so distraught that he died by his own hand. Yes, he took his own life because of the damage that bullying had inflicted upon him.

The "Huckabee" program, in addition to having interviewed a bullying victim and his family, featured as well the director of the recently released movie entitled "Bully." I urge you all to see this movie.

Mr. Speaker, I want to insist that bullies are punished at their schools by their parents and are prosecuted as juveniles if they are still minors.

We should cut no slack to bullies. They deserve no slack. If exposure could link the bullies to the aforementioned suicide, perhaps that should be pursued as well.

Mr. Speaker, this bullying plague must be resolved, but it will be resolved only when the bullies receive the punishment they deserve.

#### PUERTO RICO SNAP RESTORATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today I'm introducing the Puerto Rico SNAP Restoration Act.

In 1971, Congress enacted legislation to partially include Puerto Rico in what is today called the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, and what was then called the Food Stamp program.

□ 1010

Implementation of the Food Stamp program in Puerto Rico began in 1974. In 1977, Congress amended Federal law to fully include Puerto Rico in the Food Stamp program so that rules governing eligibility and benefits applied no differently on the island than they did in the 50 States. Four years later, however, Congress exercised its authority under the Territory Clause and removed Puerto Rico from the Food Stamp program, electing to provide the island government with an annual block grant instead. Since 1982, Puerto Rico has used this block grant to administer its Nutrition Assistance Program, which differs from SNAP in a number of material respects.

The bill I'm introducing today, which I will seek to include in the 2012 farm bill, would reinstate the SNAP program in Puerto Rico in place of the block grant.

If this bill is enacted into law, Puerto Rico would join the 50 States, the District of Columbia and two U.S. territories—Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands—as jurisdictions fully participating in SNAP. My decision to file legislation converting Puerto Rico back to SNAP was made after carefully weighing the benefits and costs associated with this conversion. I relied primarily upon an in-depth study prepared by the USDA which evaluated the feasibility and impact of reinstating SNAP in Puerto Rico. On this subject, as with other important issues that I'm tackling, I have adhered to the principle that it is essential to build a strong evidentiary record prior to taking legislative action.

The USDA report is comprehensive and raises a number of important policy questions, but its bottom-line message for Puerto Rico is crystal clear, namely, while there are some trade-offs associated with the conversion to SNAP, the benefits of conversion far outweigh the costs.

Let me be more specific. Applying certain assumptions, the USDA study found that conversion would increase the number of households that receive nutrition assistance in Puerto Rico by over 15 percent. An additional 85,000 households would become eligible for assistance under SNAP. Moreover, restoring SNAP would raise the average monthly benefit by participating households by nearly 10 percent. And instituting equal treatment for Puerto Rico under SNAP would mean an additional \$457 million in Federal spending for the island each year, over 90 percent of which would take the form of additional benefits.

These numbers reveal a fundamental truth: because Congress removed Puerto Rico from SNAP 20 years ago, hun-

dreds of thousands of needy children, families, and seniors on the island have received no nutrition assistance at all or have received far fewer benefits than they would have received if they lived in the 50 States or even in the neighboring Virgin Islands.

Accordingly, Puerto Rico's exclusion from this program serves as yet another example of how the American citizens I represent, especially my most vulnerable constituents, are treated unequally because of the island's territory status.

Whether I'm fighting to convert Puerto Rico back to SNAP or to increase the island's annual block grant, I strongly believe this is a fight worth making. By ensuring that the neediest of my constituents can afford a healthy diet, we enable them to lead a dignified and independent life, which in the long run helps reduce health care costs and takes pressure off other safety net programs.

#### THE RYAN BUDGET AND THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, this is an important week for the future of our Republic. In this Capitol, we are debating and voting on budgets, laying out our visions for how we should handle the spending, taxing, and debt issues facing America in the coming years. Across the street at the Supreme Court, they're debating what, if any, limits can be placed on the Federal Government's power to regulate under the Commerce Clause of our Constitution.

But, really, we're talking about the same thing: Do we still live under a Federal Government of limited and enumerated powers? Do we believe that the source of our government begins in "We the people"? Do we believe in liberty? Do we trust people to make their own decisions about their own lives without reliance on, or subservience to, an all-knowing and all-powerful central government in Washington? Are there limits on what Washington can demand of the citizens that it's supposed to be serving? Republicans believe that the answer to these questions is a resounding "yes."

The budget put forth by Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee shows that it is possible for this Congress to offer solutions to the challenges of the modern world that are rooted in limited government, individual freedom, and the Constitution. It is our responsibility to govern and to offer the people an alternative to the do-nothing attitude of the Senate Democrat leadership or the business-as-usual, tax-spend-and-borrow budget offered by the President.

The arguments being made by the plaintiffs against the individual mandate are that the Constitution is not

dead, that at least one party in Washington and a majority of the country still believe that the Constitution means what it says, and that there are limits on the power of Congress and of the executive branch.

I'm energized and hopeful for the future of this great Republic as I see these events unfold this week, and I'm reminded of the observation of President Reagan:

I hope we once again have reminded people that man is not free unless government is limited. There's a clear cause and effect here that is as neat and predictable as a law of physics: as government expands, liberty contracts.

#### THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today the clock is ticking here in Congress and especially on the floor of the House where people around the country would like to be preparing for the next construction season. Indeed, the most important action for the economy, for job creation, and for strengthening the livability of our communities might well be enacting the Surface Transportation Act. Sadly, so far, the news has not been good.

Later today, we debate the House Republican budget, which would slash infrastructure funding to a level less than is required simply to meet obligations for contracts that we've already entered into with people that are building roads, bridges, and transit systems. And we have an obligation to them. They're down that path and the budget sadly would not even allow the Federal Government to meet its partnership obligation.

There's more bad news as we see the Republican leadership can't come to grips with what would be required to move the transportation authorization bill forward. Last month, they offered up what has been characterized as the worst transportation bill in history. It was partisan, and it was unbalanced. It would have overturned two decades of transportation reform, undercut transit and the vital enhancement programs that communities have used to improve the quality of life and stretch their transportation resources. It even attacked bike and pedestrian programs, eliminating Safe Routes to School for our children.

Well, luckily, it collapsed under its own weight. They were afraid to even have a hearing on it before it came to the floor, and then they found out that there wasn't an opportunity to pass it. The support wasn't there in the face of united opposition around the country from people who care about transportation. At the same time, the Senate has given us a balanced and bipartisan bill. Seventy-four Members of the other body voted for it and passed it over to us.

I would hope that there is time for us to stop playing partisan ideological games with this vital transportation bill. The headlines that the Republican maneuvering has done is an embarrassment to Speaker BOEHNER and to Chairman MICA. But not just to the Republican leadership; it's an embarrassment to the House.

□ 1020

I'm sorry that my Republican friends and colleagues can't seem to agree amongst themselves about a path forward. They cannot get 218 Republican votes for any bill, even the Speaker's proposal. The good news is they don't have to. There are 435 Members of the House. If they would work in a bipartisan basis, as we have done in the past, we can stop this short-term roulette; we can give the construction industry, local government, and people in the private and public sector the certainty they need for not just this construction cycle, but the next construction cycle. We can put tens of thousands of people to work, bolster the economy, and do what Congress needs to do, what Congress has done always until this point.

I hope the Republican leadership, before we leave this week, will at least allow the bipartisan Senate bill to come to the floor to be voted on. I'm confident that a majority will support it, and we'll meet our obligations to keep America moving and the economy growing.

#### ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, all-of-the-above energy. It's a plan first introduced by House Republicans when gas prices spiked during the summer of 2008. For the 2 years prior, congressional Democrats were following a green energy plan only, doing their best to completely eliminate the traditional forms of energy like petroleum, natural gas, and coal that account for 83 percent of our energy consumption.

When President Obama took office in 2009, he took up their flag and began pushing for his controversial cap-and-trade law that even he admitted would mean electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. He appointed an Energy Secretary that admitted on national TV that he wanted our gas prices at European levels. Well, they're both on their way. Since then, energy costs have doubled, gas prices have skyrocketed, and we are in a crisis in this country when it comes to our energy use.

Just as we saw in the summer of 2008, when these gasoline prices spiked and our energy costs rose, the price of everything else is soon to follow. When his cap-and-trade bill failed to get enough support in a Democratic-controlled Congress, he set out to have the

EPA basically regulate the bill into law.

Over the last 3 years, the EPA has issued some of the most costly regulations on power plants in their history. By 2016, the Utility MACT regulation is expected to cost \$9.6 billion annually in direct costs, and some analysts estimate its total indirect costs closer to \$100 billion. The Cross-State Air Pollution Rule is expected to impact over 1,000 power plants across the country, and, by the EPA's own estimates, it's estimated to cost \$2.8 billion annually.

With no business experience in this administration, I don't think they realize that when the cost of doing business goes up, business prices go up; and that affects every hardworking American taxpayer at the pump. When he turns on a light at home, when he buys a loaf of bread, when he goes to buy a U.S.-manufactured product, it costs.

According to the President's own Commerce Department, the Boiler MACT regulation in itself is expected to cost between 40,000 and 60,000 jobs. The impact of these regulations is already being felt. Last month, two utility companies announced the closing of 10 of their power plants as a direct result of some of the strict new regulations—another move that will raise the price of electricity for consumers.

Yet it seemed as though the President had finally come around when he said in his State of the Union speech earlier this year, right here in this room: This country needs an all-out all-of-the-above energy strategy that develops every available resource of American energy.

It's not often that I agree with the President, but at that point I did.

Unfortunately, the President hasn't stayed true to his words. In fact, just yesterday the EPA announced their latest set of regulations that will effectively ban the building of any new coal-fired power plants by dramatically decreasing carbon dioxide emissions.

Whether the President and environmentalists like it or not, coal currently accounts for almost half of the electricity generated in this country. Effectively eliminating coal-fired power plants is only going to increase the cost of electricity to American families.

We can no longer allow the White House to say one thing and do another when it comes to energy. If the President truly supports the Republican all-of-the-above energy strategy as he claimed he did, then he needs to follow through.

It's time we start to take advantage of all of the God-given natural resources this country has and to have American-made energy, American-made power that will power this Nation.

#### U.S.-AFGHANISTAN POLICY IN SHAMBLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Afghanistan is as bleak as I can remember at any point in the last 10½ years that we've been at war.

In recent months, we've seen the burning of the Koran by American troops, a video of soldiers urinating on bodies of dead Afghans, spontaneous riots in the Afghan streets protesting the continued U.S. occupation, as well as deadly attacks by Afghan soldiers on the U.S. and NATO forces that are there to help and to train them.

And now, in the most grotesque tragedy imaginable, 2 weeks ago a U.S. staff sergeant left his base, walked more than a mile to an Afghan village outside Kandahar, going door-to-door and systematically gunning down 17 civilians.

The New York Times reported that one Afghan farmer was visiting a nearby town for the day and returned home to find that his wife, four sons, and four daughters had all been murdered in the attack. And here's the irony: According to the Times' account, because the Taliban still lingered in the area, the farmer had been concerned about moving his family back to this part of southern Afghanistan last year, but he was reassured by the very fact that he would be near an American military base.

With these latest atrocities, how can we expect President Karzai, a reluctant ally under the best of circumstances, to continue to cooperate? How do we expect to convince the Taliban to come to the negotiating table for a peace and reconciliation settlement? And most importantly, after this incident, how do we convince the people of Afghanistan that we are their friends, that our presence in their country is a force for good?

Staff Sergeant Robert Bales will be tried for these unspeakable crimes, but I also think any responsibility analysis would conclude that he is also a victim of the war. He was on his fourth deployment. He clearly suffered from posttraumatic stress disorder, or even worse, mental health affliction. He clearly had no business being on active duty.

Mr. Speaker, more than a decade of war is weakening and wreaking havoc with the bodies and minds of our servicemembers. Staff Sergeant Bales will be held to account. But what about the cruel and unforgiving war machine that absolutely has to bear some responsibility? When are we going to finally set warfare aside and embrace a SMART Security approach?

Yesterday, 80 retired top military leaders took out an ad in Politico calling for robust investment in development, diplomacy, and other civilian efforts that will do a lot more than military force to keep America safe. And yet the Republican budget we'll debate later today cuts that very foreign aid in humanitarian programs.

□ 1030

When will we learn, Mr. Speaker? How bad does it have to get?

Our Afghanistan policy is an absolute shambles, and the American people know it. The latest polling shows more than two-thirds, 69 percent, believe we shouldn't be waging this war.

This is the moment we must realize that this mission has no hope of succeeding, that the only humane and responsible course is to end the war at once. This is the moment, finally, after all the tragedy and mayhem, to bring our troops home.

#### STOP MILITARY RAPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to highlight the epidemic of sexual assault and rape in the military.

Next week will mark the 1-year anniversary of my first floor speech on this issue. That day, I told the story of Technical Sergeant Mary Gallagher, who was raped by a coworker while deployed in Iraq. The week leading up to the rape, Sergeant Gallagher's assailant harassed her, stalked her, and attempted to break into her room.

Though she twice reported the assailant's threatening behavior, her command did nothing about it. They called it a "he said-she said" scenario. Justice was not served.

I've told the story of Army Specialist Blake Stephens, who was consistently assaulted and sexually harassed by the men in his unit. He reported the harassment to command, but no action was taken. Fellow servicemembers later sodomized him with a bottle; and the only punishment his assailants received was extra pushups. Justice was not served.

Last week, I told the story of Marine Lieutenant Elle Helmer, who reported repeated sexual harassment by superiors, to no avail. The Marine Corps did absolutely nothing in response to the harassment. Lieutenant Helmer was later raped by another superior whose behavior went unpunished.

Her command ultimately told her, "You're tough. You need to pick yourself up and dust yourself off. I can't babysit you all of the time. No justice was served."

Mary, Blake and Elle, like so many victims I've heard from, paint a picture of a military culture that treats sexual harassment and assault with silent acceptance, a culture that punishes victims for reporting the crimes committed against them.

The military refutes this; yet evidence suggests just the reverse. The "Hurt Feelings Report" that stands beside me is a repugnant example of how rape and sexual assault has been trivialized, and how a victim was mocked in the military.

It was supposed to be satire. The "report" was posted on the Facebook page

of a female captain in charge of the Marine Barracks Protocol Office just a few months ago. It mocks fellow marines who file sexual assault complaints with a list of "Reasons for filing this report," which include options such as:

"I'm a little b——."

"I'm a little p——."

"I'm a cry baby."

And "I want my mommy."

And what did the head of protocol do when she saw this document? Did she report or punish the people who made it? Did she tell them there is zero tolerance for this behavior?

No, she didn't do anything of the sort. In fact, the head of protocol wrote this caption to the image on her Facebook page: "My marines crack me up."

It's no wonder that only 13 percent of victims of rape and assault are brave enough to report the crimes committed against them. The "Hurt Feelings Report" and the Facebook response convey a toxic culture when it comes to sexual harassment, assault, stalking and rape. Victims have been told to "get over it," or told that they were "asking for it" based on the way they dress.

One year ago, I promised to tell the stories of servicemembers who survived rape and sexual assault while in the military. I said then, and I promise you now, that I will tell their stories until meaningful action is taken to eliminate the chasm between the number of estimated sexual assaults and the number of prosecuted sexual assaults.

I urge survivors to email me at [stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov](mailto:stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov) if they want to speak up.

#### THE DEATH OF TRAYVON MARTIN IS AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, the death of Trayvon Martin is, indeed, an American tragedy. Too often this violent act that resulted in the murder of Trayvon Martin is repeated in the streets of our Nation.

I applaud the young people all across the land who are making a statement about hoodies, about the real hoodlums in this Nation, particularly those who tread on our laws wearing official or quasi-official clothes.

Racial profiling has to stop, Mr. Speaker. Just because someone wears a hoodie does not make them a hoodlum.

The Bible teaches us, Mr. Speaker, in the book of Micah 6:68—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. RUSH. These words:

He has shown you, O man—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair must remind Members of clause 5 of rule XVII. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. RUSH. What is good. What does the Lord require of you? To do justly

and to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God.

In the New Testament, Luke 4:18-20 teaches us these words:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He has anointed me to proclaim the good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. RUSH. And to recover sight to the blind, to set the oppressed free.

I urge all who hear these words to heed these lessons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is no longer recognized.

\* \* \*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will ask the Sergeant at Arms to enforce the prohibition on breaches of decorum.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind Members that clause 5 of rule XVII prohibits the wearing of hats in the Chamber when the House is in session. The Chair finds that the donning of a hood is not consistent with this rule. Members need to remove their hoods or leave the floor.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, America has the best health care system in the world.

Long before coming to Congress, I spent my energy in the life and health insurance field. In selling individual contracts, I found that questions of preexisting conditions and portability were a major concern for people buying individual health insurance contracts.

Over the years, I became convinced that these two major challenges could be solved by breaking down the walls between the individual States. This would provide a much larger pool of applicants, thus allowing for a much more reasonable base to underwrite the cost of covering those preexisting conditions and allowing for more effective portability.

□ 1040

When we debated how to solve the problems affecting our health care system 2 years ago, many were warned that government would go too far and must not be the solution. Our former Speaker said, "We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it." Well, now we know what is in it, and it's time to speak up.

Mr. and Mrs. America, do not allow a federally mandated program to undermine the best health care system in the world. Do not allow a Federal mandate to get between you and your physician. Do not allow government to undermine your right to choose between

the great variety of protection available in the marketplace. Do not allow a politically appointed board to ration health care in the name of reducing costs. Do not allow the Federal Government to take us down the pathway to socialized medicine. Do not allow us to be dominated by those who would have America look more and more like Europe.

So, Mr. and Mrs. America, it's time for all of us to come together. We can solve the problems of our existing health care system without allowing a bunch of unelected bureaucrats getting between you and great health care.

You need to tell Congress to do their job—solve the problems without destroying the best health care system in the world.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Reverend Dennis Culbreth, First Baptist Church, Jasper, Alabama, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, I want to thank You so much for the privilege we have to pray to You today. You are the Creator of all. It is through You that we can have hope and we can have grace.

Father, You have blessed our country as no other country has been blessed. I pray, Lord, that You will never let this body forget Your goodness and Your mercy to us all. Guide these legislators in such a way that Your will is promoted throughout the world.

Continue to use our country as a beacon on the hill. It is because of Your mercy our country is a light of hope shining in a lost and a dark world.

Dear Lord, please let us never take this freedom for granted. As these representatives gather from across the Nation, we ask for Your guidance and for Your wisdom as these men and women seek to make decisions that affect the lives of every American here at home and across the world.

And this I pray in Jesus' name, amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. REYES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agree to the request of the House of Representatives that the Senate return to the House the bill (H.R. 5) "An Act to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system."

#### WELCOMING REVEREND DENNIS CULBRETH

THE SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor and my privilege this afternoon to welcome our guest chaplain, Dennis Culbreth, who gave today's opening prayer.

Dr. Culbreth, as senior pastor, serves a congregation of 2,400 at First Baptist Church in Jasper, Alabama. Prior to his tenure at First Baptist Church in Jasper, he served congregations across Alabama, Virginia, and Georgia.

In addition to his service within his congregation, Dr. Culbreth has also been an active member of the senior executive leadership team for the North American Mission Board and the Virginia Baptist Convention.

Dr. Culbreth earned his bachelor of arts at Samford University, his master's in divinity at the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and his doctorate at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

He is a native of Evergreen, Alabama, and enjoys spending time with his family—his wife, Marybeth, and children

Andrew, Matthew, and Grace—as well as playing an occasional round of golf.

Dr. Culbreth is a devoted and inspired leader in our community, and it's a privilege to have him here today to be with us and to give our opening prayer.

It's my honor to serve him, his family, and his congregation in the Fourth Congressional District of Alabama.

Again, I welcome Dr. Culbreth to the United States House of Representatives this afternoon.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The Chair will now entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### CONVICTED RAPIST COLLECTS MONEY FROM VICTIM

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the white ribbon campaign's theme is "No Excuse for Abuse."

Crystal Harris was raped by her abusive husband, and it was not the first time he hurt her, abused her, or even threatened her. But this particular crime and rape was caught on tape. So, Shawn Harris was convicted and sent to prison for 6 years. It sounds like justice prevailed. The outlaw was put away. But that's not the rest of the story.

A judge ordered that once the sex offender husband gets out of jail for rape, the victim must pay him \$1,000 a month in spousal support and, get this, she has to pay the legal bills for the divorce—his legal bills.

The victim has to pay the rapist. It should be the other way around. The criminal should be paying Crystal restitution because rape is never the fault of the victim, and a victim never owes the perpetrator anything.

No judge, no law should force victims to financially support convicted rapists because there is no excuse for abuse.

And that's just the way it is.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the chaplain of the day asked God to look over this Congress. I ask God and think the preacher should have asked for direction a little bit further, to look over the Supreme Court, because the Supreme Court has in its hands the Affordable Care Act.

A report was just issued yesterday that said in my home city of Memphis, African American women are twice as likely to die of breast cancer than Caucasian women. That's unacceptable.

Part of that is because they don't get the health care they need. The Afford-

able Care Act will see to it that everybody gets access to affordable health care, that there won't be a disparity of twice as much for the cost of insurance for women than men, and that mammograms will be offered to people, ladies, without a co-pay.

If the Affordable Care Act passes, that disparity in health between white women and black women in my city and in America will end. That is wrong.

Part of what's happened in my city is a vestige of Jim Crow, and even though those laws have been repealed, we still suffer from them, and there is a lot in the Affordable Care Act that will end those. I hope the Supreme Court rules on the side of life.

#### RESTORE THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

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

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today, I introduced H.R. 4232 with my colleague from Ohio, Congressman TIM RYAN.

The Restore the Freedom of Information Act is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that would make it easier for American taxpayers seeking information from the Federal Government's multibillion-dollar bailout programs.

When the executive branch ceases to function as an arm of the government and begins taking ownership of private enterprise, they should not be able to hide behind the Freedom of Information Act restrictions and keep secret their dealings and the use of taxpayers' dollars.

In the auto bailout, the administration actively took away the pensions of Delphi's salaried retirees and now refuses to release documents to tell the taxpayers how this happened.

Mr. Speaker, whether it's the auto industry, the financial sector, or even a future bailout, taxpayers deserve access to this information, and H.R. 4232 will do just that. The Restore the Freedom of Information Act will ensure that the administration can not continue to hide its decisions from public scrutiny and deny American taxpayers the access they deserve.

□ 1210

#### BUDGETS ARE ABOUT VALUES

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, budgets are about values. The budget we are about to debate today, the Republican budget, does not reflect American values. It is a budget for the survival of the fittest. It cuts the highest tax bracket from 35 percent to 25 percent. That's going to add \$5 trillion to the debt. In order to compensate for that, this budget cuts \$5.7 trillion in domestic discretionary spending.

If this budget were ever to become law, it would push back all the progress we've made over generations in terms of malnutrition, in terms of poverty rates, in terms of protecting our seniors. It is a budget that would make Charles Darwin blush. It is a budget not worthy of this House, and it is a budget I hope will be resoundingly rejected because of the values that do not reflect America at its best.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO THE MAMMOTH SPRING HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise today to recognize the achievements of the Mammoth Spring High School boys' basketball team.

This season, the Bears went 36 and 7 and claimed Arkansas' Class 1A State Championship trophy after defeating the Sacred Heart Rebels by a score of 42-39. This is the first ever State championship victory for the boys' basketball team, and it is a great source of pride for the Mammoth Spring community.

I would like to commend Head Coach Jeremy Cude for leading his team to a State championship. Additionally, I would like to recognize players Mason Brown, Seth Brown, Joby Busch, Wayne Coffey, Houston Cooper, Craig Hoover, J.D. Major, Tyler Mullins, Josh Parker, Ryan Roberson, Cortley Rutledge, Dylan Skaggs, A.J. Smith, Matt Turnbough, and Garrett Wooldridge for the leadership they have shown.

Great accomplishments like a State championship don't happen without a great deal of dedication. The Mammoth Spring Bears and their head coach have put Mammoth Spring on the map and have brought a great deal of pride to their community. Now that the boys' basketball team has brought a State championship trophy home to Mammoth Spring, I have no doubt that the players will set new, even higher goals to achieve.

Congratulations once again to the Bears and to the entire Mammoth Spring community for their State championship victory.

#### CESAR E. CHAVEZ

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

Mr. REYES. Today, I proudly stand and join with millions of Americans in remembering the life and legacy of one of our greatest civil rights pioneers in our Latino community, Cesar Chavez.

An advocate for social justice, Cesar Chavez dedicated his life to giving voice to those who couldn't speak for themselves. Cesar Chavez advocated for strong health care for communities. He advocated for good-paying jobs from

which people could lead the kinds of lives that our country cherishes and honors.

Cesar Chavez was a Navy veteran who, perhaps, during World War II was disappointed in the way that segregation existed in the armed services; but it gave him the passion to go out and do the kind of work that today we celebrate: a legacy that was adopted by President Obama from the words of Cesar Chavez, who always thought, “Si, se puede.” Yes, we can.

So, today, I proudly stand here and remind us that we have so much to be grateful for from those who have advocated in our respective communities—Cesar Chavez, Martin Luther King, and so many others.

#### OBAMACARE

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. President Obama’s ObamaCare plan not only raises many constitutional questions, but it is creating an environment where younger Americans, like my little nephew, Preston James Hunter, who was born last night, will be forced to live in a world with less choice and higher health care costs.

As the cost of health care rises, we are seeing that taxpayers are on the hook for even more money. We all know that this bill pulled \$500 billion out of Medicare, and now we’re learning that over the next few years the States are going to have to pay another \$620 billion for Medicaid expenditures. Yes, \$620 billion for Medicaid expenditures. In Tennessee, my home State, TennCare estimates that the health care law will increase TennCare enrollment by 242,291 people. That is at an extra cost of \$225 million a year. Those are just the estimates.

While the President and Democrats in Washington are raiding Medicare, Republicans in the House are fighting back and are working to protect Medicare for our seniors. As for the job-killing aspect of ObamaCare, we now find 20 new and increased taxes that are in this bill, taxes that are affecting American families and employers.

We simply cannot afford a forced health care plan that doesn’t work, that raises taxes, and that many Americans believe is unconstitutional.

#### CESAR E. CHAVEZ

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of a great civil activist, Cesar E. Chavez. This week, we celebrate the life of a man who symbolizes dignity and respect and who would have turned 85 years old on March 31.

He was a farm laborer, a leader, a co-founder of the United Farm Workers, and a veteran. He brought social jus-

tice to migrant workers and communities, which included better pay, improving housing, outlawing the child labor law, and human dignity. He achieved all of this through the use of nonviolence.

For over 10 years, I have worked to create a national holiday to commemorate Cesar Chavez. Please join me in celebrating the life of a great American hero by supporting my legislation, House Resolution 130, which designates the fourth Friday of every March as Cesar E. Chavez Day.

Martin Luther King, Jr., once telegraphed Cesar Chavez with a message: “Our separate struggles are really one—a struggle for freedom, for dignity, and for humanity.”

The legacy of Cesar Chavez will continue to inspire not only Latinos but people across our Nation who believe in the American Dream. “Si, se puede”—yes, we can.

#### INVESTING IN DOMESTIC ENERGY

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Chicagoland region hit a record—a record high for gas prices. Gas is \$4.51 a gallon in the 10th District of Illinois and is about \$4.67 in the city of Chicago. At a time when family budgets are stretched to their limits, rising gas prices are contributing to many things, including that of rising food prices and skyrocketing bills at the pump.

My energy plan includes investing in domestic energy and in implementing an all-of-the-above approach because these are bipartisan ideas that we can and should support. Not only will this help reduce our dependence on foreign oil, but it will help create jobs right here at home and lower the cost of energy for small businesses and families across the country.

We must continue to explore environmentally friendly forms of energy while utilizing the resources we have here at home. Let’s come together on this important issue so that hardworking taxpayers and hardworking families can be assured that we are listening and are putting their concerns above political rhetoric.

#### COMMENDING PRESIDENT OBAMA’S COMMITMENT TO MIDDLE CLASS SECURITY

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, over the past 3 years, President Obama has passed legislation, has introduced crucial programs, and has offered important tax incentives to restore economic security to middle class families across our Nation.

Immediately after assuming office, President Obama created a middle

class task force that is targeted at raising middle class living standards and at giving the middle class a voice in the White House. President Obama also expanded small business loan programs in order to give small business owners access to credit and in order to boost job creation. He also extended the 2010 payroll tax cut through 2012 to give the average working family \$1,000 a year and to give increased Federal student aid to low-income college students.

Mr. Speaker, I commend President Obama’s bold leadership and vision, and I commend him for his commitment to restoring economic security for our middle class families across America.

#### FISCAL SOLVENCY UNDER THE REPUBLICAN HOUSE BUDGET

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Our Nation is currently standing at a critical crossroads. Should Washington weigh deeper into the red or should we continue cutting spending and get our Nation on the track towards fiscal solvency under the House Republican budget, which cuts more than \$5 trillion while preventing the President’s tax increases?

In addition to paving the way for our Nation to get back on track towards economic security and prosperity, the Republican budget also puts forward bipartisan solutions to save and strengthen Medicare for current seniors and for our children and grandchildren.

Under our current trajectory, Medicare will be bankrupt in just a decade. This plan preserves current Medicare plans for those in and nearing retirement while offering guaranteed coverage options for future seniors, including those with preexisting conditions or tough health histories. It is financed by a premium support payment which would provide more assistance to low-income and less healthy seniors. The Medicare plans will compete against one another, which ultimately will create lower costs and a better quality of care.

The budget refuels our economy to create an environment for businesses to grow jobs with fundamental tax reform, protects the security of health and retirement plans, and begins to reduce our deficit now to leave our children with a country free from debt.

□ 1220

#### REJECT THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROPOSAL

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget proposal offered by Mr.



RYAN of Wisconsin. My home State of Rhode Island has one of the highest unemployment rates in the country. My constituents need commonsense solutions that will create jobs and get our country back on the right track, not another extreme proposal from the House Republican leadership.

Unfortunately, this budget proposal would give the wealthiest Americans an average tax cut of \$150,000 while slashing important support for middle class families and investments that we need to grow our economy. And once again, House Republicans are proposing to end the Medicare guarantee for our seniors; in this case, by replacing it with a voucher program that would not be guaranteed to keep pace with rising health care costs, which could result in higher costs for our seniors and less quality of care.

I urge my colleagues to reject this proposal.

#### WHITE RIBBON CAMPAIGN

(Ms. BUERKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BUERKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out about an important issue that faces our society: domestic violence and sexual abuse. Our country has a moral obligation to stand up against those who exploit power to commit violence against men, women, and children.

In an effort to raise awareness about domestic violence and sexual abuse, my district kicked off the White Ribbon Campaign last week. The White Ribbon Campaign is led by men and encourages all members of the community—men and women, young and old—to join in their efforts. This male leadership helps to acknowledge the important contributions men have made towards this effort and invites others to take a role.

From March 23 to April 1, thousands of my constituents in central New York will be wearing a white ribbon or a white wristband to raise awareness about domestic violence and sexual violence. I encourage my House colleagues to join me in wearing a white ribbon to put a spotlight on this very important issue. Wearing the white ribbon demonstrates a personal pledge never to commit, condone, or remain silent about violence against men, women, or children.

#### FAMILY HEALTH INSURANCE

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the health of women and their families is threatened. It's threatened not only by a Supreme Court case across the street but by the Republican budget right here in the House.

The Affordable Care Act law protects women from being charged more for health insurance for simply being a

woman, and it allows women to get health coverage and not be denied because giving birth may be considered a preexisting condition. And it helps families—mothers and fathers—have a little bit of peace of mind in raising their children.

Last Friday in my district, I met with Kathy Estrada and her son Nick. Kathy and her husband have worked hard and are doing the best they can to raise their son. But as a young man in his twenties, Nick is building a life, and it's incredibly expensive to buy health care insurance. He is a skateboarder, and she used to lay awake at night worrying that something might happen to him out on the streets and she wouldn't be able to take care of him because he couldn't be on her insurance. But because of the affordable care law, Kathy can rest easier because Nick can be covered on her insurance policy. The affordable care law is today helping women and families of all ages across the country, and that's the way it should continue.

#### MEDICARE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, imagine you come to a fork in the road. You look on your GPS, and you see that the path to the left leads to an old bridge that is falling into the river. The path on the right leads to a brand-new bridge that is guaranteed to get your car over the river. Obviously, everyone would go over the new bridge.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to Medicare, we have a GPS provided to us by the Medicare trustees. They clearly say that if we stay on the same road, Medicare will be broke by 2024. Republicans want to provide a new bridge that protects and preserves the program for current and future retirees, a program that gives future seniors the option to stay in traditional Medicare or to choose a new plan that best fits their needs.

Unlike current Medicare, the Republican plan provides greater benefits for low-income and sick seniors and requires more from wealthy seniors. The Medicare trustees have put up a bright orange sign saying: "Bridge Out Ahead." We can either heed their warnings and turn down a new path or plow right through and end up in the river.

#### MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues here in the House to take action and create jobs by bringing Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century, or MAP-21, to the House floor for a vote.

Yesterday, for the second time this week, the Republican leadership pulled

a short-term highway extension bill. Time is running out, and the ninth extension will be expiring this Saturday, March 31. If Congress does not act by Saturday, millions of construction jobs will be at risk. Gas taxes will not be collected, which can add up to over \$90 million a day.

Two weeks ago, MAP-21 successfully passed the Senate with a bipartisan vote of 74-22. While it is not a perfect bill, MAP-21 is fully paid for and is estimated to save 1.8 million jobs and create up to 1 million more jobs. While I would prefer a 5-year transportation bill, MAP-21 is legislation that both Republicans and Democrats can support. A transportation bill will not only improve our infrastructure but will provide jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to bring to the floor MAP-21 for a vote.

#### WE HAVE ONE MORE OPPORTUNITY TO SAVE MEDICARE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity over at the Supreme Court to witness the oral arguments on the individual mandate. I believe I could tell from the faces of the Justices that there was significant skepticism about this provision of the Affordable Care Act. You know, if we were smart, that skepticism could open the way for thoughtful alternatives by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to preserve and protect Medicare. Speaker PELOSI last year cut \$500 billion from Medicare, and the President has placed his bet on a bureaucratic control board, the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

A trustees' report from a year ago suggested that the Medicare trust fund will be exhausted in less than a decade. That doesn't seem like a viable way forward. We've got a budget resolution up this week to preserve and protect Medicare. The Republican action ensures access to care in the future. This House has voted to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, and maybe the Senate should take up the same action.

We have to reduce the spending that diverts thought and effort from patient care and free up resources to focus on these patients. We are committed to protecting our seniors and Medicare, lowering the deficit, and creating a workable system that allows for good doctors to help more patients.

#### REMEMBERING ANTHONY DEJUAN BOATWRIGHT

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

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Speaker, it's with sadness that I rise to honor the life of Anthony Dejuan Boatwright, who



passed away at the age of 11 Sunday night. Juan was 14 months old when he was left alone at his day care center, fell into a bucket of water and bleach, and suffered irreversible brain damage. At that time, there was no law requiring Georgia licensed day care centers to carry insurance or even let parents know that they didn't carry insurance. That meant that despite being awarded a \$30 million jury verdict, Juan's family couldn't collect the money needed to care for Juan's life over the past 11 years.

Juan's mother, Jackie, has led a courageous effort to correct this injustice. And in 2004, Georgia enacted a law requiring that day care centers disclose their insurance status. Last Congress, Juan and Jackie's fight led the House to pass the Anthony Dejuan Boatwright Act so that families across America would never again experience the same tragedy.

During the last 11 years, Juan inspired a movement to protect the safety of children everywhere. Juan, your mother and I thank you for your life. You will be missed, but your legacy lives on.

#### AMERICAN-MADE ENERGY TO POWER THIS NATION

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the President's road to "Regulation Nation" is truly never ending. Just yesterday, the EPA announced their latest set of regulations which will effectively ban the building of any new coal-fired power plants. This regulation comes on the heels of some of the most costly regulations in the history of the EPA, including the Utility MACT and Boiler MACT rules. He promised that his energy policies would mean "electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket," one promise the President has kept.

Coal is one of our most plentiful resources. Over 50 percent of our energy is provided by coal. We can no longer allow the White House to regulate this country into an energy crisis. It's time we start to take advantage of all the God-given natural resources this country has and have American-made energy power this Nation.

□ 1230

#### OPPOSE THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I'm troubled by the Republican budget's effect on health care, specifically the provisions that would eliminate the Affordable Care Act. Passing the Republican budget would be detrimental to the health of citizens across the United States, but it's particularly harmful to women.

As we mark the anniversary of the Affordable Care Act, we can measure its successes by the benefits that women have already realized: preventive care is guaranteed, gender rating will soon be gone, and access to contraceptives has expanded. This expansion is important for all women, not just those women who use contraceptives for birth control.

My colleagues will share stories of women who have been put at risk by this budget. I would like to share the story of Julie, an Oregonian whose contraceptives are important to her health on a daily basis to treat endometriosis. Without contraceptives, Julie would suffer from extreme pain and the risk of infertility. Under the Republican budget, her access to this medication could be in jeopardy.

It is unconscionable to deny women access to treatments that can improve the quality of their lives, and I urge my colleagues to stand up for women and oppose the Republican budget.

#### THE EPA IS OVERSTEPPING ITS BOUNDS

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAPITO. I rise today to bring attention once again to this administration's assault on our domestic energy production.

For the past 3 years, I've been saying many times from this very podium that the EPA is overstepping its bounds and regulating where it cannot legislate and costing us American jobs.

Last Friday evening, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia overruled the EPA's veto of the Spruce Mine's Clean Water Act permit. The decision stated—and this is a quote from the judge—that the EPA's veto was "unprecedented" and it had acted in a manner that was "arbitrary, capricious, and not in accordance with the law." Could there be a clearer sign that we've been subjected to an overreach of Executive power?

This decision is a win for West Virginia, but we have a long way to go because the administration's so-called energy policies have led to higher gas prices and higher heating prices.

We're blessed to have abundant natural resources in this country, particularly in my State of West Virginia, but this becomes irrelevant if this administration continues to hold these domestic resources hostage. All-of-the-above means following the law.

#### MEDICARE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many people are smiling about the argument in the Supreme Court on the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, but I will tell you those children born with sickle cell and asth-

ma are praying that ObamaCare survives. Those elderly persons who fall into the doughnut hole with Medicare part D are praying for ObamaCare to survive. I am as well, Mr. Speaker, because I believe in a humanitarian approach in service to our Nation: Help those who cannot help themselves.

As we look forward to a vigorous debate on this Republican budget, I hope that we stand together against ending Medicare, destroying jobs, and moving forward on the lopsided help that we give to the wealthy over the poor.

#### VICTIMIZING THE VICTIM

I also want to say that Trayvon Martin's parents were here yesterday, and I want to stand against victimizing the victim. We say to them in a forceful way that it is important for justice to be done, that justice is to assure the arrest of Mr. Zimmerman, who will not be alleged guilty but will be innocent until proven guilty.

Now is the time to heal this Nation and to recognize that this case must move forward with justice for a little boy.

#### MEDICARE

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, Senator LIEBERMAN, an Independent from Connecticut, said: "The truth is we cannot save Medicare as we know it. We can save Medicare only if we change it."

I agree with Senator LIEBERMAN.

My mother is on Medicare, and I want to ensure care for our senior citizens by maintaining this program for those currently on Medicare and preserving it for future generations.

Our budget, which we will vote on tomorrow, saves Medicare for current and future generations with no disruptions for those in and near retirement.

Our reforms are not partisan. In fact, they are based on a bipartisan proposal by Chairman RYAN and Senator RON WYDEN, a Democrat of Oregon.

I urge my colleagues to support the GOP budget tomorrow because failure to take action to save this program today poses the greatest threat to the health and retirement security of America's seniors.

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, for too long, women have faced discrimination at the hands of insurance companies who label pregnancy as a pre-existing condition and then deny coverage or charge more for it.

Erin from Chicago writes:

When I found out I was pregnant, I had full insurance coverage. I was told, however, that I did not have a pregnancy rider and therefore my pregnancy would not be covered.

How can I pay for health insurance that will not cover a vital part of a woman's life? I was asked if I wanted to purchase the rider that would not take effect for over 365 days.

Thanks to ObamaCare, insurers will no longer be able to get away with this. Beginning in 2014, insurers cannot deny or charge more for any preexisting condition, and that would include pregnancy.

#### A DEJA VU BUDGET

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. It's deja vu all over again.

Simply put, the Ryan-Romney Republican budget ends Medicare. AARP said: "The proposal lacks balance and jeopardizes the health and economic security of older Americans."

The budget we will consider this week fails the test of balance, fairness, and shared responsibility. It showers the few Americans that are the very wealthy with an average tax cut of at least \$150,000, while preserving giveaways to Big Oil companies and Wall Street CEOs.

What's worse is that all these tax breaks would be paid for by ending Medicare and cutting education, basic research, and new sources of energy.

Obviously, this budget rejects all of our American values.

This is not the first time the other side has tried to end Medicare. They tried it last year, too. The American people rejected the Ryan proposal then and they will reject this latest attack on our middle class now.

#### THE 2013 BUDGET AND MEDICARE

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Budgets are about priorities. I think it should be about helping people climb the ladder of opportunity so they can live a good middle class life, the American Dream.

But the Republican budget hurts the middle class. It provides billions in tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, Big Oil, and special interests. Millionaires get an extra \$150,000 in their pockets in tax cuts.

How do the Republicans pay for this? This is how:

They take some by slashing education and leaving 10 million students with less money for college. They steal some from our future economy, gutting investments in science and technology. But Republicans do the most damage to seniors. They end the Medicare guarantee. They shift medical costs to seniors. They basically let Medicare wither on the vine.

These aren't my priorities or those of the American people. That's why I oppose the Republican budget.

□ 1240

#### JUSTICE FOR TRAYVON MARTIN

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I rise to thank those Members and witnesses who joined together yesterday to discuss the tragic shooting of Trayvon Martin: Representatives CONYERS, JACKSON LEE, BROWN, BARBARA LEE, RICHMOND, NADLER, JOHNSON, GREEN, QUIGLEY, RUSH, DEUTCH, YVETTE CLARKE, DANNY DAVIS, CARSON, MEEKS, SEWELL, RICHARDSON, WATERS, CHU, and COHEN.

I cannot tell you how comforting it was, Mr. Speaker, to his parents and to everyone there to see such sharp, very strong support from this body. Together, we can continue to apply pressure in this case of Trayvon Martin, a little boy from my district, District 17, Miami-Dade County, Florida; and together we can make a difference. Thirty-two days and still no justice.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

#### OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS, AS THE BIRTHPLACE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1339) to amend title 32, United States Code, the body of laws of the United States dealing with the National Guard, to recognize the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1339

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. OFFICIAL DESIGNATION OF SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS, AS THE BIRTHPLACE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 1629, Captain John Endicott organized the first militia in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in Salem.

(2) The colonists had adopted the English militia system, which required all males between the ages of 16 and 60 to possess arms and participate in the defense of the community.

(3) In 1636, the Massachusetts General Court ordered the organization of three militia regiments, designated as the North, South, and East regiments.

(4) These regiments drilled once a week and provided guard details each evening to sound the alarm in case of attack.

(5) The East Regiment, the predecessor of the 101st Engineer Battalion, assembled as a regiment for the first time in 1637 on the Salem Common, marking the beginning of the Massachusetts National Guard and the National Guard of the United States.

(6) Since 1785, Salem's own Second Corps of Cadets (101st and 102nd Field Artillery) has celebrated the anniversary of that first muster.

(7) As the policy contained in section 102 of title 32, United States Code, clearly expresses, the National Guard continues its historic mission of providing units for the first line defense of the United States and current missions throughout the world.

(8) The designation of the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States will contribute positively to tourism and economic development in the city, create jobs, and instill pride in both the local and State communities.

(b) DESIGNATION OF SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS, AS NATIONAL GUARD BIRTHPLACE.—In light of the findings made in subsection (a), the City of Salem, Massachusetts, is hereby designated as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(1) MILITARY CEREMONIAL SUPPORT.—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau, in conjunction with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Council of Governors, and the Adjutant General of the State of Massachusetts, shall provide military ceremonial support at the dedication of any monument, plaque, or other form of official recognition placed in Salem, Massachusetts, celebrating the designation of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States.

(2) FUNDING SOURCE.—Federal funds may not be used to design, procure, prepare, install, or maintain any monument, plaque, or other form of official recognition placed in Salem, Massachusetts, celebrating the designation of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States, but the Adjutant General of the State of Massachusetts may accept and expend contributions of non-Federal funds for this purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1339, recognizing the city of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States. I would like to thank my colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN TIERNEY, for bringing this measure before the House, and I'm honored to be a cosponsor of this legislation with him.

It was in 1629 that Captain John Endicott organized the first militia in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in Salem and that all males between the ages of 16 and 60 participated in the defense of that community. Each week, this first regiment diligently practiced drill and provided guard detail to protect the colony throughout each night. This militia, and those that followed, would come to play a significant role in the Revolutionary War and all conflicts that have followed.

Today, the National Guard continues its proud mission of providing units for the first line in defense of our great Nation at home and throughout the world. By designating the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States, we hope to see positive tourism and economic developments in the city, a city already recognized throughout the world as one of immense historical significance.

But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this resolution will instill pride in both the local and State communities in their rich patriotic heritage and properly recognizes the critically important role that the National Guard has played in defense of our Nation and its citizens since the earliest days of our Nation.

As the oldest component of the Armed Forces of the United States, the services our National Guard has provided our country are innumerable and immense. I'm honored to be here today to be part of the history in the formal recognition of this, the National Guard's birthplace. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to offer my support for H.R. 1339, recognizing the great city of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States. I'd like to thank my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for bringing this important measure, of which I am an original cosponsor, before the House.

The National Guard has provided over 370 years of dedicated service to our country. Beginning in 1629, when the first militia was organized in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in Salem by Captain John Endicott, the National Guard has played a key role in protecting the Nation and responding to contingencies around the globe. The

National Guard is the oldest component of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The patriots who founded our Nation followed English military tradition and organized their able-bodied male citizens into militias. All males between the ages of 16 and 60 were expected to maintain arms and participate in the defense of the community. The colonial militias protected their countrymen from foreign invaders and helped to win the Revolutionary War. Following the war, our Forefathers empowered Congress to "provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia." However, recognizing the militia's State role, the Founding Fathers reserved the appointment of officers and training of the militia to the States. Today's National Guard still remains a dual State-Federal force.

The service of our Guard is just as vital today as it was in the days of our Forefathers. The Guard deployed more than 50,000 troops in support of the gulf States following Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Tens of thousands of Guard members have served in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan. Today, the National Guard continues its historic dual mission, responding to State and local emergencies while ably and courageously serving our Nation overseas in times of war alongside their Active Duty and Reserve counterparts.

So I am proud to stand here today to recognize Salem, Massachusetts, as a city of great historical significance in the birthplace of our National Guard. I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), the author of the underlying legislation.

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding, as well as for taking the time to help manage this bill and for being an original cosponsor; and I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, as well, for cosponsoring this bill and for his kind words in discussion of what it is and how meaningful it is not just to Salem, Massachusetts, but to the country as well.

I rise in support of this bill to officially recognize Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard. Salem was the site where our country's first military regiment mustered. This militia was the foundation of what would eventually become the National Guard.

Last year, I offered a version of this legislation as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill, and it was approved by a voice vote. Unfortunately, my amendment was not included as part of the final conference report. So for the past several months, we've been working together to bring this bill to the floor.

Next month is the 375th anniversary of that first muster on Salem Common, and it's being commemorated; so I'm particularly pleased that the House is considering this bill at this time. I want to be clear: consideration of this bill today is made possible because of bipartisan support; and just like my two colleagues here, there are a number of people, over 116 cosponsors from both parties, who participated in bringing this bill. I want to thank the majority leader, as well as the leadership on both sides, for his courtesy given to the staff as well as to me. I also want to thank the House Armed Services Committee chairman, BUCK McKEON, as well as the ranking member, ADAM SMITH, and their staffs; and I want to note the 116 colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, all the Democrats on the Armed Service Committee and a substantial number of Republicans on that committee for their support.

This kind of consideration is just the way this House should behave and should act, and I'm glad that we were able to do it on this bill.

So today is an important day for the City of Salem and for the National Guard and for local residents like Larry Conway and many others who have been advocating for this designation for years. Designating Salem as the Birthplace of the National Guard will pay tribute to those who first organized to defend our country almost 375 years ago, and it will also honor those men and women who continue to serve in the National Guard today.

We are working closely with our Senate counterparts to ensure that that Chamber acts quickly in time for the 375th anniversary next month. I won't recount all of the details my colleagues here were so kind to enumerate, but I do note that the bill itself sets forth all the important benchmarks and the progress that we've made.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues, and I urge all the colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

□ 1250

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add, again, my words of thanks and commendation to the gentleman from Massachusetts for sponsoring this resolution. Because, as was reflected, in honoring the birthplace of the National Guard, we honor all who have served throughout our Nation's history.

During my statehouse days, as well as now in Congress, I've had the remarkable privilege to interact with both my Air and Army National Guard in Pennsylvania, as well as National Guard troops from around the country in my many visits to Iraq and Afghanistan and elsewhere. These are remarkable, remarkable men and women, citizen soldiers through and through, who,

when called upon, respond to the call of their Nation and their fellow citizens, serve us so courageously.

So, again, I'm honored to be a sponsor of this resolution, and I commend the gentleman for introducing it.

I urge a "yes" vote in support of its passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1339, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. TSONGAS. 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.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 28, 2012.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for documents issued by the Superior Court for the State of California, North Valley District in connection with a civil case currently pending before that court.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that because the subpoena is not "material and relevant," compliance with the subpoena is inconsistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk of the House.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 112, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 597 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 597

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022. The

first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Brady of Texas and Representative Hinchey of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 29, 2012, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure extending expiring surface transportation authority.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, it's budget day. It's budget day, and we get to begin that in the Rules Committee.

Now, I have the great pleasure in this body, as a freshman, of serving on both the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee, so you can imagine the

sincerity with which I bring my enthusiasm to the floor today.

Coming here as a freshman who believes in an open process, who believes that we ought to have the opportunity to bring all ideas before the American people and let the 435 Members of the people's House express their opinion, I'm proud to tell you that the rule that is before us today allows for not one budget to be debated, not two budgets to be debated, not three, not four, not five, and not six, Mr. Speaker; but the rule that we bring today allows for seven different visions of the United States budget to be brought before this institution and debated. That is every single budget that was introduced, offered yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in front of the Rules Committee.

Candidly, had more Members submitted budgets, had we had 11, had we had 12, we would have made those in order, too, because this debate that we will have over these next 2 days, Mr. Speaker, is a debate about the vision that we have in this body for this country. I am so proud of the vision that was voted, reported out of the Budget Committee, and that will be made in order by this rule.

The options we'll have before us, Mr. Speaker, as made in order by this rule, include the President's budget. You may remember last year, Mr. Speaker, the President submitted his budget to Congress and not a single Member of the House offered that budget on the floor. It was offered in the Senate. It didn't get any votes. It was defeated 97-0, but it was offered there. This year, we're going to be able to look at the President's budget and debate that here on the floor of the House for the first time in my term.

We're going to have a budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus today that lays out a vision for America, that talks about taxation, that talks about revenues and spending and where we should prioritize. We have a bipartisan budget that's been introduced, Mr. Speaker, that will come before the floor of this House, again, to be debated in its entirety. We have the Progressive Caucus budget that's coming. We have the Republican Study Committee budget that is coming. And, Mr. Speaker, we have the Democratic Caucus substitute that is coming, all to compete with, in this grand arena of ideas, the budget that we reported out of the Budget Committee.

I see my colleague from Wisconsin, with whom I have the great pleasure of serving on the Budget Committee. We went through amendment after amendment after amendment—some 30 amendments offered and considered, debated, some with bipartisan support, some with bipartisan opposition—to create this one budget that will be the foundation for the budget debate, Mr. Speaker, if this rule is enacted.

I don't know how we could have done it any better in the Rules Committee. I hope that's what we'll hear from my friend from New York.

Again, every single budget that was offered—and that was the invitation put out by the Speaker, just to be clear. The openness and the invitation was, Mr. Speaker: Come one, come all. If you have a competing vision, send it to the Rules Committee. We'll make it in order on the floor so that we can have the kind of open debate that's going to make America proud.

□ 1300

This is the beginning of that, right here, Mr. Speaker, right now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for his kindness yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee did fine. It was open, and it allowed all the budgets, as he said, to be brought to the floor. It's what we have to work with that is concerning to me because the budget's a reflection of our values and, through that prism, the Ryan budget that we're considering today is morally bankrupt.

The budget that the majority proposes today puts corporations and the wealthiest Americans above the needs of working and middle class families. It increases military spending while slashing the safety net for the middle class and protects tax loopholes for corporations that ship jobs overseas.

In short, this extreme, partisan proposal takes a hatchet to the notion of shared responsibility and places the financial burdens of a generation upon the shoulders of seniors, the poor, and the middle class.

Under this budget, the millionaires will receive multiple tax cuts totaling at least \$300,000, and not a single corporate tax loophole will be closed.

Under this budget, we would see the end of Medicare as we know it. In its place, seniors would be offered the option of a fixed price voucher with which they may go into the market to find their own insurance, with no guarantee that the voucher you receive will come even close to covering the cost of the health care.

Meanwhile, the landmark Affordable Care Act, which is the first law to start addressing the soaring cost of health care, would be repealed. Repeal of the law would mean that children under 26 could no longer be insured by their parents, and millions of Americans suffering from chronic diseases could once again be denied care.

I don't think many Americans—certainly, I didn't know it—understand—I learned this during the Clinton health care debate—that most policies have a yearly and a lifetime limit. As a matter of fact, at that time, when we were debating the Clinton health care plan, that limit was about \$1 million, which means that an emergency like head trauma from a car accident, a bike accident, or just a workplace error on a construction site, could lead you to reaching your limit, and you would no longer be eligible for health insurance.

Let me say that in another way. Once you reach that limit with your pre-existing condition, you would be uninsurable in the United States for the rest of your life. The health care bill that everybody's talking about now does away with that, both yearly limits and lifetime limits.

Right now, most individuals still face this danger, but thanks to the Affordable Care Act, lifetime and yearly limits will be phased out in 2014. That's a very important part of this bill.

People who want to repeal health care have said absolutely nothing about what they expect to replace it with. We would assume that people with preexisting conditions could no longer get coverage.

Under the Republican budget, those protections would be taken away, and the vulnerable Americans would be left to figure out how to survive on their own.

We talk about the mandate to buy insurance. Right now, under the present law, we are all paying for people who are uninsured. Those people who choose not to buy insurance, who have to go to the hospital for emergencies, or any other reason, are paid for, they are treated, by the law, but we pay the cost. It is estimated in some areas that we spend \$1,000 a year more, those of us who are insured, simply to cover the uninsured.

Now, you can continue doing that and paying everybody else's health care costs, or we can keep this health care bill which is so important to us.

The Republican budget not only takes from the poor and gives to the rich, it even fails to fulfill the promise of a balanced budget.

Just this morning, Politico published an article entitled, "Ryan plan puts GOP in long-term budget bind." In the article, the author writes:

It is a bold, even bellicose election-year challenge. But the strict revenue limits could postpone for a generation the conserve promise of a balanced budget.

Even the majority themselves admit this plan will add \$3.11 trillion to our deficit between 2013 and 2022.

Under the majority's plan, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that all government spending, except for Social Security and paying down the debt, will have to be cut by one-third in order to balance the budget by 2040.

This draconian approach means that seniors and the poor will receive worse health care, our children will continue to learn in crumbling schools, and we will all travel, as usual, on a failing transportation network with bridges that are substandard and roads that are cracking, that is inefficient and totally out of date.

This vision does not reflect the ideals of a better America nor the hopes for a brighter future. It is neither a reflection of the values that I hold dear nor the values of the people that whom I represent.

I join many of my colleagues in supporting the Democrat alternative being

offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The Democrat alternative budget supports the creation of jobs in the high-tech and construction fields. It invests in our future by prioritizing education, as we must, also prioritizing health and the economy, and reduces the deficit through responsible spending cuts, with revenue raised by having everyone pay their fair share and by closing corporate tax loopholes.

The Democrat alternative is a thoughtful, balanced approach, one that does not place the entire burden of sacrifice on the backs of seniors, the poor, and the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the misguided and dangerous proposal before us and, instead, consider one of the numerous alternatives that protect the middle class while reducing our deficit in a responsible way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

[From POLITICO.com, Mar. 27, 2012]

RYAN PLAN PUTS GOP IN LONG-TERM BIND

(By David Rogers)

Call it the 19 percent solution.

As House debate begins Wednesday, that's the bottom line of the new Republican budget blueprint, which breaks with the August debt accords and substitutes a vision of capping revenue at 19 percent of gross domestic product and scaling back government to fit into that suit.

It's a bold, even bellicose election-year challenge. But the strict revenue limits could postpone for a generation the conservative promise of a balanced budget. At the same time, deep cuts to health care and education most likely will make it harder for GOP frontrunner Mitt Romney to appeal to independents and women voters in the presidential campaign.

Indeed, it's a tight box that Republicans have put themselves in and one that literally requires a transformation of government to escape.

Just an upward adjustment of revenue to 20.25 percent of GDP would bring Washington into balance by 2023 under the same House plan. But the party's anti-tax stance precludes that, and it is not until 17 years later that an extended forecast by the Congressional Budget Office shows a modest surplus in 2040.

By that date, all government spending—except Social Security and payments on the debt—would have had to have been cut by more than a third to reach this goal. Even in the wake of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the budget tilts heavily toward defense spending at the expense of domestic appropriations.

In a show of unity, Romney endorsed the House plan last week, but his campaign ducked questions from POLITICO this week. If elected president, he would face almost immediate pressure to cut nondefense appropriations by 20 percent in his first budget, rolling back spending to a level that pre-dates George W. Bush's administration.

"It's not the budget I would have written," Rep. Mike Simpson told POLITICO. And the Idaho Republican—and former speaker of his state Legislature—represents an increasingly restless element in the party going forward.

It was Simpson's vote that allowed Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) to get the resolution out of his committee last week—and Simpson will stand again with the leadership on the floor. But there's no hiding the fact that he and many Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee are furious with the course taken in

this budget and more willing to lend support to those who feel revenue must also be part of the equation.

"This is going to be the most partisan debate of the year and it will set up the election for the year," Simpson said. "But I don't think it's the balanced plan to get us out of the hole we are in. Ultimately, the only thing that is going to solve this problem is not a Republican plan, not a Democratic plan, but a bipartisan plan that has buy-in from both sides. That's when we stop going out and shooting one another."

An early test in this week's floor debate could be the fate of a new entry sponsored by Reps. Jim Cooper (D-Tenn.) and Steve LaTourette (R-Ohio), also a member of the Appropriations panel.

Their proposal would present an updated version of the 2010 presidential debt commission's recommendations, a combination of entitlement savings and \$1.2 trillion in revenue over 10 years. And having shied away in the past, Cooper told POLITICO that he was now encouraged enough by the reception to proceed—the first real time the ideas have been put to a floor vote.

"My view is this is where they are going to wind up at the end of the year anyway, so we might as well start talking about it," LaTourette said. "Anybody who thinks you are not going to have to have a pot of revenue and pot of cuts is thinking funny."

Matched against this fragile center will be more traditional warring alternatives on the right and left.

The Republican Study Committee Tuesday announced its menu of still deeper appropriations cuts and Medicaid savings—all in the hopes of reaching balance in five years. At the same time, the Congressional Black Caucus weighed in with a deficit-reduction package that also exceeds Ryan's plan but is heavily dependent on what appears to be \$3.9 trillion in additional revenue—including a novel financial speculation tax—not in the White House's own budget.

Republicans hope to embarrass President Barack Obama by having one of their own call up the White House's February budget submission—for certain defeat. And the House Rules Committee late Tuesday made in order such a proposal to be offered by Rep. Mick Mulvaney (R-S.C.), who already is backing both Ryan and the more severe RSC alternative.

Democrats will have their own alternative claiming greater war savings than Obama's—it would end all overseas contingency operations funding after 2014, for example. But the 10-year deficits are still almost double those in the Ryan plan, and Republicans jumped on the fact that the resolution cancels the \$1.2 trillion sequester mechanism under the Budget Control Act—without spelling out a clear substitute.

By contrast, the Ryan resolution would also tamper with the first round of automatic cuts due in January but seeks to offset most of these reductions, about half of which would come from defense appropriations.

Six House committees would be ordered to come up with prescribed savings by the end of next month for floor action in May. Armed Services is exempted, frustrating the design of the Budget Control Act, and there is the risk of splitting even traditionally bipartisan panels, like the House Agriculture Committee.

Ryan's budget demands savings of more than \$8 billion in 2013 from Agriculture—an effort to target food stamps. And the challenge for Chairman Frank Lucas (R-Okla.) is to navigate these waters without jeopardizing the partnership he wants with the minority in writing a farm bill later this year.

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

say that I think the gentlelady from New York is right on target. I mean, these budgets are moral documents. They talk about our priorities as a people.

I tell folks back home, Mr. Speaker, and we don't have any young people on the floor with us today, but for all those young folks who are entrepreneurs, Mr. Speaker, who want to go out, and they don't want to work for the Man, they want to go out and hang out their own shingle, run their own business; you know, if they lost, at their small business, beginning on the day Jesus Christ was born, \$1 million a day, and they lost \$1 million a day at that small business every single day from the day Jesus was born, 7 days a week, through today, Mr. Speaker, they would have to continue to lose \$1 million a day every day, 7 days a week for another 700 years to lose their first trillion dollars. Their first trillion.

And the budgets that have been passed by this House and by the United States Senate and signed by Presidents of both parties have saddled our young people today in America with more than \$15 trillion—not \$1 trillion, Mr. Speaker—\$15 trillion and climbing, soon to be 16.

So when we talk about the morality of our budgets, we've got to talk about the morality of continuing to run budgets that are unbalanced. We've got to talk about the morality of continuing to pay for our priorities today with IOUs from our children in the future. We've got to talk about the prosperity that we experience today that we're trading away the prosperity of the future to have.

Health care, Mr. Speaker. It's going on right across the street. The longest line in Washington, D.C., today is right out there at the Supreme Court, folks who want to get in and find out what's going to happen.

Well, the budget that makes up the foundation of this debate that we'll have assumes the President's health care bill is going to go away. It assumes the Supreme Court Justices will accurately conclude that this mandate is unconstitutional, that the whole house of cards unfolds beyond that, and we'll start again.

And you know what's interesting?

Again, I'm so proud to be a member of this Budget Committee that I do think is doing it better than we have done it in the past under both parties. You know, had the President's health care bill come to the floor of this House five pages at the time, 10 pages at the time, 20 pages at the time, I would wager that this House would have passed the majority of it. In fact, I would wager that the American people would have approved and been enthusiastic about the majority of it.

But what has happened in this House too often, Mr. Speaker, is that we take those policies that we can all agree on, and for some reason unbeknownst to me, we decide that it would be bad if we all agreed on good policy, and so we

begin to stuff things in there that we know are going to create controversy.

□ 1310

We just manufacture an argument that we don't have to have, and that's what happened to the President's health care bill. There was this nugget of the individual mandate, that theft of freedom, a new definition about what it means to be an American. We knew that the body wouldn't support that so we began to add on sweetener after sweetener after sweetener. We could have just voted on those sweeteners.

This rule doesn't put up with that, Mr. Speaker. This rule says we're not going to try to buy anybody's vote on the floor, we're not going to try to hide the ball in these budgets. Every single Member of Congress who has a vision of America, who has a vision of the morality that my colleague from New York discussed, who has a vision of what we could be as a people if only we had the political will to implement it right here. Each and every Member of Congress was invited to put that vision forward.

There are at least two visions that we'll have today, Mr. Speaker, and tomorrow that I plan to support, visions that I think outline that correct vision of how we can retain America's economic prosperity, how we can continue to be a leader in the free world.

But I support bringing to the floor those budgets that I do not believe in because just because those folks in north metro Atlanta, Mr. Speaker, just because those folks in the Seventh District of Georgia that I represent don't approve of every budget doesn't mean that those budgets don't deserve a vote, and that is a fundamental difference between the leadership that this Speaker has brought to this Institution and the leadership that we have had from both parties in years past.

What we've said is every single idea is worthy of consideration—win or lose. Win or lose, bring those ideas to the floor for debate, and let's see where the votes fall.

Mr. Speaker, again, as a member of both the Budget Committee and the Rules Committee, I am strongly supportive of the underlying budget bill but particularly proud of this rule that makes every other budget option in order as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the majority's misguided budget.

Forty-seven years ago when seniors were the most uninsured group in our Nation, we made a promise that their health care would be guaranteed; and because of that promise, millions of older Americans today have quality, affordable health care, and they and their families have peace of mind. But



the majority's budget seems to break that promise by ending Medicare as we know it.

Instead of a guarantee, seniors would get a hope and a prayer, otherwise known as a voucher. This voucher, fixed in price, would be worth less and less each year, and health care costs incurred by individual seniors would increase by at least \$6,000 a year.

Their plan would raise Medicare's eligibility age, delaying the promise of a sound retirement for millions of working Americans, and the bill would whack away at Medicaid which provides long-term care for low-income seniors and the disabled and pass the buck to cash-strapped States where its future would be uncertain in tough budgetary times like today.

Mr. Speaker, those promoting this plan to end Medicare argue that we have no choice if we want to bring down our deficits, but their plan doesn't bring down health care costs. It just shifts those costs onto the backs of our Nation's seniors.

Today's seniors will lose important benefits that they currently enjoy today, like access to free preventive screenings and reduced prescription drug costs through the closing of the doughnut hole under ObamaCare, a term I am proud to use. The plan would weaken Medicare itself. As the voucher program draws off healthier, younger seniors, it leaves behind the oldest and sickest, those the private insurance market won't cover.

This plan will cause untold harm to our Nation's seniors and their families who today rely upon Medicare for the promise of quality, affordable health care.

You know, 47 years ago we did make a promise, a promise that is working for millions of American seniors and their families. We cannot break that promise. I urge my colleagues to oppose the majority's budget, the Ryan budget.

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

I appreciate the comments of my colleague from California, and I know her concern for America's seniors is heartfelt, and it's one that I share as well; and I hope that she will support this rule that allows for a series of votes on many different Medicare solutions. Some solutions are better than others; but even if she opposes the underlying budget, I do hope we'll have her support on the rule, because we do lay out the opportunity for folks to choose among seven different visions for solving the Medicare challenge.

I don't have the charts with me down here on the floor. I know my colleagues on the Budget Committee will bring them during the main debate; but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I can picture the charts in my mind, if you charted Medicare spending going out from 2020 to 2050, that two-generation horizon heading out there, and you charted the President's commitment to spend dollars on Medicare, and you charted the

Budget Committee's commitment to spend dollars on Medicare, you'd find that the dollar value commitment is about dollar-for-dollar going out over that 30-year window.

So the question then, Mr. Speaker, is not about how much money is this Congress committing, the question is to what priorities is this Congress committing that money.

Now, the President's budget, which we'll have an opportunity to debate and vote here on the floor of the House, turns those Medicare financing decisions, those decisions about how to save money in the system, over to what we've all come to know as IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, to make recommendations and suggestions about how to clamp down on costs.

Now, generally, that means clamping down on reimbursements to doctors.

What the Budget Committee budget does, Mr. Speaker, is give those dollars to individuals so the individuals can enter the marketplace—not a free-for-all marketplace—but a regulated and guaranteed marketplace where policies are guaranteed to these seniors so that individuals can then control those dollars and make their own choices about health care decisions.

So just to be clear, we're not arguing about dollars and cents in Medicare. The President's vision and the Budget Committee's vision is virtually identical.

What we are talking about, though, is who controls those dollars. Are they controlled by a one-size-fits-all 1965 Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan, soon to be revised by the IPAB board, or are they controlled by my mother and my father and your mother and your father and our neighbors, our aunts and uncles, individuals, Americans who will make those health care decisions for themselves.

Again, for me that choice is clear. Individual freedom will always be my choice over government control.

But getting back to the actual rule, Mr. Speaker, that's what's so wonderful about the way this Rules Committee has operated and this resolution that we have before us today. You're not restricted to just voting on my vision of solutions for this country. We're offering six other visions as well. In fact, we're offering every single vision that has come out of this U.S. House of Representatives so that we can have a free, open, and honest debate and let the American people know what their true choices for freedom are.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I was just saying to the previous speaker that I have a 98-year-old mother. Let's hand her a voucher and say, Go figure it out. That's precisely what you want to do. Go figure it out on Medicare. Unbelievable. She could really figure it out.

Chairman RYAN and the House majority have put together a lopsided budget, tries to break the middle class, gouges deeply into our commonsense national priorities and ends the Medicare guarantee.

According to estimates, more than 4 million Americans would lose their jobs because of this budget, but they provide a \$150,000 tax cut to the richest 1 percent of people in this Nation.

The Republican budget would slash the social safety net cutting the food stamp program by over 17 percent, or \$133.5 billion. That's more than the amount of food stamp funds going to 29 States and territories. Over 8 million men, women, and children would go hungry. If their plan to turn food stamps into an underfunded block grant goes through, even more damage is done. Coming out of the deepest recession since the Great Depression, food stamps help to feed 46 million Americans, 21 million children. Seventy-five percent of the program participants are families with children.

This is Robin Hood in reverse. It takes from the middle class, gives to the rich. I urge my colleagues to oppose this disastrous budget.

□ 1320

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

I would like to say to my friend from Connecticut, because I can see her passion—again, I know it comes from the heart—your mother will be in no way affected by the budget that we're voting on today, and I would like to make that clear if anybody else is concerned about their mothers. For folks who are aged 55 or older, there is not one word in the Republican budget plan that changes the commitment that we've made to folks over the past three or four decades. That commitment since 1965 remains as solid today and tomorrow under the Budget Committee budget as it has ever been.

The alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to take our 98-year-old mothers and turn them over to IPAB. Now, again, there are choices here. The Republican budget, which has become the House Budget Committee budget, allows everyone in the current Medicare system and those 55 years of age or older to experience no changes whatsoever to that program guaranteed from 1965. Because the dollars still have to be regulated and because we still have to protect this program from bankruptcy, which is a program important to so many of us, the alternative is to turn it over to this government board and to let them cut costs where they can.

Let me tell you a story, Mr. Speaker, if I can just take a moment of personal privilege.

I was talking with a physician from back home in Gwinnett County, my hometown. He is a neurologist, Mr. Speaker. He has been practicing neurology for 17 years, and he is the youngest neurologist in the county. This is one of the largest counties in



the State of Georgia, which is one of the largest States in the Nation, and we haven't had one new neurologist coming into our area in 17 years. This doc says he's thinking about getting out. He has got an uncle who is a primary care physician in south Georgia, a primary care physician who is the only one to accept Medicaid, Mr. Speaker, in a five-county radius.

Folks say that there is this guarantee of health care. Let me tell you, if you can't find a doctor who will take you, your insurance card isn't worth much.

What we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to restore the promise of America's health care system. What is it about the American health care system that's driving our doctors into retirement? Is it that we're not clamping down enough and that if only we had the IPAB board clamp down even more that it's going to increase access to care? I tell you that it's not, Mr. Speaker.

There are lots of different ways to prepare budgets, and I didn't know what to expect when I got on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker. I'll be honest. It could easily degenerate into a political exercise. I've seen it happen. It could become all about the right talking points and about all the right focus group conversations and have nothing to do with how we should actually lead this country forward—but not so on the Chairman PAUL RYAN Budget Committee. In meeting after meeting, in conversation after conversation, this Budget Committee chairman said there is one way to do a budget, and that is to do a budget with honest numbers and honest priorities that lay out in plain vision, for all to see, our vision of America's future—and he did it. He did it with the help of a very competent Budget Committee.

Again, as I look to my friend from Wisconsin with whom I share the bottom dais there on the Budget Committee, he did it with lots of input and lots of conversation; but he did it in a way so that no one would say they're just gaming the numbers, so that no one would say this is all about politics, and so that everyone who comes to the floor of this House can vote for this House Budget Committee reported budget with the pride of knowing it was put together with integrity about a vision for a better future. Again, we are going to have six other competing visions, Mr. Speaker. I can only hope that those numbers, those charts, those graphs were put together with the same care and integrity that Chairman RYAN used in the Budget Committee.

For folks who are trying to make up their minds about where they're going to cast their votes today, again I urge the strong support of this open rule that allows for the complete debate over all of these alternatives; but I also encourage my colleagues to give a look at that work product that we created on the House Budget Committee, a

work product that I believe, Mr. Speaker, is crafted in a way that can make every Member of this body proud.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that, immediately after the House adopts the rule, it will bring up H.R. 4271, a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA.

This is a vital law that I coauthored with Pat Schroeder in 1994 and of which I have been an original cosponsor each time it has been reauthorized. Since VAWA's enactment in 1994, the cases of domestic violence have fallen, and over 1 million women have used the justice system to obtain protective orders against their batterers.

To discuss this proposal, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of the bill, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Representative SLAUGHTER.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question in order to allow us to consider the Violence Against Women Act. It is pathetic and it is disappointing that it has come to this—that we have to use procedural shenanigans to talk about an initiative that has been a bipartisan initiative since 1994.

Violence against women in this country is not levied against just Democrats but Republicans as well; not blacks or whites or Hispanics but against Native American people as well; not just Christians or Muslims but Jews and nonreligious people—atheists—as well; not just rich people or poor people but middle class people as well; and not just against heterosexual women but homosexual couples as well. It knows no gender. It knows no ethnicity. It knows nothing.

I'll tell you that violence against women is as American as apple pie. I know not only as a legislator but from my own personal experience that domestic violence has been a thread throughout my personal life, from being a child who was repeatedly sexually assaulted up to and including being an adult who has been raped. I just don't have enough time to share all of those experiences with you.

Yet I can tell you, when this bill came out of the Senate Judiciary Committee with all of the Republican Senators—all of the guys—voting no, it really brought up some terrible memories for me of having boys sit in a locker room and sort of bet that I, the A kid, couldn't be had and then having the appointed boy, when he saw that I wasn't going to be so willing, complete a date rape and then take my underwear to display it to the rest of the boys. I mean, this is what American women are facing.

I am so proud to be an author of this amendment because it has been, in the past, a bipartisan bill. This bill will strengthen the core programs and sup-

port law enforcement, prosecutions, and judicial staff training. It will include new initiatives aimed at preventing domestic violence-related homicides that occur every single day in this country. It will extend the authority to protect Native American victims on tribal lands. It will ensure a strong response to the insufficient reporting and services for victims of sexual assault. It will increase the numbers of U visas for undocumented women who, because they're in the shadows, are particularly vulnerable to domestic violence. This bill will also expand services for those in underserved communities, who, due to their religion or gender or sexual orientation, have not been served.

This is not a partisan issue, and it would be very, very devastating to women of all colors, creeds, and sexual orientations for us not to address this.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my colleague from Wisconsin that her words are always among some of the most powerful that we have on the Budget Committee, and I don't believe I've ever heard her speak from a place that was not of conviction. I want to say I appreciate those words, and you have my support on the Rules Committee. If we can get that bill reported out of Judiciary, I would love to see that in the Rules Committee and would love to see us report that to the House floor for that same kind of free and open debate that we are having today on the Budget Committee, and I appreciate the words that you shared.

I must say, though, Mr. Speaker, I have a tough time connecting the Violence Against Women Act with these budgets. I will disagree with my colleague from Wisconsin and will encourage folks to support the previous question so that we can have this budget debate. Should we have the debate that my colleague is discussing? I believe we absolutely should. Again, I know the committees of jurisdiction are working on that, and my hope is that they will report that and send that to the Rules Committee.

□ 1330

But today, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity. It's not an unprecedented opportunity, but it's one of the rarest of opportunities that we have here in the House, which is to have a debate on the floor that includes every single idea that any of our 435 Members have offered as a vision of how to govern this land, of how to set our fiscal priorities, of this morality that is deciding how to spend taxpayer dollars. We must seize that opportunity today. It's one that comes but once a year, Mr. Speaker; an opportunity but once a year to set these priorities. And again, the Rules Committee has provided time not just today but tomorrow as well to make sure we can thoroughly flesh out each and every one of these ideas and make sure that no one's voice on the floor of this House is silenced.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me take about 30 seconds just to say that I appreciate what my colleague from Georgia is saying. However, we are not giving a choice whether we are going to do the budget or violence against women, but we're going to have an attempt to do both on the rule.

What we can do in the vote for the budget—when we vote for the rule, we would like to have the previous question be defeated so that we can add VAWA to it. That's all we are trying to do here today.

The bill is about to expire. It would be a dreadful thing to think that women and children and the other spouse would be growing up with violence because we have failed to provide the resources to stop that, after it has been so successful since 1994.

Now I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank the gentlelady from New York for the consistent leadership she has given to this important legislation since it was passed. It took us a number of years to get it passed in the first place, and it's never been off her radar screen.

I especially want to thank my good friend from Wisconsin, who has come forward in a very compelling way to ask that we vote "no" on the previous question so that we can consider the Violence Against Women Act, which may well expire, making it—I fear—a real target for the Appropriations Committee because the law will not have been reauthorized.

Mr. Speaker, I visited a safe house last week in my district because I wanted to hear why a woman would make the decision to stay at home with an abuser rather than leave. I'm not sure I understood in my heart why she would assume the risk rather than leave. I'm glad I went. There were eight women there, different ages. Some had children. For the first time, when I heard the stories of these women, I understood in the most poignant and practical way what a "hotline" actually means, what a "rape crisis center" means. After that experience, the notion that when this legislation expires, the Appropriations Committee would have before it unauthorized appropriations, which become a target in and of itself, was just too much to bear. Yet the reauthorization bill has gone nowhere here. At least in the other body, the bill has been passed out of committee. It is a bipartisan bill, with several Republicans as well as Democrats on it.

Ms. MOORE's amendment essentially does no more than incorporate the Senate bill, which is tailor-made for our consideration, because in keeping with the way in which reductions are taking place—20 percent is very painful—but there is a 20 percent reduction in the reauthorized act, even though with any reauthorization you would expect an

increase. Yet even with that reduction, we cannot get the bill on this floor. So we must do what we're doing this afternoon.

If you want to talk about a bill that is worth the money, there are very few bills where we can show the kind of cause-and-effect that we can show here. There has been a 50 percent drop annually in domestic violence. And the reason for that is there's been over a 50 percent increase in reporting. Women are not afraid to come out because they know that if they report it, go to the police station, the police will tell them where there is a safe house.

Don't leave women out on the streets. Don't leave their children with no place to go. Vote "no" on the previous question in order to allow the House to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, which I think would receive bipartisan support if it were heard this afternoon.

Mr. WOODALL. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I was expecting one additional speaker, but I believe she is not here. So I am prepared to close.

Let me say, Mr. WOODALL is a generous and kind man, and I know he understands what we are talking about here today.

My speaker is here, so let me yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlelady.

In 21st century America, three women die every day at the hands of their husbands, boyfriends, or former partners. Domestic violence causes 2 million injuries a year. Sadly, it is something that one out of every four women will experience in their lifetimes.

This is particularly a difficult problem for young women today. Women between the ages of 16 and 24 have the highest rates of relationship violence, and one in every five women will be sexually assaulted while they are in college. Even more worrisome, we know that when couples are experiencing economic difficulties, domestic violence is three times as likely to occur.

Victim service providers have seen an increase in demand since the recession began while also seeing their funding cut. More than 70 percent of shelters credited "financial issues" for increases in abuse that they have seen in communities across the country.

In 1994, our now-Vice President JOE BIDEN wrote and championed the Violence Against Women Act. In 17 years it has cut the rate of domestic violence in our country by over half. It is past time to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act again, and my colleague's amendment would allow us to act now. This bill reauthorizes the programs that have been proven to work to stem domestic violence and to help law enforcement and prosecutors do their jobs.

This reauthorization enjoys bipartisan support in the United States Senate, with 59 cosponsors. In addition, over 200 national organizations and 500 State and local organizations have urged us to pass this bill, including the National Association of Attorneys General, National District Attorneys Association, National Sheriffs' Association, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association. Why do they want us to do this? Because it helps to make their jobs easier, and it gives women the tools to be able to protect themselves.

Everyone, everyone in this Chamber wants to see an America where no woman ever has to endure the scourge of domestic violence. The Violence Against Women Act is helping us realize this vision. We must reauthorize the law so it can continue to help our constituents.

And I am also proud to tell you that the Affordable Care Act, the health care reform legislation, now says that if a woman is a victim of domestic violence, her insurance company can no longer say that that is a preexisting condition, and she can get the kind of health care coverage that she needs. That's the value of reauthorizing this legislation and the value of the Affordable Care Act.

I urge you to support this amendment so we can act now. Let's move forward. Reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act once again.

Mr. WOODALL. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, Ms. DELAURO has just reminded me that when we began the debate on health care, that eight States in the United States and the District of Columbia considered violence against women to be a preexisting condition, and a woman who had been beaten to a pulp could not be insured because she would be apt to have that happen to her again. And we changed that in that bill.

□ 1340

I think all of us, too, are familiar with the phrase "rule of thumb," but I'm not sure a lot of us understand what it means. The rule of thumb was the size of a man's thumb and the stick with which he could legally beat his wife. So every time you use that, I want you to remember what that means.

Since VAWA's enactment, we've all seen that domestic violence has fallen over half. Policemen have been trained and the courts have been trained to understand it better.

There was a time in the United States when it was simply considered a private matter and police would not always take away the offending partner, leaving a person again to be beaten one more time.

I don't think anybody in the House of Representatives wants this to expire. I'm sure they don't. Everybody has mothers, sisters, daughters, and nieces that they want to protect.

This is such a simple thing. It doesn't hurt the budget at all. We have tried our best to get this bill brought up in the House; and we're terrified, frankly, those of us who have spent a good bit of our time in Congress trying to deal with this act, that it will expire. As I've pointed out many times, I've been at this since 1994.

It's such a serious thing, that shelters for battered women are never revealed as to their location because of fear that the offending spouse will find them and make them come home or other things.

This past 5 or 6 years, we've seen a number of spouses being killed; and we always look at what goes on in those houses, and nobody ever realized before what was happening there. More women obviously need to know that there is someplace that they can go and someplace that they can get help.

Let me give you a figure because we're pretty much concerned here about the deficit, the budget, and costs.

In studies recently released, they have shown that just a 2-minute screening of domestic violence victims in a yearly checkup can save nearly \$6 billion in chronic health care costs every year. The screenings are provided for in the Violence Against Women Act, which trains health care professionals to recognize and address the signs of domestic violence, because obviously most women who are trying to cover it up simply attempt to live with it and are not going to bring it up themselves.

Approximately 2 million women are physically or sexually assaulted or stalked by an intimate partner every single year; one out of every six women has experienced an attempted or completed rape at some point in her lifetime; one in four women in the U.S. will experience domestic violence in her lifetime. This is terrible.

The Congress has a responsibility to ensure that rape prevention programs are fully funded, that law enforcement has the resources, that battered women's shelters are open, and that victim advocates have the training to stop the violence against women.

With all this authorization expiring before this year's end, we're in danger of letting these responsibilities go unfulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I urge my colleagues to please vote "no" on the previous question for all of those women who live in fear and for all those children who witness that violence. Violence against women changes people's lives forever, mentally and physically. They will never, ever be the same. For

heaven's sake, let's reauthorize this bill. It does so much for them.

I urge everyone in the House to please vote "no" and defeat the previous question so we continue to provide support to the millions of women who are victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the comments of my friend from New York. We serve together on the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, and we grapple with tough issues on the Rules Committee every single time we meet. There's no easy day on the Rules Committee. Every bill is a challenge because of the different ideas that folks have to make it better. But what I've learned in that time, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm not the smartest guy in the room, I'm not the smartest guy in this Congress, and I'm not the smartest guy in my district.

There's a reason we have regular order here in the U.S. House of Representatives, so that even a good idea we can make better.

I have some folks come to me in my district and they say, ROB, why is it that you put that hospital funding that we need in the transportation bill? Those things don't have anything to do with one another. Why do you combine those two things? If it's a good idea to pass the transportation bill, let's pass the transportation bill; and if it's a good idea to pass the hospital bill, let's pass the hospital bill. But why do you put these disconnected things together? Why do you try to fund a new military procurement program in the environmental and National Park funding? Why do you stick those things together, ROB? They don't have anything to do with one another.

I actually campaigned on that issue, Mr. Speaker, because I think they're right. I think that the American people deserve an up-or-down vote on one issue at a time. I think my colleague from New York, my colleague from Connecticut, my colleague from the District of Columbia, and my colleague from Wisconsin make extremely compelling cases for why we should see the Violence Against Women Act come through regular order.

But my understanding is—and I would be happy to be corrected if I'm mistaken—my understanding is the bill was just introduced yesterday, that it hasn't had an opportunity to go through those committees where folks know so much more about these issues than we do in the Rules Committee or in the Budget Committee; that it has not had an opportunity to be amended and improved, to have the opportunity for those Members for whom this is a heartfelt and compelling issue to put in their two cents to make it even better.

I think it should have that opportunity, Mr. Speaker. I encourage folks to vote "yes" on the previous question so that we can move forward to debate

these budgets today, and then I urge my colleagues—let me say it, Mr. Speaker, because I know folks are watching this on the screens back in their rooms—the bill number of the Violence Against Women Act is H.R. 4271, Mr. Speaker. There's no question—because this is a House where folks believe in regular order—that the more cosponsors a bill accumulates and the faster it accumulates them, the more likely it is to end up on this floor in haste, rapidly, immediately in order to have a hearing.

I would encourage my colleagues to go and look at that bill again just dropped yesterday, but certainly something that I know this House and the Judiciary Committee and others are going to want to consider.

The opportunity we have today, though, Mr. Speaker, with this rule, is to define our national vision. I don't mean our vision for just the Nation, our land, Mr. Speaker. I mean a vision for us as a people. Who are we as a people, Mr. Speaker?

I heard one of the Presidential candidates speak the other day and he said, This year we don't need politicians that we can believe in; we need politicians who believe in us.

I thought that was pretty profound. I don't need somebody I can believe in. I need somebody who believes in me. That's true, Mr. Speaker.

We lay out all of these different competing budget visions here, the summaries of which I hold in my hand. My question to my colleagues is: Which of these visions do you believe believes in you? Which of these visions lays out that future of America that is best for you and your family, that is best for your constituents and their families, that is best for your State, that is best for our Nation?

The visions are starkly different, Mr. Speaker. Again, the base bill is the bill that we reported out of the Budget Committee. That is the base text. These are substitutes for that.

For example, we have a bipartisan substitute—Republican and Democratic Members of the House—that raises taxes by \$2 trillion more. To be perfectly accurate, it's \$1.8 trillion more than the Republican budget that the committee passed. It spends \$3.1 trillion more. It focuses on different priorities. The debt increases by about \$1.4 trillion. That's the cost of those priorities. Again, some priorities may be worth that cost. We'll have that debate on the floor.

The ranking member on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland, his budget substitute also raises taxes by \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years more than the House Budget Committee budget does and spends \$4.7 trillion more than the House Budget Committee budget does and thus adds \$2.9 trillion more to the backs of our children.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, about \$15.5 trillion today, soon to be \$16 trillion, that we've borrowed and spent, that

we've impoverished our children with so that we can live today at the standard of living that we have, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Maryland's substitute increases that by \$3 trillion more than does the House Budget Committee report.

Do the priorities that he spends on merit that kind of increase? Do the priorities that he focuses on merit that kind of debt increase? Perhaps they do. We're going to have that debate on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1350

The Congressional Black Caucus substitute raises taxes by \$6 trillion over 10 years, more than the House budget bill does, and it spends \$5.3 trillion more, which means the Congressional Black Caucus substitute actually reduces the national debt more than the House Budget Committee does. Now, it does so by raising taxes \$6 trillion, and it only reduces the debt by under \$1 trillion, but that's one of those priorities that folks have had the courage to lay out here on the floor of the House that we're going to make in order.

My colleague from New York, the chairman from California, this Budget Committee of men and women, Mr. Speaker, has made every single option available.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus, Mr. Speaker, their proposal is to raise taxes by \$6.8 trillion more than the Republican Budget Committee budget, the budget that was passed out of the entire Budget Committee. It increases spending by about \$6.6 trillion, one of the highest spending of the bunch, again, focusing on priorities that all 435 Members of this House deserve an opportunity to hear and an opportunity to consider.

We have an opportunity in this House, Mr. Speaker, to do great things. We have an opportunity in this House to stand up for the priorities that are the priorities of our constituents back home. And we don't have to vote on 100 different ideas in one bill, Mr. Speaker. In the 15 months I've been here, Mr. Speaker, all but about five of the bills have been short enough for me to read; I don't have to staff it out, and I don't have to have a team of speed readers out there working through it. All but about five have been short enough for me to read.

That's a source of great pride for me on the Rules Committee, because I've told folks back home and folks believe it back home that we ought to have time to carefully deliberate each and every thing. Folks are tired of 1,500-page bills. Folks are tired of 2,500-page bills. Folks are tired of the defense bill being merged with the transportation bill which is merged with the health care bill which is merged with the national parks bill which also funds the White House. That's crazy, and it doesn't have to be that way. There's not one rule of this House that requires that nonsense to go on. In fact, the opposite is true. The rules of the House

were actually created to prevent that from going on, and we have to work really hard to pervert the process in a way that makes that possible.

This Speaker has made an effort unlike any I've ever seen to try to have one idea at a time down here on the floor of the House, one idea at a time so that the American people's voice can be heard. If we bring a bill to the floor, Mr. Speaker, that supports dogcatchers on the one hand and hospital funding on the other and somebody votes "no," what are they voting "no" on? Are they voting "no" on the dogcatchers or are they voting "no" on the hospital? You can't tell. And that's what happens. Have you seen that?

Have you ever wondered why it is, Mr. Speaker, that in our appropriations process the food stamp language and the agricultural subsidy language is in the same appropriations bill? I always wondered. I started thinking about it as I watched the votes going on the board, and what I figured out is that we don't have enough farmers in this country for everybody to vote to increase farm spending, and we don't have enough folks with high food stamp populations in their district to support having high food stamp spending, but when you combine those two groups together, guess what? You get 51 percent of this House and you can make things happen.

Well, I guess I support the ingenuity of folks who find ways to cobble a multitude of ideas together and find 51 percent, but I ask my colleagues, is that really what our constituents sent us here to do? Is cobbling together multiple ideas and just trying to game the system enough to find your 51 percent, Mr. Speaker, is that really what our Framers intended? Or, alternatively, should we commit ourselves to not just having an open process, Mr. Speaker, but an open process on a single idea?

Do you know what I found on the Rules Committee? And it was a surprise to me—and if you haven't had a chance to serve on the Rules Committee, it might not be intuitive to you—but when you bring a small bill to the Rules Committee, when you focus on one single idea, when you find one priority that you want to make the law of the land and you send that to the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, then the amendment process is only open to amendments that are germane to that underlying idea. If you bring a bill about hospital funding to the Rules Committee, well, then, the only germane amendments that will be considered are amendments that have to do with hospital funding.

So the shorter we make these bills and the more single-minded we make these bills, the more open we can have the process here on the House floor. Mr. Speaker, this freshman class is full of a bunch of CEOs from the private sector, folks who ran for Congress because they're worried about the direction of this country, and they said, Dadgumit, I've got to step up; I've got

to run, and I've got to be a part of the solution. And they get here thinking that they were going to be able to do it all overnight. It turns out there are 435 of us, and we all have the same voting card. It's harder. Nobody is king of the world in here. It's one man, one woman, one vote, and there are 435 of us. You've got to find that agreement.

Well, it turns out there really is a lot of agreement, not just agreement on the Republican side of the aisle, not just agreement on the Democratic side of the aisle, but agreement across this whole House when we open up the process and allow the House to work its will.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we have here today. We have a rule that opens up the process, that flings open the doors of democracy and lets every single idea be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage an affirmative vote on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 597 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4271) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 3 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the 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 Republican 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. WOODALL. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-

minute votes on adopting House Resolution 597, if ordered; suspending the rules with regard to H.R. 1339; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—235

Adams	Gingrey (GA)	Nugent
Aderholt	Gohmert	Nunes
Akin	Gosar	Nunnelee
Alexander	Gowdy	Olson
Amash	Granger	Palazzo
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Austria	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pence
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Barletta	Grimm	Pitts
Bartlett	Guinta	Platts
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Bass (NH)	Hall	Pompeo
Berg	Hanna	Posey
Biggert	Harper	Price (GA)
Bilbray	Harris	Quayle
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Black	Hayworth	Reichert
Blackburn	Heck	Renacci
Bonner	Hensarling	Ribble
Bono Mack	Herger	Rigell
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rivera
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Roby
Brooks	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Buerkle	Issa	Rokita
Burgess	Jenkins	Rooney
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Ross (FL)
Campbell	Jones	Royce
Canseco	Jordan	Runyan
Cantor	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Capito	King (IA)	Scalise
Carter	King (NY)	Schilling
Cassidy	Kingston	Schmidt
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Chaffetz	Kline	Schweikert
Coble	Labrador	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Cole	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Landry	Sessions
Cravaack	Lankford	Shuler
Crawford	Latham	Shuster
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Simpson
Culberson	Latta	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Denham	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Dent	Long	Southerland
DesJarlais	Lucas	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
Dold	Lummis	Sullivan
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Terry
Duffy	E.	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	Manzullo	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Tiberi
Ellmers	Marino	Tipton
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Turner (NY)
Farenthold	McCaul	Turner (OH)
Fincher	McClintock	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McCotter	Walberg
Flake	McHenry	Walden
Fleischmann	McKeon	Walsh (IL)
Fleming	McKinley	Webster
Flores	McMorris	West
Forbes	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Meehan	Whitfield
Fox	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Gallegly	Miller, Gary	Womack
Gardner	Mulvaney	Woodall
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Gerlach	Myrick	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Young (FL)
Gibson	Noem	Young (IN)

NAYS—183

Ackerman	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Altmire	Bass (CA)	Bishop (NY)
Andrews	Becerra	Blumenauer
Baca	Berkley	Bonamici
Baldwin	Berman	Boren

Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Heinrich	Pelosi
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Himes	Peters
Butterfield	Hinchey	Peterson
Capps	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Capuano	Hirono	Polis
Cardoza	Hochul	Price (NC)
Carnahan	Holden	Quigley
Carney	Holt	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Honda	Reyes
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Richardson
Chandler	Israel	Richmond
Chu	Jackson Lee	Ross (AR)
Cicilline	(TX)	Rothman (NJ)
Clarke (MI)	Johnson (GA)	Royal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kaptur	Rush
Cleaver	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kind	T.
Connolly (VA)	Kissell	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Cooper	Langevin	Schakowsky
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Costello	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Critz	Levin	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David
Cuellar	Lipinski	Serrano
Cummings	Loeback	Sewell
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Sires
DeFazio	Lujan	Slaughter
DeGette	Lynch	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Maloney	Speier
Deutch	Markey	Stark
Dicks	Matheson	Sutton
Dingell	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Donnelly (IN)	McColum	Tierney
Doyle	McDermott	Tonko
Edwards	McGovern	Towns
Ellison	McIntyre	Tsongas
Engel	McNerney	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Michaud	Velázquez
Farr	Miller (NC)	Visclosky
Fattah	Moore	Walz (MN)
Frank (MA)	Moran	Wasserman
Fudge	Murphy (CT)	Schultz
Garamendi	Nadler	Waters
Green, Al	Napolitano	Watt
Green, Gene	Neal	Waxman
Grijalva	Olver	Welch
Gutierrez	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Hahn	Pallone	Woolsey
Hanabusa	Pascrell	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Benishek	Mack	Roe (TN)
Filner	Meeks	Shimkus
Gonzalez	Miller, George	Stearns
Goodlatte	Paul	
Jackson (IL)	Rangel	

□ 1426

Messrs. ALTMIRE, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, DOGGETT, Mrs. LOWEY, Messrs. OLVER and CARNAHAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. BLACK and Mrs. MYRICK changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 139, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

ON THE RETIREMENT OF HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN JOHN V. SULLIVAN

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

Mr. BOEHNER. It's my privilege today to pay tribute to John Sullivan, who will retire this week after 8 years of service as our Parliamentarian and 25 years of service to this House.

John leaves his post with much to be proud of, starting with a first-rate team of parliamentarians who will do a fine job carrying on his legacy.

The parls are the people who are here first every morning, and they're also the last ones to leave at night. They review every piece of legislation. They keep us tethered to the rules and traditions that are the House's foundation. In this way, the parliamentarians are really the glue that holds this House together.

The leader of that team is John Sullivan, whose devotion to the House is as total as his commitment to Indiana basketball. Now, Coach Bobby Knight once defined "discipline" as "doing what you have to do, doing it as well as you possibly can, and doing it that way all the time." By this definition, John truly is one of the most disciplined people to have ever served in this House.

He consistently has shown grace under pressure in what well may be one of the biggest pressure cookers on Earth. He has strengthened and modernized the Office of the Parliamentarian to meet the needs of a more open and transparent Congress.

John, who was here on 9/11, determined how the House should go forward, and has spent every day preparing for the unexpected. In a body where anything can happen, he's always thinking two steps ahead, like any good coach.

So, of course, John's a modest man. He would just say it was just him doing his job. Like I said, discipline. But make no mistake: for the House and the people that we serve, he's gone above and beyond the call of duty.

John, we're sorry to see you go, but we want to wish you and your family the best. On behalf of the whole House, we want to thank you for your service.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the Speaker for yielding. I am proud to join him to honor the long and distinguished service of the House Parliamentarian, John Sullivan.

For 25 years, as has been said, he has served the House with distinction and dignity, integrity and intellect. He has used his keen mind, excellent legal training, and a commitment to public service to make nonpartisan, objective decisions. Always first in his mind was the Constitution and, therefore, his undying respect for the institution of Congress. Indeed, through his service

and his example, John Sullivan has become an institution himself, a source of wise counsel and parliamentary leadership, and though his name rarely makes headlines and though his hard work is seldom noticed in the public eye, the American people have benefited greatly from his extraordinary career.

A proud son of northwest Indiana, John Sullivan was a lawyer by training, a graduate of the Air Force Academy, and served our Nation in the Judge Advocate General's Office of the Air Force. He went on to advise the House Armed Services Committee before joining the Parliamentarian's office. He would ultimately hold the title of Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, a post occupied by only three others in the past 75 years. He has been a fair and independent voice, a professional of the highest caliber, a careful steward of the rules of the House, a true public servant.

Mr. Speaker, as a point of personal pride, on June 2, 1987, I was sworn in as a result of a special election, and I was the first Member of Congress to take the oath of office during John's tenure. For many reasons, he will hold a long place of honor in the history of the House, and in my personal history as well.

In a recent story on his career, John Sullivan summed up the key characteristics of his success. In his own words, he said, "You have to be very attentive to every syllable being uttered and able to think on your feet," as the Speaker said.

Attention to detail, quick thinking, staying attuned to the letter of the law, these were the hallmarks of John Sullivan's service. He has left a lasting legacy, and I am confident that his deputy and replacement, Tom Wickham, will continue in the same fine tradition.

We owe a debt of gratitude to all of our Parliamentarians. We owe a special debt of gratitude and our heartfelt thanks on this day to our Parliamentarian, John Sullivan. He has earned the respect and the admiration of Members of Congress, and he will be missed. We wish him and his wife, Nancy, and his children our best wishes for their future endeavors.

Congratulations and thank you, John Sullivan.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 112, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 184, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]  
YEAS—241

Adams	Gingrey (GA)	Nugent
Aderholt	Gohmert	Nunes
Akin	Goodlatte	Nunnelee
Alexander	Gosar	Olson
Amash	Gowdy	Palazzo
Amodei	Granger	Paulsen
Austria	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Pence
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Bartlett	Grimm	Platts
Barton (TX)	Guinta	Poe (TX)
Benishek	Guthrie	Pompeo
Berg	Hall	Posey
Biggert	Hanna	Price (GA)
Bilbray	Harper	Quayle
Bilirakis	Harris	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Rehberg
Black	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Blackburn	Hayworth	Renacci
Bonner	Heck	Ribble
Bono Mack	Hensarling	Rigell
Boustany	Herger	Rivera
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Brooks	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Buerkle	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Issa	Rokita
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Rooney
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Ross (FL)
Canseco	Jones	Royce
Cantor	Jordan	Runyan
Capito	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Carter	King (IA)	Scalise
Cassidy	King (NY)	Schilling
Chabot	Kingston	Schmidt
Chaffetz	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Chandler	Kissell	Schweikert
Coble	Kline	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Cole	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lance	Sessions
Cooper	Landry	Shimkus
Cravaack	Lankford	Shuler
Crawford	Latham	Shuster
Crenshaw	Latta	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Denham	Long	Southerland
Dent	Lucas	Stearns
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Stutzman
Dold	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Dreier	E.	Terry
Duffy	Manzullo	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Tiberi
Ellmers	Matheson	Tipton
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Turner (NY)
Farenthold	McCaul	Turner (OH)
Fincher	McClintock	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McCotter	Walberg
Flake	McHenry	Walden
Fleischmann	McKeon	Walsh (IL)
Fleming	McKinley	Webster
Flores	McMorris	West
Forbes	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Meehan	Whitfield
Fox	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Gallegly	Miller, Gary	Womack
Gardner	Mulvaney	Woodall
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Gerlach	Myrick	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Young (FL)
Gibson	Noem	Young (IN)

NAYS—184

Ackerman	Baca	Bass (CA)
Altmire	Baldwin	Bass (NH)
Andrews	Barrow	Becerra

Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva

Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
LaTourette  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCormack  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell

Pastor (AZ)  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schramer  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth

United States, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.  
The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.  
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 6, answered “present” 4, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]  
YEAS—413

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggart  
Bibray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway

Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri

Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schramer  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions

Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southerland  
Speier  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schramer  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions

NOT VOTING—6  
Filner  
Jackson (IL)

Mack  
Meeks  
Paul  
Rangel

□ 1441

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:  
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 140, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

OFFICIAL RECOGNITION OF SALEM, MASSACHUSETTS, AS THE BIRTHPLACE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1339) to amend title 32, United States Code, the body of laws of the United States dealing with the National Guard, to recognize the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the

NAYS—6  
Amash  
Goodlatte

Griffith (VA)  
Hurt

McKinley  
Wolf

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—4

Benishek  
Forbes

Rooney  
Wittman

NOT VOTING—8

Cantor  
Filner  
Jackson (IL)

Mack  
Meeks  
Paul

Rangel  
Sullivan

□ 1449

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to designate the City of Salem, Massachusetts, as the Birthplace of the National Guard of the United States.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:  
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 141, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”



THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 300, nays 111, answered “present” 4, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—300

Ackerman	Culberson	Jones
Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Jordan
Akin	Davis (IL)	Kaptur
Alexander	DeGette	Keating
Altmire	DeLauro	Kelly
Amodi	Denham	Kildee
Austria	DesJarlais	King (IA)
Baca	Deutch	King (NY)
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart	Kingston
Bachus	Dicks	Kissell
Barletta	Dingell	Kline
Barrow	Doyle	Labrador
Bartlett	Duncan (SC)	Lamborn
Barton (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Lance
Bass (NH)	Edwards	Langevin
Becerra	Ellison	Lankford
Berg	Ellmers	Larsen (WA)
Berkley	Emerson	Larson (CT)
Berman	Engel	LaTourrette
Biggert	Eshoo	Latta
Bilbray	Farenthold	Levin
Bilirakis	Farr	Lewis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Fincher	Lipinski
Bishop (UT)	Flake	LoBiondo
Black	Fleischmann	Lofgren, Zoe
Blackburn	Fleming	Long
Blumenauer	Flores	Lowe
Bonamici	Fortenberry	Lucas
Bonner	Frank (MA)	Luetkemeyer
Bono Mack	Franks (AZ)	Lujan
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Boustany	Fudge	Lungren, Daniel
Brady (TX)	Galleghy	E.
Bralley (IA)	Garamendi	Maloney
Brooks	Gibbs	Marchant
Broun (GA)	Gonzalez	Marino
Brown (FL)	Goodlatte	Matsui
Buchanan	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Buehner	Gowdy	McCarthy (NY)
Burton (IN)	Granger	McCaul
Butterfield	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Calvert	Green, Al	McCollum
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McHenry
Campbell	Grimm	McIntyre
Canseco	Guinta	McKeon
Cantor	Guthrie	McMorris
Capps	Hahn	Rodgers
Carnahan	Hall	McNerney
Carney	Hanabusa	Meehan
Carson (IN)	Harper	Mica
Carter	Hastings (WA)	Michaud
Cassidy	Hayworth	Miller (MI)
Chabot	Heinrich	Miller (NC)
Chaffetz	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Cicilline	Herger	Moran
Clarke (MI)	Higgins	Mulvaney
Clarke (NY)	Hinche	Murphy (CT)
Clay	Hinojosa	Murphy (PA)
Coble	Hirono	Myrick
Cohen	Hochul	Nadler
Cole	Holden	Napolitano
Connolly (VA)	Holt	Neugebauer
Conyers	Hultgren	Noem
Cooper	Hurt	Nunes
Courtney	Issa	Nunnelee
Crawford	Jenkins	Olson
Crenshaw	Johnson (GA)	Palazzo
Critz	Johnson (IL)	Pascarell
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Pearce

Pelosi	Runyan	Sullivan
Pence	Ruppersberger	Sutton
Perlmutter	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (PA)
Petri	Scalise	Thornberry
Pingree (ME)	Schiff	Tiberi
Pitts	Schmitt	Tierney
Platts	Schock	Tonko
Polis	Schrader	Towns
Pompeo	Schwartz	Tsongas
Posey	Schweikert	Upton
Price (GA)	Scott (SC)	Walberg
Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Walden
Quigley	Scott, Austin	Walz (MN)
Rehberg	Scott, David	Wasserman
Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Schultz
Richardson	Serrano	Waters
Rigell	Sessions	Watt
Rivera	Sewell	Waxman
Roby	Sherman	Webster
Rogers (AL)	Shimkus	Welch
Rogers (KY)	Shuster	West
Rogers (MI)	Simpson	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Sires	Wilson (FL)
Rokita	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Roskam	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Ross (AR)	Smith (WA)	Womack
Ross (FL)	Southerland	Woolsey
Rothman (NJ)	Speier	Yarmuth
Roybal-Allard	Stearns	Young (FL)
Royce	Stutzman	Young (IN)

NAYS—111

Adams	Hanna
Andrews	Harris
Baldwin	Hartzler
Benishek	Heck
Bishop (NY)	Herrera Beutler
Boswell	Himes
Brady (PA)	Honda
Buerkle	Hoyer
Burgess	Huelskamp
Capuano	Huizenga (MI)
Castor (FL)	Hunter
Chandler	Israel
Chu	Jackson Lee
Clyburn	(TX)
Coffman (CO)	Johnson (OH)
Conaway	Kind
Costa	Kinzinger (IL)
Costello	Kucinich
Cravaack	Landry
Cummings	Latham
DeFazio	Lee (CA)
Dent	Lewis (GA)
Doggett	Loeb
Dold	Loeb
Donnelly (IN)	Lynch
Duffy	Manzullo
Fitzpatrick	Markey
Forbes	Matheson
Foxx	McCotter
Gardner	McDermott
Garrett	McGovern
Gerlach	McKinley
Gibson	Miller (FL)
Graves (MO)	Miller, George
Green, Gene	Moore
Griffin (AR)	Neal
Grijalva	Nugent
Gutierrez	Olver
	Pallone

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—4

Amash	Gingrey (GA)
Cardoza	Owens

NOT VOTING—16

Bass (CA)	Filner	Paul
Capito	Gohmert	Rangel
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (KY)	Jackson (IL)	T.
Dreier	Mack	Van Hollen
Fattah	Meeks	

□ 1456

Mrs. MALONEY changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 142, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 112.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 597 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 112.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1455

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, with Mr. KLINE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

I look forward to working with my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, the ranking member, on what's going to be a long day and a great debate. Let me start this debate, first off, by saying this is what our constituents sent us here to do: to lead, to make decisions, to budget.

I want to start off by saying to the gentleman from Maryland how much I appreciate the adherence to the long-standing protocol in the Budget Committee on how, while we clearly disagree on a lot of the big fundamental

issues, we've been able to conduct this debate in a civil manner. And I'm pleased that that tradition from the Budget Committee is continuing to this day, and I want to simply say how grateful I am for that.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, we passed the boldest budget in recent history, a comprehensive plan to lift the debt and free the Nation from the constraints of an ever-expanding Federal Government. We changed the debate in Washington. Suddenly we're having a debate about how much spending we should cut instead of how much more to spend, how to create jobs the right way, by getting the Federal Government off our backs, by eliminating the debt, and by reforming the Tax Code so that American families and small businesses can create a true economic recovery.

This week, we're prepared to be right here on the floor to take it one step further. We're bringing a 2013 budget, which we call the Path to Prosperity, which does this: it cuts \$5.3 trillion in spending from the President's budget. It clears the roadblock of the partisan health care law that is now being debated in the Supreme Court because we believe that this partisan health care law is a roadblock to bipartisan reform. It puts our budget on the path to balance and a path to completely pay off our debt.

By contrast, look at what other leaders are doing today. The President sent us a budget last month, the fourth budget in a row, which proposes to do nothing to pay off the debt, let alone ever get the budget in balance. The President gave us a budget with the fourth trillion-dollar deficit in a row, ignoring the drivers of our debt, doing what his budget says, "advancing the deterioration of our fiscal situation."

The President's Treasury Secretary came to the Budget Committee and said:

We are not saying we have a solution to the long-term problem. We're just saying that we don't like yours.

Well, I couldn't have said it better myself.

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, by offering empty promises instead of real solutions, the President and his party leaders have made their choice clear. They're choosing the next election over the next generation. Our government, in both political parties, have made decades of empty promises to Americans, and soon those empty promises are going to become broken promises unless we reform government. We're borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend. It can't keep continuing.

We're offering Americans a better choice. We're offering Americans solutions. And let me just quickly walk you through just the kind of situation America faces today. This is what the Congressional Budget Office tells us we're looking at—a crushing burden of debt that is not only going to affect

our children's generation by denying them a better standard of living, a prosperous future, but it's going to put our own economy into a tailspin. All the experts came to the Budget Committee and told us we don't have much time left to avert this tidal wave of debt.

Now, what's the rush? Why do we need to move so quickly? Because, Mr. Chairman, every year we don't do something to fix this debt crisis, we go that much deeper into the hole. That many more trillions of dollars of empty promises are being made to the American people.

Back in 2009, we asked the General Accountability Office how many empty promises is our government making to today's Americans? In 2009 they said, \$62.9 trillion. Then we said in 2010, how many empty promises now? Now it's \$76.4 trillion. Today, just 1 year later, they're now saying last year's stack of empty promises to Americans was \$99.6 trillion. It's impossible to get your mind around these numbers.

What does that mean? That means if we want our government to keep all of the promises it is now making to current Americans—my mom's generation, my generation, and my children's generation—we have to, all of a sudden, invent, create and come up with about \$100 trillion today and invest it at Treasury rates just so we could have the money to keep these promises government is making. That's impossible. It can't be done. We know that.

So it's time to stop lying to the American people. It's time to be honest about the situation we're in and then start fixing the problem because every year we go over \$10 trillion deeper in the hole. Every year we go that much closer toward a debt crisis where government reneges on its promise to Americans. The people who need government the most—the poor, the sick and the elderly—they're the ones who get hurt first and the worst in a debt crisis.

What is the primary driver of this crisis? Spending. What the Congressional Budget Office tells us is spending is on course to double by the time my kids are my age and then double again over the course of this century. Revenues are going back to where they historically have been, but spending is on an unsustainable trajectory. And when you have to borrow that much money, when you have to borrow 40 cents on the dollar, just look at where it's coming from. This is not the 1970s where our debt was relatively pretty small and we borrowed about 5 cents on the dollar from foreign countries; and it's not the 1990s where our debt was getting big, and we borrowed at 19 cents from foreign governments.

Today, in 2012, 46 percent of our borrowing in this country—borrowing that's bigger than our economy now—comes from other nations, China being number one. We can't keep relying on other governments to cash flow our government. We are ceding our sov-

ereignty and our ability to control our own destiny as a country when we have to hope that other countries will lend us money. We've got to get this under control.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, here's what this budget does in a nutshell. It says, Let's get ahead of this problem. Let's preempt a debt crisis, and let's do it in a way so we can do it in a gradual way. Let's do it in a way so that we can preempt and prevent a debt crisis on our own terms as Americans. Let's not wait until we have a crisis. Let's not wait until interest rates go up and we're in sort of a European meltdown mode. Let's do it right, and do it now, because then we can keep the promises that government has made to people who need it the most—people who are already retired, people who are about to retire, the people who rely on government. You have to reform government to do that.

Instead of this mountain of debt, the Path to Prosperity budget puts our deficit and our debt on a downward slope and pays off the debt entirely over time. That takes time, that takes will, and it begins now. In short, Mr. Chairman, if we don't tackle these fiscal problems soon, they're going to tackle us as a country.

The best way to do it is put the kinds of ideas and reforms in place that grow the economy, create jobs, and get us back on a path to prosperity. We believe in the Founders' vision of the American idea. Your rights come from God and nature, not from government; and we believe in the freedom to pursue happiness. That means we want prosperity, we want upward mobility, and we want freedom and opportunity. Freedom and opportunity are gone if we have a debt crisis.

So what we're saying is let's do everything we can to get this economy growing, to get people back to work and back on their feet, and let's get our spending under control. Let's get our borrowing under control, and let's reform those government programs that are the primary drivers of our debt so that we can fulfill that great legacy that all of our parents told us about when we were growing up in this country, and that is this: each generation in America makes the next generation better off.

We know without a shred of doubt, it's irrefutable, that we're in the midst of giving the next generation a worse-off country, a lower standard of living and a diminished future. We have a moral and a legal obligation to stop that from happening, to pass a budget, to prevent that, to get us back on prosperity and get our debt paid off; and that's precisely what this budget does.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me start by thanking the chairman of the Budget Committee for the way he's conducted the proceedings in

the committee, and I look forward to a debate on the floor because as the chairman said, we have very deep differences. We do not have a difference on the question of whether or not we should reduce the deficits and the debt. Of course we do. We have a difference over how to do that.

In that regard, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this Republican plan and in support of the Democratic alternative. The Republican budget on the floor of the House today is simply the sequel to last year's plan—more of the same. It abandons the economic recovery and ends the Medicare guarantee for individuals whose median income is under \$21,000 while providing a whopping average tax break of almost \$400,000 for people making over \$1 million a year. These tax breaks for the very wealthy and the tax breaks for special interests come at the expense of middle-income taxpayers, at the expense of seniors, and at the expense of essential investments to keep America strong.

This Republican plan will weaken economic growth and, according to independent analysts, result in over 2 million jobs lost over the next 2 years. It rewards corporations that ship American jobs overseas while slashing investments in education, in scientific research and infrastructure that help America grow our economy right here at home. In short, it is a path to greater prosperity if you are already wealthy, while leaving seniors, working Americans, and future generations behind.

Mr. Chairman, we gather here at a very important time for our country. As a result of the extraordinary actions taken over the last 4 years and the tenacity of the American people and small businesses, America avoided a second Great Depression, and the economy is slowly recovering. Still, millions of Americans remain out of work through no fault of their own. We must push forward with the recovery, not fall back; and we certainly should not return to the failed economic policies that got America into this economic mess to begin with.

And yet that is exactly what this Republican budget does.

□ 1510

It is a recipe for national stagnation and decline. It retreats from our national goal of out-educating, out-building and out-competing the rest of the world. And it will weaken the economic recovery by slashing investments to important economic growth and expanding those tax breaks that reward corporations that ship American jobs overseas. Even when we have 17 percent unemployment in the construction industry, it cuts critical investments in our transportation systems, including a 46 percent cut in transportation starting next year.

As I mentioned earlier, nonpartisan analysts looked at this and concluded it would lose 2 million jobs over 2

years. So, rather than putting the economy into reverse, we need to move forward. We need to adopt the remainder of the President's jobs plan, a plan that's been sitting here in the House since September.

It's also clear that putting America back to work is the fastest and most effective way to reduce deficits in the short term. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that our weak economy and underemployment is the single major contributing factor to the deficit this year, accounting for over one-third of the projected 2012 deficit. So we need to come up with a credible plan.

The issue, as I said, is not whether but how. Every bipartisan group that has looked at ways to reduce the deficit in a credible way has recommended a balanced approach, meaning a combination of spending cuts and cuts to tax breaks for the wealthy, and the elimination of special interest corporate tax loopholes.

The Democratic alternative provides that balanced approach, while the Republican plan, unfortunately, fails that test. Instead, their plan would again rig the rules in favor of the very wealthy and special interests. That may not be a surprise, since virtually every House Republican has signed a pledge—a pledge—to Grover Norquist saying they will not close a single special interest tax loophole, not eliminate a single oil subsidy for the purpose of deficit reduction, not one penny.

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that we face a real deficit and debt problem. Apparently, the problem is not big enough to ask folks at the very high end of the income scale to contribute one penny toward deficit reduction.

In addition to locking in those parts of the Bush tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the very wealthy, they now have a new round of tax cuts that will provide, on average, a \$400,000 tax cut for people making over \$1 million a year. That's according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center.

So, here's the key: because our Republican colleagues refuse to ask millionaires to contribute 1 cent to deficit reduction, they hit everyone and everything else.

Let's take a look at Medicare recipients. They immediately increase costs to seniors for Medicare preventive services and terminate a new service, the wellness programs, that were part of the Affordable Care Act. They immediately reduce support to seniors in the prescription drug plan by reopening the doughnut hole. That decision will cost seniors with high drug costs an average of \$10,000 over the next 10 years.

Once again, this Republican budget does not reform Medicare; it deforms it. It proposes to end the Medicare guarantee, shifting rising costs onto seniors and disabled individuals. It gives you the equivalent of a voucher, but if your voucher amount is not suf-

ficient to pay for the rising cost of health care, too bad. Too bad. It simply rations your health care and choice of doctor by income and leaves seniors to the whims of the insurance industry.

Despite claims that market competition is going to bring down those rising costs, the plan creates that artificial cap on the voucher support. Our Republican colleagues say they're using the part D prescription drug plan as a model, but that has no artificial cap. They say it's the same kind of plan offered to Members of Congress under the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, but that has no cap on support from their plans. So, unlike Members of Congress, seniors in Medicare will get vouchers with declining purchasing power relative to rising health care costs.

In fact, if you look at this chart, Mr. Chairman, you will see what the current Medicare plan would provide in terms of the amount of support provided by the plan to the individual on health care. That's the blue line. This is the green line, Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, the plan that Members of Congress are on. As you can see, the amount of the premium support keeps pace with rising health care costs. This red line is the Republican voucher plan that caps the amount an individual can receive and goes steadily downward, giving seniors on Medicare a worse deal than Members of Congress would give to themselves.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this budget also rips apart the safety net for seniors in nursing homes and assisted living facilities, as well as low-income kids and individuals with disabilities who rely on Medicaid. Remember, two-thirds of Medicaid funding goes to seniors in nursing homes and disabled individuals, yet that is one of the biggest areas of the Republican budget cuts. It takes a hatchet to Medicaid, slashing over \$800 billion and cutting Medicaid by one-third by the year 2022. This is done under the Orwellian title in their plan of "repairing" the social safety net. That's like throwing an anchor to a drowning person.

Mr. Chairman, to govern is to choose, and that's what this debate is all about. The choices in this Republican budget are simply wrong for America. It is not bold to provide tax breaks to millionaires while ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors and sticking them with the bill for rising health care costs. It's not courageous to protect tax giveaways to Big Oil companies and other special interests while slashing investments in our kids' education, scientific research, and critical infrastructure. It is not visionary to reward corporations that ship American jobs overseas while terminating affordable health care for tens of millions of Americans. It is certainly not brave to cut support for seniors in nursing homes, individuals with disabilities, and poor kids. And it is not fair to raise taxes on middle-income

Americans financed by another round of tax breaks for the very wealthy. Yet those are the choices made in this Republican budget.

Where is the shared responsibility?

Mr. Chairman, we can and we must do better. Let's reject this budget and adopt the Democratic alternative which provides a balanced approach to accomplishing the goal of reducing our deficits while at the same time strengthening our economy and doing it in a way that calls for shared responsibility.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his vision and courage. It has truly been an honor to serve on the committee under his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago, the House passed a budget that would have put our Nation back on the path to fiscal solvency and ultimately paid off the entire national debt. It would have saved Medicare and Medicaid from collapse and put them back on a solid and secure foundation. According to Standard & Poor's, it would have preserved the AAA credit rating of the United States Government. That plan was killed in the Senate, which has not passed a budget in 3 years.

The Senate majority leader complained that it threatened the Cowboy Poetry Festival in Elko, Nevada. An allied group ran a smear campaign depicting Congressman RYAN as a monster willing to throw his grandmother off a cliff. Sadly, that's what passes for reasoned discourse from today's left.

The result is that today our country is another year older and more than \$1 trillion deeper in debt. We've lost our AAA credit rating. We've watched our Nation's debt exceed our entire economy, putting us in the same league as the worst-run European governments.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a perfect budget, no budget ever is, but it will save our country from the calamity that is now destroying Greece. That should be reason enough for adopting it with a resounding and, dare I hope, bipartisan vote.

A year ago, a panel of experts from left to right warned us that we were, at best, 5 years from a sovereign debt crisis. I wonder how many more years we've got. How many more chances will we have to set things right before events overtake us and we enter the inexorable downward spiral of bankrupt nations?

Let's not find out the answer to that question. Let us act now to redeem our Nation's finances and restore our Nation's freedom while there is still time. That is our generation's responsibility. That is our generation's destiny.

□ 1520

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member VAN HOLLEN for yielding the time and stand to say that jobs need to be America's number one priority. The Republican budget shows, once again, that Republicans don't have a jobs agenda. You balance family and national budgets by creating jobs and putting people back to work.

We still have over 12 million Americans looking for work, and that doesn't even include those who have fallen off benefits or are looking for work but can't find full-time employment.

I said when we marked up this bill in committee, and I will say it again, this Republican budget completely ignores the President's jobs agenda. Instead, Republicans, incredibly, criticized Democrats for taking the steps that helped save the U.S. auto industry and millions of related high-paying manufacturing jobs.

Republicans opposed the payroll tax extension for middle class Americans, which will help keep demand up so that businesses can hire more workers. Republicans are pushing for irresponsible cuts that economists have warned will hurt the economy and job creation, and Republicans proposed a partisan transportation bill that would bankrupt the highway trust fund and destroy thousands of jobs.

In committee, we couldn't even get the Republicans to support a modest Veterans Jobs Corps to create 20,000 jobs for our vets returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. I raised this situation with President Obama during one of his Ohio visits and shared with him H.R. 494, a bill I've drafted, and the President saw a need to create jobs, and his administration asked Congress to do this for our returning vets.

The Republican majority has said no to our veterans as thousands and thousands of them return and remain unemployed.

I ask my colleagues to reject the Republican budget, support the Democratic alternative, and put our economy first. Job creation for all Americans must be our top priority and is the first step in beginning to balance our budget which requires a growth economy.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. MICA, for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. MICA. I thank the chair of the Budget Committee. And first, let me commend Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

I'm pleased with the cooperative working relationship between our two committees, particularly as we seek to move a multiyear surface transportation reauthorization to the floor in the near future.

As you know, H.R. 7 is the most significant transportation reform bill

since the Interstate Highway System was created some 50 years ago. The bill will reduce the Federal bureaucracy by consolidating or eliminating more than 70 programs and allows States to set their own transportation priorities, not bureaucrats here in Washington.

H.R. 7 provides the stable and predictable funding stream that is necessary for States and construction companies to take on major construction projects that span several years. The bill accomplishes more with less through significant reforms, including cutting in half the time it takes to complete major transportation infrastructure projects.

H.R. 7 also establishes a blueprint for job creation, is responsibly paid for, and includes no earmarks, no tax increases or deficit spending.

As everyone here knows, our surface transportation programs expire on Saturday, and we need to pass an extension in the next few days in order to ensure that these programs will not disrupt the folks who may be furloughed and construction workers who would be sent home.

I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will act responsibly and put politics aside and join us in passing a short-term extension so we can work on a longer-term solution.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7 meets two criteria of the deficit-neutral reserve fund outlined in this budget. First, it will maintain the solvency of the highway trust fund, and second, it will not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal year 2013 through fiscal 2022.

The resolution before us also assumes a new potential funding stream for the trust fund in the form of oil and gas revenues, and ensures that any future funding transfers will be fully offset.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. MICA. Both of which are included in H.R. 7.

I would like to confirm with the gentleman from Wisconsin that my understanding of these provisions is correct, and that H.R. 7 is in compliance with the budget resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Florida is correct in his observations that H.R. 7, as considered by the House, is in compliance with the fiscal year 2013 budget resolution before us today. And we look forward to the final, long-term reauthorization bill.

Mr. MICA. I thank the chairman for his diligence and ongoing efforts to bring much-needed fiscal discipline to Federal spending.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, that was an interesting colloquy, especially given the fact that the Senate has passed a bipartisan transportation bill; again, a bill that has very broad support that, if we took it up today in the House, we could get it passed right now, and it would be good for the economy and good for the fact that we have

17 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

As I remarked earlier, the Republican budget that we're considering would actually cut transportation funding spending outlays by 46 percent next year. That is not good for the economy, and I hope this body will overturn that.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, over the past several months, in hearing after hearing in the Budget Committee, we have heard one recurring theme from our expert witnesses. Chairman Bernanke said it, Director Elmendorf said it, Acting Director Zients said it, and Secretary Geithner reaffirmed that the draconian, reckless cuts proposed by the Republican majority, and made evident in their budget proposal that we are considering on the House floor today, will create an enormous headwind for our economy. Yet, here we are again.

Yes, here we are considering the same Republican budget plan as last year, hearing the same arguments from Chairman RYAN and the Republican leadership.

As I said last week in committee, I feel like it's "Groundhog Day" all over again, but Bill Murray is nowhere in sight, and this is no comedy.

In all seriousness, the harmful spending cuts incorporated into this budget proposal go further than simply damaging a fragile recovery. These cuts pull the rug out from under our most vulnerable: our seniors, our children, and those with serious illness.

Democrats reject the idea that the way to deal with rising health care costs is to give seniors a voucher to purchase private insurance and then tell them to figure out how to keep their own costs down.

Democrats believe that we cannot solve our budget challenges simply by shifting health costs and risks onto people who are least able to bear them: seniors, disabled individuals, and poor families.

Last week I offered an amendment in the Budget Committee that no one in this body should ever have to offer. My amendment would have prevented reckless and shameful Medicaid cuts to seniors in nursing homes. Like all of the other amendments offered by my Democratic colleagues, this amendment was rejected on a party-line vote. This is simply unconscionable.

As a Member of Congress representing a large number of seniors in south Florida, I can tell you that the House Republican budget would be devastating for seniors and older Americans. This Republican "path to poverty" would pass like a tornado through America's nursing homes, where millions of America's seniors receive long-term and end-of-life care.

Sixty percent of Americans in nursing homes are on Medicaid, so cuts to Medicaid would have a dramatically

negative impact on our seniors. The Federal Government made a commitment to each and every one of us that when we got older we wouldn't need to live in poverty or force our children into poverty in order to care for us.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. For decades we have looked to Medicare and Medicaid with the expectation that the Federal Government would honor its commitment. Now, under this budget plan, Republicans are trying to back out of our commitment to seniors. We cannot go back on our promise to the Greatest Generation. There is a better way forward.

I ask my colleagues to think about our seniors and our most vulnerable and reject the Republican budget plan.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes just to respond to a few of the things that have been said.

First off, it's not the budget that lowers the highway funding next year by 46 percent. It's the current law that governs the highway trust fund that does that anyway.

Let's remember, Mr. Chairman, the highway trust fund is going insolvent. That's under current law. So our budget simply reflects that current law. But we say, let's go get new sources of revenue from oil and gas exploration to go to the highway trust fund, and let's have a reserve fund so that we can go out and find savings to fix this highway trust fund.

But since those bipartisan negotiations are just beginning to take place, since that conference is beginning to take place, we can't include it in this budget. Therefore, we had the reserve fund to be held in order to accommodate that compromise once it arrives.

□ 1530

Medicare. The growth rate of Medicare under this budget is the same one the President proposes in his budget. So for the chart my friend from Maryland used saying this is what the Republican budget does to growing Medicare out in the future, it's the same one President Obama proposes.

Here's the difference: President Obama, in his law, the one being debated over at the Supreme Court, says 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats will be in charge of putting price controls and cuts to Medicare to accommodate that growth rate versus our plan to put 50 million seniors in charge of choosing what health care plan is best for them. More for the poor, more for the sick, less for the wealthy; and it makes Medicare solvent.

Here's the catch: we don't change the benefit for current seniors. This system applies to younger people. Unlike the current law that the President passed, that my friend voted for, 15 bureaucrats are in charge of putting price

controls on current seniors' medical care which leads to denied care for them.

So if we're talking about who's saving and strengthening Medicare, it is this budget as opposed to the status quo which raids it, rations it, and still allows the program to go bankrupt.

With that, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire, a member of this Budget Committee, Mr. GUINTA.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to add my voice to those calling for the passage of the Path to Prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a debt crisis in this Nation. We have a spending crisis in this Nation. This Congress was sent here just a year ago to fix and solve these problems; and we have, for the second year in a row, offered solutions. We have offered ideas, and we will continue to work with the other side of the aisle to try to find what we all believe is a more prosperous Nation.

For too long, job creators in my home State of New Hampshire have paced on the sidelines. They tell me over and over that we want to expand our payrolls, we want to see stability and predictability from Washington first. But that hasn't happened.

Mr. Chairman, it's not asking too much for our Nation to see what good, sound fiscal policy looks like, and we ought to provide that opportunity. We ought to pass this piece of legislation.

The Path to Prosperity gives job creators the confidence to resume doing what they do best: innovate, operate, and expand their businesses and their job opportunities for the rest of us.

It does so by reducing spending \$5.3 trillion over the next decade. We slowly bring the deficit below 3 percent of GDP as quickly as 2015, and we have a path to balance this Nation's budget.

We also do this by reforming our Tax Code. Consolidating six tax brackets down to two, 25 and 10 percent, and on the corporate side reducing the rate from 35 to 25, going to a territorial system, allowing the opportunity for our economy to once again be thriving.

The best way to sustain a lasting economic recovery is to remove the hurdles and the barriers that are holding back job creators; and this budget, Mr. Chairman, does just that.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Path to Prosperity, and I call on the Senate to approve it as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, a couple of points.

The bipartisan bill that came over from the Senate would provide funding fully paid for, offset for 18 months. So you could avoid the big 46 percent cut next year that's in the Republican budget and make sure folks out there who are looking for jobs in the construction industry could get to work.

Secondly, with respect to Medicare, you have two fundamentally different approaches. The approach we had in the Affordable Care Act was to say we need to modernize the Medicare system

by changing incentives. So we reward and incentivize the quality of care, the value of care, not the volume of care which drove up costs.

What we do not do is offload the risk of those rising health care costs onto seniors.

Now the board, the IPAB the gentleman referred to, is specifically prohibited, and I have the language right here, from including any recommendations to ration health care, raise revenue or Medicare beneficiary premiums, whereas the Republican plan expressly works by offloading those risks and those costs onto seniors. A very different approach.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. In Akron, Ohio, Summa Health Care is already implementing some of these accountable care organization methods, the medical home, and saving millions and millions of dollars because of the health care reform bill. I love this idea of we can't have a board that's rationing care.

What are the insurance companies doing today, Mr. Chairman? We act like we're living in a society where the insurance industry is okaying every procedure that needs to get done. They're rationing care right now. We have 40 or 50 million Americans who can't afford health care.

So we're going to throw our seniors now into the insurance market, and we're going to give them a premium support or a voucher—and our friend says it's not a voucher, it's premium support—to help them go out into the free market and buy insurance. But that voucher is only going to go up 3 or 4 percent a year while health care costs are going to go up 5, 10—who knows—15 percent a year. So that voucher every single year goes down and becomes worth less. That's the concern that we have on our side, and that's why we think the reform we put into place was a positive thing.

Then the Medicaid cuts, which people in Ohio use to make sure they can get into a nursing home when they're seniors, get a cut by one-third.

So we're cutting Medicaid by a third, we're basically privatizing the Medicare system into a voucher system, sending our seniors to swim with the sharks in the insurance market, hope that the insurance companies grant them coverage for what they may need. Oh, by the way, you can't really make money off insuring senior citizens. This is the kind of philosophy. This is why this debate about the budget is really a positive one because I think it articulates the two different sides.

Lastly, let me just say this is about balance. The deep, deep cuts in the Republican budget are because they can't ask Warren Buffett to pay a little bit more in taxes. All during the committee process this year and last year, we had our friends on the other side of the aisle who honor Ronald Reagan—light candles, burn incense, put his picture up.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RYAN from Ohio. Ronald Reagan raised taxes 11 times: Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982; Highway Revenue Act of 1982; Social Security amendments of 1983; Railroad Retirement Revenue Act, tax increase of 1983; Deficit Reduction Act of 1984; Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985; Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985; Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986; continuing resolution in '87, and a continuing resolution in '88.

The responsible thing to do is to ask Warren Buffett and his friends to help us make sure that these cuts aren't that deep in Medicare and Medicaid and Pell Grants and the other investments that we need to make in this country.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Budget Committee, I'm pleased to have not only helped author this budget but to stand here in strong support of it. It's a fair budget. It's an honest budget.

The gentleman from New Hampshire said this is the second year in a row that we are telling the truth to the American people. You know, the old adage was "never touch that third rail of politics." Never touch Medicare, never touch Medicaid, never talk about Social Security. Touch it and you will die. We are debunking that myth because that's exactly what it is.

We give credit to the American people by telling them the truth. We have that respect for them. Sixty-five percent of our spending year over year comes out of this House on programs that don't work well and that are bankrupt. They won't be around for our children, and that's these programs right here.

This is what drives our debt: 65 percent of our current spending.

You know what's unfair? It's unfair that in a few decades these programs, as this chart shows, will take 100 percent, will take up all of the revenue that we bring in, the taxes that we bring in as a Federal Government.

Now, some will say, Hey, wait a minute, I paid into those programs; I deserve to take out. Well, that's kind of true as well.

Let's take Medicare for example. On average, we pay in 30 percent of what we're going to take out; and that 70 percent difference comes from the children of tomorrow who don't exist yet, who have no voice in this debate.

□ 1540

It's unfair that no one speaks for them. We do.

We speak for the people in the here and now, and we speak for the people of tomorrow. Immigrants didn't come to

this country for wealth redistribution. They didn't come to this country to practice intergenerational theft. They want their kids and they want their grandchildren to have a better life than they did. Our budget does that.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The gentleman is absolutely right about the need to look out for future generations and the issue of the deficit. What I always find staggering is the refusal to close one single loophole—just one penny—for the purposes of reducing the deficit so that we can address that issue of the deficits in future generations.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), who has been a great member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I thank the ranking member.

The Federal budget is a statement of our priorities and our values as a Nation. The budget needs to be fiscally responsible and reduce the deficit, meet our obligations to our seniors and our families and our future, and make targeted investments to grow our economy.

The Republican budget fails to meet all three challenges. It fails our Nation's seniors and our middle class. It fails to ensure that we can compete from a position of strength in a global economy, and it fails to offer a balanced approach to deficit reduction. The Republican budget relies solely on spending cuts. It chooses tax reductions for millionaires at the expense of the middle class, and it chooses tax breaks for the biggest corporations over small business and new jobs.

The most direct assault on our values as Americans is the Republicans' plan to dismantle Medicare as we know it. Rather than protecting the promise of Medicare for seniors now and into the future, the Republicans break that promise. Rather than reducing costs through payment and delivery system reforms, the Republicans do nothing to contain costs, and they simply shift the cost burden onto our seniors. Rather than guaranteed benefits, the Republicans leave seniors on their own to buy what benefits they can afford with a voucher of limited value. This means seniors are subjected to the uncertainty of the insurance industry, meaning possible discrimination based on age, illness, and income. Their budget even cuts health coverage for our sickest and frailest seniors, threatening their access to vital nursing home care.

For decades, Medicare has provided both financial and health security for America's seniors, with access to quality, affordable, guaranteed health benefits. Medicare is a promise to our seniors, and it is a promise that this Republican budget breaks. America's seniors deserve better. Instead, we need a balanced approach to reduce the deficit, to meet our commitments in our Nation, particularly to our seniors, and to create an environment that grows our economy now and into the future.



Reject this Republican budget and choose the Democratic budget alternative, which meets our Nation's challenges in a way that is balanced, fair, and responsible.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to simply say that I keep hearing this word, "voucher." I'm told it polls well if your goal is to try and scare senior citizens. What we're talking about in here is to build upon the bipartisan reforms that have been advocated in the nineties, in the early part of this decade, and most recently on how best to save and strengthen the Medicare guarantee.

First, no changes for anybody in or near retirement in Medicare.

Second, when people 54 or below become Medicare eligible, they'll get a list of guaranteed coverage options from Medicare from which to choose, just like we do as Members of Congress, including, in this case, the traditional Medicare program. Medicare will subsidize their premiums from the plans they choose. If you're low-income or sick, you'll get much more. You'll get total coverage—no out of pocket—for a low-income person; and we say, if you're a wealthy person, you can probably afford more out of pocket, so you're not going to get as much of a subsidy.

That premium grows. We competitively bid. The plans must offer the basic benefit so it protects against health inflation; and as a backstop, it grows no faster than what the President proposes in his.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. In yielding myself 30 additional seconds, Mr. Chairman, here is the difference:

The President's is different. He allows Medicare to go bankrupt. Yet, even with that, he takes a half a trillion dollars from Medicare to spend on his new health care program for other people, and he puts a board of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in charge of denying care by denying prices. It says you can go and cut reimbursement rates to providers and that you can do a values-based benefit design, which is what they propose—whatever that means—to affect current seniors.

We reject the idea that Medicare should be run by 15 unelected bureaucrats. Instead, we want to preserve it for the current generation.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the House Republican Conference, a former member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I especially thank him for his national leadership on this pressing issue of the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, last week, Secretary Geithner came up to Capitol Hill to warn of the threat to the American economy of the European debt crisis. Now, Mr. Chairman, the American peo-

ple know that the greater threat to the American economy is the American debt crisis. We face the absolute worst debt crisis in America's history, and yet it has been almost 3 years since both House and Senate Democrats have submitted a budget—almost 3 full years.

Now, to his credit, the President has submitted a budget. To his shame, it adds \$11 trillion to our national debt on top of the \$5 trillion that he has already imposed of additional national debt. Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that the spending trajectory of the Federal Government is unsustainable. And what does our President do in his budget? He takes an unsustainable spending trajectory and doubles down. He makes it more unsustainable, which makes it unconscionable. Perhaps worst of all, Mr. Chairman, even though he knows what the drivers of our national insolvency are, he refuses to deal with them.

But don't take my word for it. Listen to the editorial pages of major U.S. newspapers, many of which are pretty liberal in their orientations.

The Boston Herald writes:

President Barack Obama has apparently decided that he is not going to be part of the solution to the Nation's enormous deficit, which would make him, yes, part of the problem.

The LA Times:

It's past time for the administration to lay out a credible plan for bringing the deficit and debt under control. Sadly, Obama's budget proposal shows that he would rather wait until after the election to have that reckoning.

USA Today:

The best test of a budget proposal these days is whether it reins in the national debt. The election year budget President Obama sent to Congress on Monday fails that test.

It's pretty clear the President's policies have failed and are hampering our economic recovery. Because they have failed, regrettably, our President has resorted to the politics of division and envy, which is fairly evident in his budget. He has not appealed to the better angels of our disposition and not to the noblest aspirations of our fellow citizens. Instead, he appeals to their basic instincts.

The Nation is truly, truly at a crossroads between two very, very different paths. The President's path is one of crushing, unsustainable debt; a massive tax increase on struggling families and small business; and, most troubling, a diminished future for our children and grandchildren. In short, it is the road to becoming a European-style social democracy of the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, it is past time to quit spending money we don't have. It is past time to quit borrowing almost 40 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese, so we can just turn around and send the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

Where the President and other Democrats have failed to lead, House Republicans, under the leadership of our

Budget chairman, PAUL RYAN, have acted. We have a vastly different path for America's future. It is a path of opportunity. It is a path for economic growth. It is the path to prosperity, and it is the path of fiscal sustainability that, over time, not just reduces the national debt but will pay it off.

□ 1550

Number one, let's look at the differences. Our budget would absolutely prevent the President's single largest tax increase in American history, \$1.9 trillion of new taxes to be imposed upon our job creators and other hard-working Americans. And you know what's ironic, Mr. Chairman? Even if you gave the President every single job-hampering tax increase he's asked for, it's about 16, maybe 17 percent of the \$11 trillion he wants to add to the national debt. You can't tax your way out of this problem, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. So we know it's the middle-income who will end up paying this.

Second point: we repealed the President's failed health care program, the one that we now understand is going to cost almost \$2 trillion, the one that now the Congressional Budget Office tells us will cost almost 2 million jobs, and the one that creates the Independent Payment Advisory Board, as the chairman has said, that includes 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats who will begin making health care decisions for our seniors, like my 79-year-old mother, my 83-year-old father. You know, if one of them needs a hip replacement, if one of them needs a heart bypass, I want that decision to be made between them and their doctor, not the 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats who have one, and only one, purpose, and that is to impose price controls and ration the quality and access to health care for our seniors.

You know, I hear the buzz line, but it seems to me that ends Medicare as we know it. Looting \$500 billion out of Medicare to pay for the President's health care, that seems to end Medicare as we know it. Putting a global price cap, that seems to end Medicare as we know it. And most of all—since we've heard from the trustees of the Medicare and Social Security trust fund that it's going broke—allowing it to go broke, which our friends on the other side of the aisle do, seems to me to be ending Medicare as we know it.

Our budget will end the road to bankruptcy by controlling spending. Under the President's budget, spending has gone from its traditional 20 percent of our economy to 24 percent, and it's on its way to 40 percent over the course of the next generation. Our budget will control spending and limit government so we can have unlimited opportunity.



What is this debate truly about, Mr. Chairman? Here's what I think it's about. And I have shared this correspondence with my colleagues before. I heard from the Calhoun family in Winnsboro, Texas, about this debt. And he wrote me:

Congressman, I have never felt so embarrassed and ashamed about anything I have done in my life as I do about leaving this mess in the laps of Tyler and Caitlynn, my precious grandkids. I have written both of them a heartfelt apology for them to read when they get old enough to understand what I allowed our country's governing authority to do to them.

Mr. Chairman, we have no greater moral responsibility than to preserve the blessings of liberty and opportunity for this gentleman's grandchildren and the next generation. It's what we do. We are Americans. We're not just operating on borrowed money. We're operating on borrowed time.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HENSARLING. Two paths. Two choices. One duty. I hope history records that we acted worthy of ourselves, that we acted worthy of our forefathers, that we acted worthy of this great Republic for which so many have sacrificed over the years.

No more borrowed time. No more borrowed money. Let's seize the moment in history. Let's adopt the Republican Path to Prosperity budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the President's plan and the Republican budget, the difference between the Democratic alternative and the Republican budget, is that we take a balanced approach. I think everybody understands that spending cuts have to be part of the solution. This Congress acted last summer, cut \$1 trillion out of the budget. But the President and the Democratic alternative also understand what bipartisan groups all understand, which is that the only credible way to reduce our deficits is through a combination of spending cuts and cutting some of the tax breaks to special interests and asking millionaires to pay more.

I keep hearing our Republican colleagues come to the floor lamenting the large deficits and debt which we all agree we need to get under control and then refusing to cut one special interest loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit, asking a millionaire to contribute one more penny for the purpose of reducing the deficit.

Now with respect to the issue of Medicare, the reason it's not premium support is, it doesn't provide constant support to the senior on Medicare. Over time, seniors' purchasing power of this voucher will become less and less while the costs go up and up.

I would point out, again, that Members of Congress have for themselves a plan, this green line, where the purchasing power of their health plan stays constant, even as health prices

increase. But this red line here is what they would do to seniors on Medicare.

Now I've heard it said a couple of times now that the President allows Medicare to go bankrupt. Mr. Chairman, here is a chart that the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, presented in the Budget Committee. The black line here is the trajectory that they claim for their plan in terms of cost containment. The blue line is what they acknowledge the President calls for.

As you can see, the tracks are very different. This red line is projected cost increase by the Congressional Budget Office. The difference between the approaches is that the Republican plan puts the risk of being wrong here on the senior, whereas the plan we put forward says we need to change the incentive structures, to change the incentives in a way so that providers provide more cost-efficient care rather than putting that risk on the senior. That is the fundamental difference. And AARP, the largest organization of seniors in the country, agrees with what I have just said. They say in their letter:

The premium support method described in the proposal, unlike private plan options that currently exist in Medicare, would likely "price out" traditional Medicare as a viable option, thus rendering the choice of traditional Medicare as a false promise.

They go on to say that the purchasing power of this voucher will not keep pace with health care costs. Let's not put that risk on seniors.

And with that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) who has been just tenacious in making sure that we deal with these issues in a fair and balanced way.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the ranking member very much.

The Republican budget makes something very clear, and that is, Democrats and Republicans have very different visions for our great country. The Republican vision is harsh, and independent commentators have said a few things about their proposed budget. They've called it reverse Robin Hood. They've called it disturbing. And they've called it extreme. And I think one of the primary reasons is that the Republican budget breaks the promise that this country has made to generations of Americans that is Medicare.

The fundamental promise of Medicare is if you work hard and you play by the rules and you pay into Medicare every year, as you are working, that it will be there for you in retirement, and you can live your retirement years in dignity. Even in the face of a diagnosis of Alzheimer's or cancer, you will not go bankrupt, and your children will not go bankrupt.

Medicare makes America great. But unfortunately, through this budget, the Republicans say they don't share that view. Specifically, the Republican budget ends guaranteed coverage that our parents and grandparents have paid for, cuts Medicare benefits. It increases premiums and co-pays, and it scraps all

of those important democratic cost saving reforms that strengthen Medicare.

I offered an amendment in the Budget Committee that would retain closing of the doughnut hole, the annual wellness visit, and other benefits, but unfortunately, it was voted down.

□ 1600

It ends Medicare as we know it and forces the average senior to pay twice as much for half the benefit.

Americans need to ask why. Why do they want to cut Medicare while at the same time protecting corporate tax subsidies and loopholes like the ones for Big Oil? Why do they want to cut Medicare while at the same time increasing tax breaks for millionaires?

The Republican budget proposes a harsh vision indeed, a vision that is contrary to our values for American families.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. To catch up on time, does the gentleman from Maryland want to yield to another Member?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been fighting for jobs as part of this budget.

Mr. PASCRELL. When I was introduced to this budget, the chairman of the Budget Committee stated that his reason for turning Robin Hood on his head was to stop an "insidious moral tipping point."

Madam Chair, I can only assume April Fools came early and this budget resolution is a joke.

We're going to steal from the middle class and working poor because we need to stiffen their upper lips and improve their moral fiber.

Let's talk about moral fiber. Where were the morals of the bankers on Wall Street who drove this economy off the cliff? They're doing just fine today. They're not doing time. But the middle class is still struggling and millions of Americans are unemployed.

You don't have to look far to see what the real intentions of this budget are. It's a 30-year pathway to poverty and shrinking the middle class even further.

Don't take my word for it. When asked if his tax plan would hurt the middle class, the chairman of the Budget Committee responded with: I don't know. There's no way to know that. Are you playing Russian roulette with a shrinking middle class?

Madam Chair, let's try and help the chairman figure this out. The \$4.6 trillion tax giveaway to the very wealthy in this budget means that the middle class homeowners lose their mortgage interest deduction and property tax deduction, students lose the deduction for interest on student loans, small businesses lose tax credits for buying insurance, and future seniors will have Medicare turn into a voucher program that will make them pay \$6,000 more out of pocket by 2022, because this Republican budget cuts \$800 billion from Medicare.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MYRICK). The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Premium support doesn't reduce costs. It simply shifts them to seniors without the guarantee of Medicare benefits.

Seniors like Medicare. Take it from me, they like the security it provides them, and it controls costs better than any private sector plan, and it costs less than any private sector plan. This is not a plan to strengthen Medicare. This is a plan to slowly drown it.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another 10 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. And leaving no working family's stone unturned, this budget takes 62 percent of its \$5.3 trillion in nondefense budget cuts from programs that protect the most vulnerable in this society, which includes food stamps, Head Start, and the Women, Infants, and Children Nutrition Program.

This is a joke.

Thank you for presenting it to us. We'll present our own.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, the hyperbole knows no bounds these days.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just about 2 months ago, I went with my daughter, parked in a church parking lot, and let her take the wheel.

She's 15 years old, and we're in that process of her learning how to drive. I do that because I'm her dad, and I know the dangers that she's about to face. I quite frankly know the dangers to our neighbors around us and their trash cans and their garage if I don't spend time teaching her how to drive. That's my responsibility to do that because I'm the adult and I'm to step up and take the lead when it's there so as to avoid the danger that is coming.

That is where we are right now as a Nation. We can continue to pretend that this is not serious and that we can continue to spend more money; and if we only just spent a little more and if we only tax a little more, we'll tax our way out of this, we'll spend our way out of this. I promise it will get better. I know that we're at \$15.6 trillion in debt; but if we only got it to \$18 trillion, if we only got it to \$20 trillion, then our economy will finally catch up and stabilize.

What the people back in my district say is the same thing that I know: The problem is bigger than that.

If we were 20 years ago saying let's tweak the Tax Code a little bit, let's do a couple of things, we could get a simple fix. It is not like that today. Just this year, we had \$1.3 trillion in deficit spending. This President has racked up in 3 years and 3 months more debt than the previous administration did in 8 years.

It is time to make some hard choices, but they are the right choices; and that's what I hear from people back home. They say: Balance the budget. It's not right to take away money from the next generation so we can try to just continue to stir up more programs for us.

It is not right to just create a never-ending list of new options and to say if we just give more money to this group and to this group and to this group, it will fix it. It's not right that we don't protect defense. We have to do that.

People are frustrated. They are talking about the Tax Code. Just tax this person, just do this little bit, just add a few more pages to it. They want us to fix the Tax Code, not just tweak it.

Year after year I hear people saying to me, fix Medicare. Senior adults look at me and they get it. There's a problem. They want us to fix it. They want us to stabilize it. Considering all the things that were said last year, I'm amazed that PolitiFact said that the ending Medicare as we know it was the biggest lie of the year in politics, and it looks like it's in a race to win in 2012 again.

We are not ending Medicare as we know it. We are protecting it for the future because it is unstable. It is going insolvent. It is time for us to repair it and protect it and put it on a path that can be sustained for the days to come.

All the people in my district want is a reasonable, right plan that actually deals with the drivers of our debt, that actually deals with the tough issues and says stop playing with us, we're adults, let's fix this and let's get on with it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, somebody who has said let's fix this in an adult way, a balanced way, the way other bipartisan groups have done is Ms. MCCOLLUM from Minnesota.

I yield the gentlelady 2 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, this Republican budget is a political document. It's the House Republicans' platform for November.

The GOP platform puts our economy and millions of jobs at risk. They gut protections for seniors and families in need. They abandon local communities at a time when Washington should be a partner for opportunity and economic growth. The Republican platform cuts student loans and grants for higher education by \$166 billion. The Republican budget forces seniors to pay out of pocket an average of \$600 additional every year for medications they need because the GOP reopens and throws seniors back into the Medicare part D doughnut hole.

This budget drives Americans into an enormous GOP pothole, gutting Federal transportation investments by 25 percent, abandoning communities and businesses that need improved infrastructure to remain competitive.

This Republican budget cuts regular benefits on the wealthiest and most privileged millionaires and billionaires.

The Republican platform should really be called Millionaires' Manifesto, because it will borrow billions of dollars from Communist China to guarantee every millionaire a tax cut worth nearly \$400,000, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. And all that is added to our national debt.

The Republican budget gives oil companies \$21 billion in taxpayer subsidies, while they are gouging Americans who are working hard when they fill up their tank at the gas pump and the oil companies continue to make record profits.

The GOP budget sounds extreme. Well, it's only because it reflects the core values of the Tea Party House Republicans: protect the rich, cut off the poor, and walk away from the middle class.

□ 1610

Democrats have a budget that prioritizes deficit reduction and invests in the middle class. Democrats strengthen our American competitiveness by investing in education, basic research, modern infrastructure and green energy: investments that will create jobs. I urge support for the Democratic proposal.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield myself 1 minute to make a statement. I'm pleased my friend from Maryland brought our chart down to the floor with his yellow background.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If the gentleman will yield, let the record show that in a moment of genuine bipartisanship, I gave the chairman's chart back to him for his own use.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That's right. I thank the gentleman.

The cap on Medicare that is in law under the President's budget applies to current seniors. That doesn't occur for current seniors in our budget. We don't put this cap because we don't want the 15 bureaucrats putting price controls on care to current seniors. For future seniors 54 and below, Medicare grows at the same rate that the President's budget proposes it grows at. The difference is we don't want the bureaucrats rationing care.

On the purposes of taxes, I love this issue about tax fairness. The President is proposing higher tax rates and more loopholes. Here's the point I'm trying to make.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yielding myself an additional 30 seconds, I'll say this. If you look at the current code, the top 1 percent of taxpayers get almost all the tax shelters, all the loopholes.

So here's the novel idea that we have come up with, and it's a bipartisan one. Get rid of the tax shelters so you can lower everybody's tax rates. And so a person who is parking their money through an average of about \$300,000 in tax shelters, for every dollar in that tax shelter that's taxed at zero, we're

saying get rid of the tax shelter and subject all of their money to taxation so we can lower everybody's tax rates.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an extra 30 seconds to simply say when eight out of 10 businesses in America file their taxes as individuals, raising these tax rates hits job creators. Sixty-five percent of net new jobs come from small businesses. Half of Americans work in these kinds of small businesses, and my friends on the other side of the aisle are saying it's not enough that they pay more taxes than their foreign competitors; we need to make them pay a 45 percent tax rate in January.

Well, I've got news for you. Countries around the world are lowering their taxes on their job creators, and the President is proposing to raise it. That is a job-killer.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the First Congressional District of Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. I want to applaud House Republicans for putting this budget forward. And here's why we're trying to save Medicare. Do you see this little green line? That's our Medicare revenue. Now, do you see this huge Medicare green line? This is how much we're spending on Medicare. Now, that's just in the last year. So if you extend that forward, you can see why Medicare as it exists is going broke. So that's why I'm so proud of the House Budget Committee.

What they've chosen to do is come up with a plan that will save Medicare in this way: if you want to keep Medicare, you can keep it. But if you want something like we Members of Congress have, you can elect to have that too. Now, here's what I have as a Member of Congress. When I came in as a Member of Congress, I had a preexisting condition, but the Federal Government couldn't turn me down because of that preexisting condition to acquire insurance. That's the way it would be under Medicare.

Further, I have a choice between about 10 plans. I chose a standard Blue Cross Blue Shield plan, and I knew I could get it filled anywhere in the country, including my rural State of Wyoming. I pay 28 percent of my premium. The Federal Government, the taxpayers, pay 72 percent of my premium. That's basically what they're proposing. You'd have a choice among plans. And you would pay part of the premium, and the government would pay part of the premium. If you're healthy or wealthy, you'd pay more of your premium. If you're unhealthy or unwealthy, you'd pay less of your premium.

Now, you could either choose that, if that was something you've become accustomed to, or if you wanted to choose to be on Medicare as you know it today, that would also be a choice. It seems to me, Madam Chairman, that's

a great choice. I support the Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, the gentlelady who just spoke is correct that under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan that Members of Congress are on that there is a 72 percent for the premium. That's exactly what that steady green line is. And as health care costs go up, the gentlelady will continue through the congressional plan to get a steady amount of support under the Federal health plan that Members of Congress have. Under the Republican budget plan, in fact, that support drops steadily and deeply, which is why it is not premium support.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the opportunity to speak, but I'm sad that we are speaking here today on what is an artful dodge on the part of my Republican friends to provide a political document instead of a meaningful budget.

First, as my good friend from Maryland just pointed out, they will slowly, surely, and steadily shift the burden to senior citizens by freezing the amounts the Federal Government will give. And it's interesting that Republicans save, they keep and then spend the money from reforming Medicare that is already ensconced in Federal law now.

This budget sets back an important opportunity to reform our tax program. Their \$10 billion of tax cuts over the next 10 years will be somehow offset by closing loopholes, and they have steadily refused to identify what loopholes they can possibly close without hammering average Americans.

You cannot do it. Every independent analyst agrees that this is going to be a massive shift in tax unfairness, and it's going to put a greater burden on most Americans while it gives more assistance to those who need help the least.

As far as closing loopholes, I just spent 4 hours in the Ways and Means Committee where they provided another big tax benefit that they're going to work to try to make permanent in the future. They're trying to have it both ways without being specific.

But I will tell you the area that is of greatest disappointment to me is not just the assault on the most vulnerable. Has anybody talked to the providers in your district about the cuts to Medicare, the frail, the elderly, the poor, the most vulnerable—

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. But look at what is happening in transportation. This is an area, until this crew came to town, that used to be bipartisan. We used to be able to bring transportation bills to the floor and pass them in a cooperative basis. We just had a Repub-

lican bill blow up because they didn't even have a hearing. It was absolutely a partisan effort, the worst transportation bill in history. Now we're on the verge of losing the construction cycle for this summer because they will not allow the bipartisan Senate bill to come to the floor that would provide stability not just for this construction cycle but for the next construction cycle.

What are the transportation elements of this budget? Look at them carefully. They would not even provide enough money to meet the contractual obligations that States, transit districts, and cities are already involved with. Contractors are at work on projects—

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman 15 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Contractors are already at work, and their budget would not provide enough money to meet the obligations that we have right now, let alone build for the future. It is unfortunate, it isn't worthy of your support, and I hope you will vote "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. Madam Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the fiscal 2013 budget resolution. There has been some fiery rhetoric that the House budget will end Medicare, but this simply is not the case. Both Republicans and Democrats have worked on plans that will strengthen seniors' health care accessibility and security.

If our country remains on its current path, in 10 short years Medicare will go bankrupt. The Congressional Budget Office warns that in 2022, the Medicare trust fund will run out of money and default on its obligations to current seniors.

□ 1620

As representatives of the American people, we here in Congress have the responsibility to address this growing crisis so that millions of seniors now and in the future will not be left without the vital care that they've earned and deserve. As a father and grandfather, I cannot, in good conscience, pass that burden on to my children and grandchildren—or, for that matter, anyone else's.

The House budget will not only protect Medicare benefits for seniors today but will also ensure its solvency for future generations. It guarantees coverage for current and future beneficiaries, regardless of preexisting conditions.

Premium support programs have had a proud history of bipartisan support and would also give more assistance to lower-income and ailing individuals while reducing assistance to millionaires and billionaires.

Under our proposed fixes to preserve the Medicare program, beneficiaries

will also be able to choose from Medicare health plans competing for their business just like seniors currently enjoy with the very popular Medicare part D prescription drug coverage. This will drive down costs, improve value, and increase choice.

And speaking of choice, instead of 15 unelected bureaucrats choosing, we will see 50 million seniors with the freedom to choose for themselves.

With this proposal, those who are at or near retirement—meaning any individual 55 years or older—will see no change whatsoever to their current benefits. Because there has been a lot of misinformation out there, I want to stress that point: no one 55 and older will see any change to their Medicare under this plan.

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

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

Mr. RIBBLE. Simply put, the House budget will improve Medicare. It will inject financial life into this critical but threatened program.

The Path to Prosperity budget does exactly what the name suggests: it will decrease costs while improving health care quality and coverage for millions of seniors today and millions more tomorrow.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who has been fighting for education, among other things.

Mr. DOGGETT. This budget is based on the false belief that if we ask those who have the least in America to take a little less and we ask those who have the most to thicken their cushion just a little bit, that everybody will be a winner and America will grow. No matter how many times that mythology fails—most recently with the Bush-Cheney tax cuts that didn't grow the economy effectively but did grow the deficit to record levels. No matter how many times it fails, they insist on having a little more of it.

Our contrasting view on tax policy was demonstrated in the committee consideration of this bill. I suggested that we extend the higher education tax credit that I authored so that a mechanic and a nurse with a young person who's gotten their high school diploma in San Antonio, Texas, can walk over to St. Philip's or San Antonio College and have their tuition, up to \$2,500—which will cover tuition and textbooks there—that they get that right off their taxes, a tax cut. They rejected that tax cut because they said it would be better if we gave a tax break to billionaires and those at the top of the economic ladder, and eventually that mechanic and that nurse and that young person would see the benefit. I don't think they do. I think they'd like to be able to choose for themselves with a higher education tax credit opportunity for the future.

And the little brother and the little sister there, or in Lockhart or in San

Marcos, that want an opportunity to be prepared for school with Head Start and early education, our budget provides for them. It provides opportunity and hope for them. But Republicans insist that they ought to sacrifice a little bit more.

As for our seniors and our veterans, we suggested for veterans that we wanted to provide more job opportunities.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. And as for our seniors, we suggested that getting a certificate to go fish for insurance is no substitute for Medicare.

This is about values, about dignity for those in retirement, and opportunity for our young people.

This Republican budget is not a Path to Prosperity. It's an expressway of retreat ideas, an expressway to mediocrity.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Chairman, I rise today to participate in a debate that Americans deserve but, unfortunately, Democrats want to avoid.

Madam Chairman, the Senate has refused to pass a budget in over 1,000 days; but as Washington races down the road of debt and decline, hard-working taxpayers deserve an honest debate and a real choice. That's why we've come to the floor today.

This budget, the Path to Prosperity, gives the American people a choice between two futures: a future of deficit spending and taxes; or they can choose to set priorities, cut government spending, and keep Medicare solvent for future generations.

Madam Chairman, as I sit here on the floor today and listen to debate, I hear a lot of talk about a balanced approach, about shared sacrifice. Well, Madam Chairman, I believe what Americans are looking for is leadership. They're looking for people who they can trust.

I want to say thank you to the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. PAUL RYAN, for leading the Budget Committee in a team effort to bring forward a pathway that shows real solutions to the problems that we face.

Americans are asking themselves who can they trust in Washington. Well, the solution we always hear from the other side of the aisle is let's just raise tax taxes, raise taxes on the rich, let's eliminate loopholes. Well, you know what? I agree. We should eliminate the loopholes, get rid of the credits, the incentives, and make a fairer, flatter Tax Code. But until Washington is truly determined to fix the spending problems that we have, to save Medicare, to make sure that Social Security is around for future generations, I don't think we should seriously look at any tax increases.

We can talk about tax reform, but Americans want us to address what we can control, and that is spending. We can talk about raising taxes or we can talk about tax restructuring. I believe tax restructuring would be a solution where we could find bipartisanship.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I believe that we can deal with the problems that we face in spending without raising taxes, and that we can truly address tax reform in a bipartisan fashion.

I ask that this body seriously consider the Path to Prosperity and support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I think we should engage in tax reform, but I don't think we need to wait for tax reform to get rid of some of the subsidies to the Big Oil companies or to get rid of the subsidies for corporate jets. We can do that now as part of a balanced approach.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the newest member of the Budget Committee—we're pleased to have her on the committee—the gentlelady from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. I thank my colleague for yielding.

We have a real choice to make here, a choice between a Republican budget that hurts the middle class and those who are struggling to get out of poverty, and a Democratic alternative that presents a balanced approach to reinvest in our economy.

It's critical for the communities and employers in my district and around this great country that we continue to support, not cut, research and workforce development, that we renew our commitment to, not cut, public education. These are key areas in which we must invest in order to maintain and accelerate our much-needed economic recovery.

We've seen the private sector dividends paid by the research facilitated by the NIH, the NSF, and the Department of Energy. It's undeniable that emerging solar, wind, and even wave energy technologies will all have critical roles to play on our road to energy independence.

As these technologies continue to develop, we must improve upon, not cut, workforce development initiatives; and community colleges will play an important role in achieving this goal. In Oregon, we've seen exciting partnerships develop between green energy technology manufacturers and community colleges.

Of course, access to a quality education must start well before our children reach college age. Our public schools are the cornerstones of our communities. We have an obligation to ensure that we provide the funding necessary, not cut important quality education that will enhance all of our children's future.

When our children do reach college age, it's important that the option of

higher education is available and affordable. Instead of cutting Pell Grants and raising student loan interest rates in order to provide tax breaks for millionaires, let's work to protect our financial aid investments. Continued access to these programs will help prepare our future workers.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman another 15 seconds.

□ 1630

These programs will help prepare our future workers for their careers in the next-generation technologies.

There's a stark contrast between the Republicans' budget and what my Democratic colleagues and I are proposing. We're at a fork in the road, and I urge my colleagues to avoid the path to poverty by rejecting the Republican budget and coming together to support the balanced approach.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. America is on the economic road to Greece. Our national debt is 100 percent of our gross domestic product. And I want you to think about that 1 minute. Did you ever think you would hear that on the floor of Congress, that our national debt is 100 percent of our gross domestic product?

It's just mind-boggling if you just take a step back and think, for every dollar we spend, 42 cents is borrowed. What would a business do, what would a family do, what would you do with your own individual finances? Obviously, you would change your ways.

Today we have that opportunity. That's what the Ryan Republican budget is all about. Number one, it reduces spending. It reduces spending by over \$5 trillion, more than the President.

Number two, it eliminates loopholes in the tax system so that the Tax Code would be fair, competitive, and balanced.

Number three, it reduces the deficit and the debt by over \$3 trillion.

And number four, it reduces the size of government from being 24 percent of the economy down to 20 percent. Hopefully, we could even reduce it more than that, and it reduces the size of government without endangering us from a national security point of view, or without pulling out the safety net that's so important to our seniors and our most vulnerable members of society. It does this through commonsense reforms, through elimination of waste, through reduction and duplications.

You know there are 44 different Federal job training programs? If one of them works, why would you need the other 43?

The GAO says there are 19 duplications of effort and procurement at the Pentagon. Let's get rid of them.

Over at the USDA—I happen to know, I'm on this committee—the Federal

feeding programs are unbelievable. If you're Bob, and you're 3 years old, Bob is eligible for 12 Federal feeding programs. At 10 years old Bob is eligible for nine. At 35 years old Bob is eligible for seven.

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

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

Mr. KINGSTON. At 65, Bob is eligible for six Federal feeding programs. That doesn't mention what's going on on a State or local level. These are duplications that Democrats and Republicans alike should agree with, let's eliminate. This is the low fruit.

That's what the Ryan budget does, commonsense reform, elimination of waste and getting rid of the duplications, and putting America on a road to prosperity, so that my children, Ann, Betsy, John and Jim, can live in an economy that's growing where there's opportunities for them. And I urge my colleagues to support the Ryan budget.

#### BOB'S FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

At age 3, Bob is eligible for 12 programs:

1. Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
2. Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)
3. Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Program (FFVP)
4. School Lunch Program (SBP)
5. National School Lunch Program (NSLP)
6. Special Milk Program (SMP) [Can receive if not on any other program]
7. Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)
8. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
9. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
10. The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)
11. Women, Infants & Children (WIC)
12. WIC's Farmers Market Nutritional Program (FMNP)

At age 10, Bob is eligible for 9 programs:

1. Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
2. Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Program (FFVP)
3. School Lunch Program (SBP)
4. National School Lunch Program (NSLP)
5. Special Milk Program (SMP)
6. Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)
7. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
8. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
9. The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)

At age 35, Bob is eligible for 7 programs:

1. Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
2. Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)
3. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
4. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
5. The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)
6. Women, Infants & Children (WIC)
7. WIC's Farmers Market Nutritional Program (FMNP)

At age 65, Bob is eligible for 6 programs:

1. Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
2. Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP)
3. Sr. Farmers Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP)

4. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)

5. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

6. The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)

At all ages, Bob can receive:

1. Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservation (FDPIR) if living on Indian Reservation & not receiving SNAP

2. Disaster Assistance Program (D-SNAP) if family experiences natural disaster

3. Nutrition Assistance Block Grant (NABG) if family lives in U.S. Territory

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the distinguished ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I was interested to hear the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the Appropriations Committee, complain about this duplication. Apparently, during the 6 years when the Republican Party controlled the White House, the House, and the Senate, they didn't find any of them. They're late to see them, but better late than never.

The other concern I had was, he talked about duplication at the Defense Department in procurement. But this budget protects the Pentagon and, in fact, increases its spending.

Now, we have been told we should not be talking about cutting Medicare because that's not what's happening. So let me cite The Wall Street Journal, rarely accused of distorting the Republicans' position. In fact, they are defending the chairman of the Budget Committee against the right wing.

And here's what The Wall Street Journal says, because we're talking here not about cutting spending but shifting it. The Wall Street Journal editorial yesterday:

"Mr. Ryan's budget would cancel the additional defense cuts of \$55 billion a year"—out of \$700 billion—"under the sequester and replace them with savings in the entitlements. His Medicare and Medicaid reforms would generate future savings many times greater than would be gained from gutting the defense budget."

Now, some of us don't think that pulling out of Afghanistan, with the corruption there, quicker than is now planned would be gutting the defense budget. I know my Republican colleagues like to be critical of welfare in some cases, but they continue to support the greatest welfare program in the history of the world, the American taxpayer subsidy of the defense budgets of the wealthy nations of Western Europe.

But let me again read what The Wall Street Journal says. Here's how they characterize the Ryan budget:

Mr. Ryan's budget would cancel the additional defense cuts of \$55 billion a year and replace them with savings in the entitlements.

Social Security and Medicare.

So in this respect, at least, we're not talking about cutting spending, but shifting it from the military into the

Defense Department. And that's why the AARP has written so persuasively that his plan would, in fact, destroy Medicare.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, since defense was brought up, I'm happy to defend our national defense.

I rise in strong support of the FY 13 Republican budget. It's a responsible budget that recognizes that we cannot continue on our current fiscal trajectory. It also acknowledges the importance of a strong defense.

Let's not forget: we're still a Nation at war. We have 90,000 combat forces deployed in Afghanistan as we're sitting here, and while we have no intention of staying there indefinitely, we must ensure that our troops have the equipment and support they need to accomplish the mission. We must also ensure that promises made to our veterans are kept.

We have emerging threats and turmoil across the globe. Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General Dempsey told us during a hearing on the defense budget that this is the most dangerous time that he has experienced in his long, decorated career, which is 38 years.

This is not a time for further cuts, which can fundamentally destabilize and increase the risk to our forces and the ability to secure the homeland. The President's budget provides the bare minimum for our forces for FY 2013, and would devastate them in latter years, with a planned \$487 billion in cuts over 10 years.

The GOP budget ensures that Congress fulfills the constitutional requirement for a strong national defense. It also recognizes the fiscal reality that we face by incorporating the recommended efficiencies provided by former Secretary Gates and current Secretary Panetta.

The GOP budget also addresses the devastating impacts that sequestration, both the method and the amounts, would have on our ability to protect our vital national interests around the globe.

Make no mistake. Sequestration would decimate our military and signal to the world that we are ceding American military superiority. This is an unacceptable choice, and the GOP budget rejects sequestration as a means of addressing our fiscal challenges.

Instead, the GOP budget tackles sequestration head-on by thoughtfully and responsibly dealing with the real drivers of our national debt: mandatory spending programs.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. The choice is clear. We can either continue to bury our collective heads in the sand, as the Presi-

dent's budget does, or we can be honest with the American people and make the hard choices now that will ensure America continues to be the beacon of opportunity and success.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the FY 13 Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, the President's budget and the Democratic alternative also get rid of the sequester, but we replace that with \$1.2 trillion in deficit reduction through a balanced way because we think it's more important to protect that defense spending than it is to protect a lot of the special interest loopholes.

Here's the statement from General Martin Dempsey, the current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And he says, with respect to what this budget will do:

It's a force that's prepared to secure global access and respond to global contingencies. It's a military that can win any conflict anywhere.

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, not talking about the Republican budget, talking about the President's budget.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the distinguished ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

□ 1640

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Ryan budget.

Our seniors and working families in New York struggle with rising rent, food, and health care costs. Now is not the time to squeeze working families in order to provide tax giveaways to the most fortunate among us.

This budget will mean big cuts to the supplemental nutritional assistance program which provides food assistance to 1.8 million New Yorkers. For students looking to secure an education, this budget will mean drastic cuts to higher education funding, meaning higher costs for students. New York's small businesses and, to that effect, small businesses across this country will see Federal programs they rely on for access to credit and technical assistance reduced by \$80 million—exactly the wrong direction to go as we seek to hasten our economic recovery.

Nowhere does this budget fail our Nation more than in the area of health care. Medicaid will be slashed by \$810 billion, meaning disabled people, the working poor, and low-income children.

For our seniors who have worked hard their entire life, this budget will mean turning our back on the Medicare guarantee for the first time, pushing the 74,000 Medicare recipients in New York's 12th District into an untested, unreliable voucher system.

Let's be clear: if you vote for this budget, you're voting to end Medicare as we know it.

Madam Chair, the Ryan budget repeatedly chooses millionaires and billionaires over working families. Those are not American values. They are not New York values. We should reject them. Vote "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, in 2011 PolitiFact labeled the line "this ends Medicare as we know it" as the lie of the year in 2011.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Budget Committee and also, I think, a member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. COLE.

Mr. COLE. Madam Chair, I rise to support the Republican budget, and, frankly, I do so with a great deal of pride.

It's the only serious plan that either party has put forward that deals with the looming debt crisis that we face. It cuts \$5.35 trillion out of projected spending over the next decade. It reforms Medicare and Medicaid, something everybody in this House knows needs to happen. It actually lays out the blueprint for tax reform. It deals with the sequester in a responsible way. It forces the authorizing committees to finally begin to deal with the entitlement crisis that we face. And it adds \$200 billion back to defense spending over the next decade, something, as my colleague, Mr. CALVERT, pointed out, that is very much in our national interest.

This budget is politically viable. It passed the House last year; it will pass the House this year; and, frankly, it got more votes in the United States Senate last year—42—than any budget presented by anybody. Let's contrast that with our friends on the other side.

The President's budget last year got zero votes in the United States Senate, a body that his party controls. Our Democratic friends in the Senate haven't produced a budget in 3 consecutive years, and our friends on the other side didn't do so when they were in the majority, didn't do so last year. I'm delighted, actually, that they will do so this year. I think that's a step in the right direction. But that budget is largely silent on entitlement reform.

My main criticism of all the Democratic budgets is not that they can't pass; it is that they're simply not serious. They don't deal with the problems that the country is facing.

In my experience, Madam Chairman, a plan beats no plan. Our friends on the other side have no plan. We do. It's a plan we should embrace enthusiastically to avert the crisis that faces our country, so I urge its passage.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a former member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Chair, as the House votes on the budget this week, I remind my colleagues that a budget represents our values. Sadly, tragically, this Republican budget seems to value only cruel Darwinism debasing the American society as we know it to survival of the fittest.



If you value relieving traffic congestion, this disinvestment in transportation throws you to the wolves. If you value job creation efforts like Make It In America, the Republican budget leaves you out in the cold, unemployed. If you value the American innovative spirit, the Republican attack on education leaves nothing but scraps. If you value retirees and those that spent a lifetime making America what it is today, Republicans end the Medicare commitment to you and picks seniors' pockets.

Madam Chairman, the Republican budget disinvests in America. In fact, the only thing Republicans claim to value, fiscal responsibility, rings hollow in the face of a \$5 trillion of transfer of wealth to the already wealthy in America by cutting the highest tax bracket from 35 to 25 percent.

Simply put, this Republican budget attacks the America that I and my constituents value.

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

Mr. OLSON. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for this opportunity to speak here tonight.

Madam Chairman, next to me are photos of my daughter, Kate, and my son, Grant. On behalf of my two children and all of the children and grandchildren in America who will be left to pay our debt for the reckless spending that we've done here in Washington that threatens their path to prosperity, I rise in strong support of the House Republican budget for 2013, H. Con. Res. 112.

This budget cuts spending to protect hardworking American taxpayers and tackles the drivers of our debts by reducing government size and reforming our tax system.

The Democrat-controlled Senate has not passed a budget in over 1,000 days, the entire time I've been a Member of this body. The President still refuses to offer credible solutions to the most predictable economic crisis in our history. Empty promises from our President and the Senate won't pay our bills, strengthen our health and retirement programs, fix our economy, or create jobs.

Madam Chairman, today we have a choice, a choice of two paths: a path of mediocrity or a path to prosperity. I urge my colleagues to support the path to prosperity. Vote for H. Con. Res. 112, the House Republican budget for 2013.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, there is no doubt that we have to reduce the deficit and debt for the good of all of our children and grandchildren. The debate today is about how we do it and whether we do it in a balanced way. I would point out the Congressional Budget Office has told us that \$2 trillion of the debt over the last 10 years is attributed to the tax cuts in 2001 and 2003.

We keep hearing today about the need, which we all agree, to reduce the deficit, but we still have not heard a

single one of our Republican colleagues say that we should reduce one tax loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit so we can deal with this in a balanced manner.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Chairman, millions of Americans around the country are focused on March Madness and the basketball Final Four showdown this weekend. But for our Nation's seniors and the middle class, the real March madness is happening right here on the House floor with the Republican budget. This is the GOP's burden of March madness with its own final four:

First, end Medicare guarantee for millions of seniors so that they're out of luck now in Medicare;

Then you move on and you force Grandma and Grandpa to pay more for all of their coverage or forego it in its entirety;

Next, what you do is you put billionaires first. You protect their tax breaks. You put them right up there on the top of the list of the most important people that need help in America today;

Then, fourth, you subsidize Big Oil by keeping the \$4 billion for tax subsidies in the budget while cutting, by 85 percent in the Ryan budget, the subsidies, the funding for wind and solar and renewable energy. Tax breaks for Big Oil; cut the programs for clean energy.

□ 1650

So here is the completed bracket for the Republicans: ending the Medicare guarantee; abandoning Grandma and Grandpa; subsidizing Big Oil; and putting billionaires first. That is the Republican Final Four, and it's also the final answer for America.

Yet, unlike the NCAA tournament, the Republican budget doesn't pit these priorities against each other—they're all winners in the eyes of the GOP. The GOP used to stand for Grand Old Party, but now it stands for the Gas and Oil Party. It stands for Grandma is out of prescriptions. It now stands for greed over principle. This is the real March madness—the Republican budget that makes winners out of Big Oil and billionaires while running out the clock for seniors and hardworking families who are left to fend for themselves.

Vote "no" on this Republican budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. By that, I am very amused, Madam Chairman.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. Thank you, Chairman RYAN.

The American people have been asking for real and long-term solutions to the very real problems we face as a Nation. For the second year in a row, House Republicans, under the leadership of Chairman RYAN, are doing just that.

I come before you today to echo what many of my colleagues have said time and again: that the budgets that have been presented before Congress and before the American people represent a tale of two futures. I'm referring to the President's budget, which leads us down a path to despair, and I'm referring to the House Budget Committee's own Path to Prosperity.

One keeps us on an out-of-control spending spree, ignores the real challenges facing Medicare, and actually takes money away from seniors and allows sequestration to strip away vital defense spending. The other makes responsible choices that address the drivers of our disastrous debt and deficits, enables us to make good on our promises to seniors, and lives up to our greatest obligation under the U.S. Constitution: providing for the common defense.

I stand before you today as a marine veteran, the only NCO in Congress also actively serving in the National Guard, and as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. To borrow from a recent article in *The Weekly Standard*, I say to you today that the Ryan plan is more than just a path to prosperity; it is truly a path to security. It is the only plan to come before this body that even begins to address the very real and scary cuts looming over our Nation's military.

I also agreed with the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mike Mullen, when he said that our national debt is our biggest national security threat. That's why I'm standing before you today in support of a plan, the only plan that makes both responsible cuts to our debt and that takes the necessary steps to protect our economic and national security.

I urge my colleagues to support the Ryan budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. I thank my friend from Maryland.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, perhaps my colleagues on the other side, my conservative friends, either don't realize what they're doing in this budget or they're trying to make sure that nobody else knows what they're doing in this budget because this budget ends the Medicare guarantees and shifts the costs to seniors. Now, this is a simple statement of fact that it either does or it doesn't.

Number two: Those making over \$1 million a year in this country will reap an average tax cut of \$394,000, while it preserves tax breaks for Big Oil. True or false? It either does or it doesn't.

Number three: It destroys over 4 million American jobs in the next couple of years. True or false? Well, the Economic Policy Institute tells us that it's true.

The last point I would like to get a true or false response from: It raises



Medicare eligibility from the age of 65 to 67. True or false?

I would yield to anybody on the other side who would like to elucidate, or clarify, any of the statements that I have made. I hear no response.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, what the gentleman refers to as simple facts was rated the lie of the year by PolitiFact in 2011.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When you're hearing this discussion, you think: When are we actually going to tackle this problem? When are all of us going to concede that not one party is responsible for this debt but that we all are? We were headed toward this fiscal cliff long before the current President took the wheel. Let's face that. I think we have on this side. Yet leadership requires fessing up to it and actually doing something to change it.

This plan doesn't end the Medicare guarantee—arithmetic does. Unless we change something, unless we put it on solvent footing, the guarantee is gone. Medicare will be bankrupt under the current trajectory. So what this plan does is recognize that and say, if you're currently in the plan, if you're currently drawing benefits, the plan shouldn't change for you; but those who are younger than 55 will need a plan that is solvent, that does work over time. So we're not ending that guarantee. The current system ends that guarantee. We're trying to fix it here.

I commend the gentleman for putting so much time into this. I commend the House Republicans for actually coming up and fessing up to the truth that not one party got us into this but that we're in this situation. This is the only budget being presented, along with one other later, the RSC budget, that actually treats this problem seriously, that treats it with the seriousness it deserves, and that actually has a plan to get out of it. So I commend the House Republicans for putting it forward, and I plan to support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I would point out again, just in response to my friend Mr. FLAKE, that this is the chart that was used by the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, showing the President's plan on Medicare and the Republican plan on Medicare, both of which have cost containment over the next coming decades. The difference is how you achieve that cost difference.

The difference is that the Republican plan offloads all the risks of what they project to be increasing health care costs on to seniors because, unlike the plan that Members of Congress have, which, as I explained, provides a constant 42 percent premium support share, the Republican plan has the contribution for Medicare rapidly declining relative to the costs of health care, which puts all that risk on seniors.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Before I start my formal presentation, let me say the gentleman from Arizona is correct. We do need to take responsibility on both sides of the aisle. Very frankly, I will tell my friend we had an opportunity to take responsibility when the Bowles-Simpson Commission voted. There was a vote in the Senate. It was divided somewhat, but mostly they voted for it in the Senate. We had one of our people from the House vote for it, a Democrat. None of your representatives voted for Bowles-Simpson, I guess, because it wasn't perfect. That was a missed opportunity—it was a doggone shame—because that would have made 14 votes, and we would have had that on the floor in the Senate and in the House. I think this is a missed opportunity because I don't think this is a real document.

Now, frankly, I also think that we had a deal. We had a deal as to what the discretionary number was going to be, or as we call it in the jargon of the House, the 302(a) allocation, which the gentleman as a member of the Appropriations Committee knows about. We had a higher number and you had a lower number, and we made a deal in between. We haven't kept that deal. We haven't kept that deal because you couldn't get the votes in your committee, in the Budget Committee, for that deal.

□ 1700

So here we are, Madam Speaker. The chairman of the Budget Committee has spoken of a choice between two futures. He is correct in framing it this way. The budget he proposes would end Medicare's guarantee, cut taxes for the wealthiest, and place our economic recovery at risk.

Robert Greenstein, head of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, described the Republican budget this way, and I quote:

It would likely produce the largest redistribution of income from the bottom to the top in modern U.S. history and likely increase poverty and inequality more than any other budget in recent times.

Now, that is not a budget on which we proceed where you have a Senate that is chaired by the Democratic Party, majority leader, and a Democratic President. You're not going to get consensus on that kind of a budget.

So this is essentially a statement of purpose and vision by one party, not a document that anybody thinks is going to pass. However, that is a future we simply cannot afford.

In fact, the Republican proposal is not a realistic budget at all, I would suggest to you. Nobody believes in its premises that we, as a Nation, are suddenly going to decide to savage our domestic programs and leave the most vulnerable out in the cold. That's not

America. That's not the values that we share as a country.

This disastrous budget ends the Medicare guarantee, increasing costs for seniors. It cuts Medicaid by a third. That's the most vulnerable in America, the poor in America.

My faith doesn't teach me that's the kind of policy I am going to support. I don't think anybody's faith teaches that. We want to take care of those who need the most help.

It will jeopardize access to affordable health and nursing home care for seniors, the disabled, and low-income families who depend upon it.

Furthermore, it repeals the critical patient protection and cost containment policies of the Affordable Care Act. That will cost us dollars.

Their budget slashes funding for programs that help the vulnerable, enable our children to afford college, and provide health coverage to those with long-term disabilities; and it puts millions of jobs and our economic recovery at risk as a result of drastic spending cuts.

At the same time, the budget extends the Bush tax cuts, including \$1 trillion in tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, and cuts an additional \$4.6 trillion in taxes on top of that. In fact, you can get tax cuts up to \$10 trillion with the Bush extension and the reduction from 35 to 25.

And, oh, yes, we're going to eliminate preference items. We won't tell you what those preference items are. We don't know when we'll eliminate them, but we're going to eliminate them.

I happen to agree we need to look at preference items. I agree with Mr. RYAN on that proposition. I'm just not very confident that, given what happened in Bowles-Simpson, that anybody has the courage to do so.

It does all that without saying how it will be paid for; but presumably, as I said, by eliminating the deductions that middle class families rely on to send their kids to college and afford their homes.

Let me say this: I have said in the past and I will say it again today, we must have a big, bold, balanced deal. That will affect entitlements, it will affect revenues, and it will affect expenditures.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I will tell my friend of my deep disappointment, because I think the chairman of the Budget Committee certainly is one of the individuals in America who could be a part of the solution but is not being part of the solution, is proposing something that is clearly unacceptable to this side of the aisle, to the President. We need to come together and come to an agreement.

Democrats have proposed a different future: one where we invest in a strong

economy and ask everyone to contribute their fair share; a future where the Medicare guarantee is preserved and seniors' health security is protected; a future where students who work hard, take responsibility for themselves, and get accepted to college won't have to worry about whether they can afford to go; a future where we help businesses create millions of jobs here at home that won't be shipped overseas; a future, ladies and gentlemen, where the deficit is reduced in a balanced way—that's the key, we all know it's the key—with everyone pitching in.

Any of the Democratic alternatives, in my opinion, will be better than this Republican budget. And I don't agree with everything in each one of those budgets, clearly.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. We have a choice today, tonight, tomorrow of two futures, and that choice couldn't be clearer.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, I urge you to stand together in defeating this budget and passing one that will bring our middle class and working families not a grim future but a bright future.

And in conclusion, let me say this:

Whatever happens to this budget, any of these budgets on the floor, is not going to be the final word. It perhaps will not even be the beginning word. We need to solve this issue, and we need to do it not by pointing fingers at one another, not by pretending that it's going to be simple, not by pretending that we're going to be able to make happy all of our supporters. We won't be. The hole we've dug is way too deep. The decisions we will make are way too tough. And the only way we will make them is to join hands and look the American public in the eye and say, We have to have a balanced deal. We have to do all that is necessary to put this Nation on a fiscally sustainable path for the chairman's children, for the ranking member's children, for my children, my grandchildren, and, yes, my two great-grandchildren.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes to first say, the gentleman doesn't look a day over a great-great-grandfather.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. First off, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sincerity of the minority whip's sentiment, and he is a man who means that. I know that.

I would say, though, that this process of fixing our country's fiscal path would have been made much better had the President proposed a solution. The President just gave us his fourth budget, and for the fourth time, it doesn't do anything to get this debt under control.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I apologize. I won't because I am under tight time constraints.

And more to the point, Mr. Chairman, the United States Senate, controlled by the gentleman's own party, they didn't pass a budget in 2010; they didn't pass a budget in 2011; and now they've announced courageously that they're not going to pass a budget in 2012 either.

How do you preempt and prevent the most predictable economic crisis in the history of our country, a debt crisis, if the President doesn't propose to do anything about it and the Senate won't even pass a budget?

We're leading; we're passing; we're proposing a solution. We understand the other side would love to just wait for us to offer our solutions to then attack. We don't care about that. We're going to offer solutions. And when we hear the word "balance," watch your checkbook; hold your wallet. It means tax increases. Mr. Chairman, it's math. You literally cannot tax your way out of this problem. The problem we have here is a spending problem. That is why we propose to cut spending.

And with that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I first want to commend Chairman RYAN of the Budget Committee for actually doing the job that we were elected to do.

As Chairman RYAN pointed out, it has been more than 1,050 days since the United States Senate has actually decided to even address the budget. And yet I look at what they're doing. I can't figure out what they're doing. We are actually doing the job that we are supposed to be doing and doing it ahead of schedule, per the statute, per what this country should be doing, and I am proud of the fact that we are here debating a budget.

I am also terribly disappointed in the President's budget.

You know, it is interesting. As I routinely hear, Mr. Chairman, the Democrats talk about a balanced approach, the problem is the President has never, ever introduced a balanced budget, a budget that even over the course of time, at some point in time, would actually balance. It never balances.

So for 4 years in a row, we're going to have a \$1 trillion-plus deficit. Understand what that means for you and your kids.

When I was first elected in 2008, this Nation was roughly in the \$9 trillion debt range. Now we're going to be close to \$16 trillion by the end of the year.

Now keep in mind: How much is \$1 trillion? That number is so large, it's hard to get your arms around it. If you spent \$1 million a day every day, it would take you nearly 3,000 years to get to 1 trillion.

□ 1710

We deficit-spend as a Nation \$4 billion a day. My State of Utah, their en-

tire budget, everything we do in our entire State is about \$13 billion for the year. This Nation deficit-spends roughly \$4 billion a day. We pay more than \$600 million a day in interest on our debt, and yet the President proposes a budget that over the course of time will get to \$26 trillion in debt in the next 10 years where we will see daily debt payments to service our debt. Those interest payments are going to be in a range closing in on \$2 billion a day. We can't do this, ladies and gentlemen. There is a proper role of government. We're taking a responsible approach, but we have to cut spending.

The reason I rise in support of this House budget is that over the course of time, we take that spending as a percentage of our gross domestic product and bring it down less than 20 percent.

Under the President's vision, he is fine with spending in excess of 24 percent of GDP. What does that mean? Think of all the transactions, all of the financial transactions in this country, and he is comfortable spending 24 cents of every dollar that is spent in this Nation. That is fundamentally and morally wrong.

But there is a choice. We have put together a plan. We are doing the heavy lifting. We're putting together a budget that's responsible.

I wish we could balance the budget overnight. You can't. We've got to put ourselves on a glide path. There is a proper goal of government. We have to achieve that. I believe that the House Republican budget is bold and realistic.

Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his great work.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The debate we're having here is not whether to reduce the deficit and the debt. We have to do that. The issue is the choices we make in the process.

The President does have a budget; it does take a balanced approach. My colleagues say: Watch out. Well, watch out for the bipartisan Commissions, all of whom have recommended taking an approach that is balanced.

Yes, we have to deal with the spending part. We've cut a trillion dollars. There are additional cuts in these budgets, but we should also end the special-interest tax breaks, and we should ask folks at the very top to take a little bit more responsibility.

Here are the choices that are made in the Republican budget. Here is a very simple one. This is the continuation of the Bush tax cuts for the top 2 percent, \$261 billion. Meanwhile, they cut \$810 billion from Medicaid. Again, two-thirds of Medicaid spending goes to seniors and individuals with disabilities.

That wasn't enough. They apparently are doubling down on tax breaks that benefit the folks at the very top. This is the amount of tax break millionaires will get from continuing the Bush tax cuts. They've added over \$260,000 in additional average tax breaks for people

making over a million dollars. They say they're going to make that up somehow. I'll tell you how they're going to make it up: by increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished assistant Democratic leader, who has been looking out for average working Americans his entire career, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to this misguided Republican budget because it fails the moral test. The Federal budget should reflect the values of the American people, and this Republican proposal does damage to those values because it is fundamentally unfair to the middle-income, to the hardworking people of America, and the most vulnerable among us.

This Republican budget would end the Medicare guarantee that working people depend upon after a lifetime of hard work. The Republican budget creates new tax breaks of up to \$394,000 for the wealthiest few. This Republican budget destroys 4.1 million jobs. The Republican budget breaks faith with the agreement their leaders made in last year's Budget Control Act to maintain funding for essential services. And this Republican budget protects all Pentagon funds while putting schools, roads, and job creation on the chopping block.

The American people have spoken loud and clear in opposition to these misguided priorities. I urge the House to pass fair and balanced legislation to reduce our deficits in a responsible and surgical manner and invest in important priorities to build a strong middle class.

Growing up in a church parsonage in South Carolina, I learned to put faith into action through firmly held values and high moral standards. This Republican budget fails the moral test, and I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my chairman for yielding.

As a freshman, I have the privilege of serving on the Budget Committee. And in years past, the Budget Committee has been all about producing a political document, a document that may make for great sound bites, may make for great television, but doesn't make for great governance. As my friend from Arizona said earlier, the challenge, the \$15.5 trillion in debt that has been placed on the backs of every child, every man and woman, every family in this country, has been the path that both parties have chosen.

My friend from Maryland, the ranking member of the Budget Committee,

says there is no disagreement that we have to get the debt under control. Yet the President, who, to his credit, has submitted a budget, submitted a budget that raised taxes by \$2 trillion on the American people, but so increased spending as well that the debt continued to climb even faster under the President's budget than it does under the broken system we have today.

Take a look at this. You can't see this, Mr. Chairman, but it's the drivers of our debt. If you look here at the blue line, it is Social Security; and Social Security is a situation that we know is facing peril, but it's facing peril in a predictable way that we'll be able to solve and control.

We see here the green line. It's Medicaid and other health saving in this country, and yet it is growing rapidly. We know how we can begin to curb that spending.

Look at this red line. This is Medicare spending growing out of control. We know it. We know it's true. That's the question folks ask me back home. In this budget conversation, they say: Rob, why does it sound like it's a big Medicare discussion?

The reason is because Medicare is the driver. Medicare spending, the spending that is done through a government mandate where individuals don't have control over their own health care, is driving this debt train.

Going back to my pride at being a freshman member of the Budget Committee, Mr. Chairman, this is a headline from MSNBC. And you know MSNBC is not one of the biggest fans of this freshman class, not one of the biggest fans of this Republican Congress. But this is what they said in a headline from March 15: "In risky election-year move, Republicans offer Medicare alternatives."

That's right. That is why 100 new freshmen came to this body last year. They didn't come to recycle old ideas. They came to offer solutions.

Yes, I know it's an election year, but dadgummit, Mr. Chairman, an election year ought to bring out the best in this body as folks work even harder to fulfill the hopes and dreams of the American people. That's what Chairman RYAN and this Budget Committee have done.

Could they have punted on this, Mr. Chairman? Could they have said, You know what, this is just too hard. We know it's coming, we know it threatens every senior in this country, but let's just punt until after the election.

We've heard some folks who have adopted exactly that attitude, but not this chairman, not PAUL RYAN and the Budget Committee, not this U.S. House of Representatives. It may be risky, but they do it because it's the right thing to do.

□ 1720

And I tell you, Republicans and Democrats alike who were elected in this freshman class in 2010 came to do the right thing for the right reasons,

not to follow election-year politics; and I'm just so proud of this chairman for giving us this opportunity.

So what is it that this Budget Committee solution is? Well, what it doesn't do, Mr. Chairman, is change anything for seniors on Medicare today, not one. No changes for today's seniors, whereas the President's proposal makes dramatic changes by empowering this 15-member IPAB board. We preserve and protect Medicare in this budget by providing for seniors—my parents, your parents and your grandparents—providing an opportunity for them to have some say in their health care decisions. We tried that with Medicare Advantage. It's been dramatically successful, and we expand that to give families more choices about their health care decisions. Preserving and protecting the Medicare mandate for future generations, this is the alternative.

Just to be clear, you can't read this, Mr. Chairman, it's the small print, it's all of the small print, that indicates the IPAB board. And it takes a lot of small print to create it because folks were scared to death when this thing was created. There's all sorts of language in this small print, Mr. Speaker, about how rationing will not happen with this board. Why? Because when you put a government board in charge of people's health care, the first thing you think is rationing.

Well, what this board can do is clamp down on what we pay providers. Now, I want you to think about the doctors in your life. I want you to think about those folks.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman from Georgia an additional 1 minute.

Mr. WOODALL. In your church, in your Sunday school class, at the CVS and at the Walgreen's is where you see those family practice docs. Do you really think those folks are the health care problem in this country? Do you really think that clamping down on more of your neighbors who provide the care to our community is the answer? Because that's the only thing this IPAB board can do: clamp down on those docs, denying care to every senior in this country.

We offer an alternative. It may be a risky election-year move, but it's the right thing to do. And I want to thank the chairman. All the naysayers in this country who said you couldn't, you did. All the folks who said you shouldn't, you did. And you did it because it was the right thing to do. This is a document that can govern our Nation, and it's one that we can be proud of, and I've been proud to be a part of it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the comments of the member of the Budget Committee, Mr. WOODALL from Georgia, but I don't think the choice the Republicans make

in this budget is the right thing to do. I don't think the American people are going to think it's the right thing to do. I don't think the choice to provide another round of tax cuts for people making more than \$1 million a year while ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors who have median income under \$23,000 a year is the right choice; and I don't think it's the courageous choice.

Now, I heard Mr. WOODALL say that it doesn't change one thing, not one thing in Medicare. That's just not true. This immediately reopens the prescription drug doughnut hole. The Republican plan takes some of the savings we achieved under the Affordable Care Act for Medicare, but instead of using it like we did to help strengthen the prescription drug plan, it reopens it. It does it immediately. That is an additional \$10,000 over 10 years for seniors who have high prescription drug costs.

Do you know what else it does immediately? It immediately ends the preventive care services we provided under Medicare. Because we want to encourage seniors to get that early care, so we eliminated the copays. Now they've got to pay that too, immediately.

Now, the gentleman said the President doesn't have a plan on Medicare. I keep having to remind my colleagues that this chart was presented by the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN. And the black line is the Republican plan, and the blue line is the President's plan. The red line is projected health care costs. And the difference between the two plans is that the Republican plan puts all the risk of those rising health care costs on the seniors. And you can see that when you look at this chart. This is current Medicare. It provides constant support for the health care services received by seniors. That's the blue line.

Here's the green line. This is what Members of Congress and Federal employees get. They get a real premium support. As health care prices go up, their premium support stays constant. This red line, that's what happens when you cap the support for seniors, as the Republican plan did. That red line going straight down is the same as that red line going straight up.

The difference between the approaches is we say, Let's modernize Medicare to put greater focus and incentives on the value of care, not so much on the volume of care, which drives up cost. The Republican plan puts all those risks of rising health care costs on seniors.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, someone who has been fighting for jobs, for fairness, and for protecting the Medicare guarantee, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee for yielding to tell him how proud he makes us all for his important work in constructing a Democratic alternative to the Republican budget, that is, Mr. VAN HOLLEN's

budget proposal that is a statement of our national values that says to the American people what is important to you about the education, health and well-being of our children, the economic security of their families, and the health security of our seniors, those are important values to us; and those values are reflected in the Democratic alternative.

The Republican Ryan bill, on the other hand, I do not believe is a statement of our national values as to what is important to the American people as reflected in their budget priorities. But you be the judge. Would it be a statement of your values if you had a budget that said to seniors we're going to end the Medicare guarantee and you're going to pay \$6,000 or more while you get less in terms of benefits, while at the same time, we're going to give an over \$300 billion tax break to the wealthiest people in our country? Would that be a statement of your values, this \$6,000 more for seniors with fewer benefits, \$300,000 or more to the richest people in our country?

Would it be a statement of your values for you, my colleagues and the American people you represent, if you had a budget that said to Big Oil, we're going to continue to subsidize you to the tune of tens of billions of dollars, but at the same time, we're going to freeze Pell Grants, we're going to eliminate them for 400,000 young people and make them less available to over 9 million young people? Lower the benefits for some, eliminate it for others, and use the money to give tax subsidies to Big Oil, Big Oil which is making tens of billions of dollars in record profits each year?

Would it be a statement of your values if you said in your budget that all of those young people who are now children who have a preexisting medical condition—asthma, diabetes, birth defect—any of those preexisting medical conditions, under present law, under the Affordable Care Act, they may not be discriminated against in obtaining health insurance? But the Republican budget says they should be because we're going to eliminate that.

To the 2.5 million young people who are now on their parents' policies until they're 26 years old, this budget says "no" to you too. We're eliminating that. We're too busy giving tax breaks to the richest people in America. And while we're at it, with young people just graduating from college, some of them may have student loans, and in the House budget—thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN—in the House budget, we have a provision that says that come July 1, the interest on those loans will not double. We have taken care of that. Under the circumstances, the path we're on, the interest rates would go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. The House Democratic budget says "no" to that doubling of interest. The Republican budget keeps it the same.

□ 1730

That's just to name a few things that I think may not be a statement of the values of the American people, whether it's interest paid on student loans, availability of Pell Grants to young people, ending the Medicare guarantee, and as the distinguished ranking member said, right now today, overturning the resources that were put in the Affordable Care Act to reduce, to narrow the doughnut hole. Maybe 5 million seniors have benefited to the tune of \$3.2 billion already in the bill. Also, there are preventative services; there are annual wellness visits without a copay.

So we're talking about kitchen table items for people where people are trying to make ends meet, where people wonder about if their children will be able to go to college, and if they do, will they be able to have health insurance so that when they look for a job, they can reach their aspirations without having their choices only narrowed by whether they have health insurance or not until the bill comes into full effect.

So there are just a couple of things that I would want people to know about this bill. They are: ends the Medicare guarantee; ends the Medicare guarantee; ends the Medicare guarantee while making seniors pay more for less, while giving over \$300 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country. And by the way, did I mention it? It's a job loser.

So I urge my colleagues to enthusiastically support the House Democratic proposal, which is a statement of our values and which our distinguished colleague will present—I don't know if it's tonight or tomorrow morning. I understand that it keeps changing.

The House Democratic alternative invests in America's priorities, creates jobs, protects our seniors and our students, strengthens the middle class. Democrats protect Medicare; Republicans dismantle Medicare. The Democratic plan asks the wealthiest to pay their fair share and put our fiscal house in order; the Republican plan gives them more than the tax break they've had, they almost double their tax break.

Our Democratic plan reflects the most enduring theme in America, the American Dream. Democrats want to reignite the American Dream, to build ladders of opportunity for all who want to work hard, play by the rules, and take responsibility. It does this by investing in small businesses and entrepreneurialism in our country, by strengthening the middle class. In that regard, we believe that our budget is a statement of our values.

We call upon our Republican colleagues to work with us on a budget that reflects our values. We must work together to protect and strengthen Medicare. We must put people back to work and build a broadly shaped prosperity for all Americans. We must make it in America to stop the erosion

of our manufacturing base. We must rebuild America, putting people back to work. We must do this with community involvement. And all of these things strengthen the middle class, which is exactly what our Democratic alternative achieves.

For the sake of our seniors, for our families, for our children, for our workers, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the Republican plan, which ends the Medicare guarantee and makes seniors pay \$6,000 or more for fewer benefits while it gives \$300,000 in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in the United States. And it costs us jobs to do so and doesn’t reduce the deficit until nearly 2040. It’s not a good deal for the American people. The Democratic budget is.

I urge a “yes” on the Van Hollen budget, a “no” on the Ryan Republican budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to simply say, yesterday they said we’re cutting taxes on millionaires by \$150,000, today it’s \$300,000—it’s probably going to be \$1 million tomorrow.

What I would simply say is, this line that says we’re ending the Medicare guarantee, let me remind you, Chairman, that this was rated the “lie of the year” of 2011 by the nonpartisan PolitiFact.

We don’t want a rationing board running Medicare. We want seniors in charge of Medicare. We don’t want to take more from successful small businesses that create our jobs and make them uncompetitive in the global economy. We want to take special interest loopholes out of the Tax Code to lower everybody’s tax rates, but especially those of small businesses that create our jobs. And more importantly, we want to balance the budget, pay off the debt. Ours is the only budget that does that. The so-called “balanced” approach by our friends on the other side of the aisle doesn’t even pretend to get the debt paid off, let alone under control.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, when President Obama released his nearly \$4 trillion budget proposal in February, he called for more spending, more borrowing, and more taxes. Despite a national debt that’s grown to more than \$15.5 trillion, the President elected to double down on the same old failed agenda.

The Senate has failed to pass a budget for more than 1,000 days—the IPAB wasn’t on the margin when they had a budget the last time in the Senate—while House Republicans are actively working to address the economic crisis facing our country.

Americans deserve better than empty promises from a broken government, and the Path to Prosperity budget offers a tangible way forward. This budget cuts spending in a meaningful way, lowers tax rates while simplifying the

Tax Code, and strengthens the social safety net.

I ask the Senate and House Democrats, what’s your plan? There is no greater contrast between the President’s budget and our Republican budget than on Medicare—something I know something about having practiced medicine for 30 years. The President and congressional Democrats cut \$500-plus billion from Medicare to fund a new entitlement, and then their cost controls were a 15-member board, a bureaucratic board—basically a denial-of-care board.

No one argues that Medicare goes bankrupt in the near future, so doing nothing is not an option. Republicans propose to strengthen Medicare for current seniors by making no changes for those 55 and older, and giving future retirees the ability to choose their own health plan—what a novel idea that is—including a traditional Medicare choice, the same thing they have today. By implementing these commonsense reforms, we can ensure Medicare will be available to current and future generations.

I am very proud of my colleagues on the House Budget Committee who have worked tirelessly to draft a blueprint that sets our Nation on a path to balancing the budget and paying off the debt. This proposal protects the country, saves Medicare, and puts America on the path to prosperity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the chairman of the Budget Committee has mentioned a number of times this PolitiFact. I want to read from what PolitiFact said with respect to this. He said that it’s true that the term “terminate” Medicare, which some had used, was an overstatement. No doubt about it. Just like, apparently, a couple of years ago they’ve said—what I’ve heard from a lot of my colleagues that the Affordable Care Act was a “government takeover of health care.” I’ve heard that a lot from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That was the big PolitiFact so-called “lie of the year” a couple of years ago. So let’s just be clear.

But this is the important part. It says: If Democrats had just slightly tweaked their statements, they would be accurate. They go on to point out that, for example, when people said the plan last year would privatize Medicare, that was true. And that President Obama was also more precise with his words saying that the Medicare proposal “would voucherize the program and you potentially have senior citizens paying 10,000 or more.” They didn’t say that was false.

What we have said, what I have said very carefully all along is that it ends the Medicare guarantee. And I firmly believe it ends the Medicare guarantee for this reason, for this reason right here: this is the current Medicare plan support for seniors in terms of the percent that they have to pay, that blue line, steady support. Green line demonstrates steady support that Members

of Congress get from the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan. Red line is what happens when you put seniors into the private health care market but you don’t allow their premium support to rise with the projected rise in health care costs. Red line, down. I think that does end the Medicare guarantee.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

□ 1740

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, there’s been an understanding in our country for a very long time that if you work as hard as you can your whole life and you follow the rules, that one of the things that you’ll get as part of this American Dream is a secure retirement; that you ought to be able to spend the years after you work loving your grandchildren, pursuing your hobbies, doing the things in life that you love and enjoy.

Essential to that part of the American Dream is the Medicare guarantee, because here’s what it really says. If you get sick and you need help, you get the help that you need as determined by you and your doctor and your family, and you pay your fair share in premiums and copays, but there’s no insurance bureaucracy to run through. There’s no approval you’ve got to get. If your cardiologist says you need a certain procedure and you think that you want to do it, you do it, and Medicare pays the bill.

This is a guarantee, and the reason it’s needed is that you can’t make a whole lot of profit off of insuring older and sicker people. So since 1965, this Medicare guarantee has been a part of the promise that we’ve made to American seniors.

This budget violates that promise because what it says is a substantial number of people, beginning with those under 55, will not be in Medicare. They’ll be in a system run by the insurance companies of this country, and the decision will shift from people and their doctors to insurance companies.

Now, the other side will say, Well, it’s going to be voluntary. Well, here’s what, in all likelihood, is going to happen. The wealthier, healthier people will sign up for the voluntary system, and the poorer, older, sicker people will stay in regular Medicare. The resources will diminish, the care will dwindle, and Medicare will wither and die on the vine.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. This obviously is a good faith and legitimate philosophical difference. But when it comes to the termination of the Medicare guarantee, when it comes to jeopardizing and violating this covenant with the people

who built this country, we think that's the wrong thing to do. And it's especially wrong when the savings—so-called savings—from this approach will finance yet another tax break for the wealthiest and most prosperous people in our country.

These are priorities we'll debate on this floor in good faith. We think they're the wrong priorities. We urge a "no" vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me yield myself 2 minutes to say, you know what ends the Medicare guarantee? The Medicare status quo.

We had the chief actuary of Medicare in the other day. He said it is \$37 trillion in the hole. That's the unfunded liability for Medicare.

Look at the driver of our debt. Medicare is growing at such a rate that it goes into bankruptcy, the part A trust fund goes bankrupt in 2021, according to CBO.

Now, what does the President's law, the current law in law, do?

It says we need to slow the growth of Medicare spending by putting a cap over Medicare. That's in law today. And then it says, in order to enforce this cap, we're going to have 15 political appointees that the President will appoint for 6-year terms. They make the decisions. They decide what health care providers can do or cannot do and what they get paid.

The Medicare chief actuary came and told us the other day, they'll start off by paying Medicare providers 80 cents on the dollar to provide Medicare benefits and then go down to 30 cents on the dollar.

You think your doctor's going to do what you need if he gets paid 30 cents on the dollar?

He said that 40 percent of Medicare providers are either going to go out of business or just stop taking Medicare patients altogether. That's the current law. That ends the guarantee.

Here's what we say:

Get rid of the rationing board. Stop the bureaucrats from getting between the doctor and her patients. And don't change Medicare for people 55 and above so that you can keep the promise the government's made to them. But for those younger generations, because the program is going bankrupt, you must reform it in order to keep the promise to current seniors.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional 1 minute to say this:

And the way we keep the Medicare guarantee is to save this. You get a list of guaranteed coverage options from Medicare, and among those choices are comprehensive private plans and the traditional Medicare option, and Medicare will subsidize your premiums.

Those subsidies go up every year. If you're low-income, all of your out-of-pocket costs are covered. As you get sick, more and more coverage to prevent you from having sticker shock. And if you're wealthy, yes, more will

be paid out of pocket because we think you can afford it.

That saves Medicare. That makes it solvent. And the competitive bidding that is done to make those providers compete against each other for our business, using choice and competition, is what the Medicare actuary tells us is the best way to preserve and save the Medicare guarantee.

You see, premium support with competitive bidding ensures guaranteed affordability. This is an idea that has had bipartisan support going back to the nineties. Yet our friends on the other side of the aisle would rather have politics than to really work to save the Medicare guarantee.

I yield 3 minutes to the doctor from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for yielding to me.

We've heard our Democratic friends talk about IPAB, of which Chairman RYAN was just discussing. These 15 bureaucrats are nothing but a backstop, a backstop there to cut lower Medicare spending.

In baseball parlance, Mr. Chairman, backstop is sometimes synonymous with the catcher, a catcher who literally will throw every senior out at second base.

I like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, my classmate, Mr. ANDREWS, who just spoke, but we're a country of laws and not of men, and I don't like anything about their budget.

Our budget incorporates the Ryan-Wyden plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy and health care rationing. Therefore, it's with deep concern for seniors that I've listened to my Democratic colleagues suggest that the bipartisan Ryan-Wyden plan will end Medicare as we know it.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot stress this point enough: Medicare, as the chairman just said, Medicare will be bankrupt as early as 2016 because ObamaCare already ended Medicare as we know it. It stole \$575 billion from Medicare in order to pay for ObamaCare.

I offered a simple amendment during ObamaCare that said any Medicare saving must go back into Medicare to save Medicare. Who could disagree with that? Well, the Democrats in the House did. Twice they defeated my amendment. Republican efforts to save Medicare from bankruptcy were thwarted by House Democrats because President Obama needed a piggy bank to pay for ObamaCare.

Today we have a bipartisan plan to save Medicare, created by House Republicans and Senate Democrats who put partisanship aside because our seniors need us to save Medicare from bankruptcy and save them from ObamaCare. If the Democrats vote against this plan to save Medicare, will they put forward their own plan to save Medicare? They're going to have an opportunity, indeed, even to vote for the

Obama budget recommendation as well as their own.

Mr. Chairman, we've heard a great deal of rhetoric from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, yet the silence on my question today has been deafening because they don't have a plan. And I hope they will stand up now and prove me wrong by telling me what is their plan.

Mr. Chairman, not only does this budget responsibly reform and save Medicare, this budget also charts the path to fiscal discipline that is long overdue in this city. H. Con. Res. 112 lowers spending by \$1.1 trillion below even what the House passed last year. This budget proposes \$5.33 trillion below what President Obama proposed in his own budget.

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

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this budget makes broad tax reforms that will prevent a \$2 trillion tax increase from taking effect January 1, 2013, will spur economic growth by lowering taxes to individuals and job creators, and it proposes a 25 percent—25 percent—corporate tax rate to promote domestic economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, it's time that we think of the next generation and not the next election. This Path to Prosperity charts a responsible course for the fiscal health of our country, and I urge all of my colleagues, support H. Con. Res. 112.

□ 1750

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I keep hearing my Republican colleagues say that their plan will provide seniors with affordable premiums for their health care services. I just keep asking myself why it is that their plan gives seniors on Medicare a much worse deal and a lot less support than the plan Members of Congress have under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan. That is a real premium support plan. That is a plan where the premium support keeps pace with rising health care costs.

So if you're talking about how to deal with Medicare, it seems to me that you should take the approach that we have taken, that the President has taken, where you modernize the system, you change the incentives to put focus on the value of care, on the quality of care rather than the quantity of care.

We're already starting up accountable care organizations. We're already starting up different methods of delivering care and different payment systems. That's a very different approach than putting the burden on seniors and putting the risk on seniors.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady who represents the Nation's capital so well, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for his brilliant and balanced work on the budget.



Shakespeare's sonnet says, "Let me count the ways." I am finding it difficult to count the reasons to oppose the Republicans' unbalanced, no-growth budget that threatens to send us back into a recession.

But when the tightest fist in the Federal Government, the OMB, says that the Republican budget would, and here I'm quoting, make it "extraordinarily difficult for the Federal Government to do its basic business," I listen.

The Federal Government, Mr. Chairman, is labor intensive. When the OMB says that there will be 4,500 fewer Federal agents on the border, working criminal cases and performing national security, I listen.

When the OMB says we won't be able to meet basic standards for food safety, I am listening.

We simply cannot keep freezing pay for Federal employees, which amounts to deep cuts or replace every three with only one employee and expect to continue protecting the American people at the same time.

The Republican budget kicks Federal employees while they are down and kicks their vital work right along with them. It guarantees the growth of the unaccountable contractor sector, which remains untouched in the Republican budget.

So much for the phantom savings at the expense of Federal employees.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman RYAN for yielding 3 minutes to talk about such an important subject as the health care of our seniors.

You know, the other side of the aisle wants to play pretend. Let's pretend that we have a program sustainable for all future generations. Let's pretend that all our seniors right now have access to all the medical care and physicians that they want. Let's pretend that the Medicare program that the President's health care reform bill establishes for our seniors allows seniors and their doctors to choose what care is best for them.

But, Mr. Chairman, we would have to be playing pretend because, in fact, we know that the program is not sustainable for all generations. This graph here is not from the Republican conference. This is from the Congressional Budget Office. This is what happens, the red. It's no accident that it's in red. This is what happens to Medicare spending under the President's proposals.

We are right here in the middle. This is when my children reach their middle age. This is when they retire. This is when my grandchildren reach their retirement. It's not sustainable. Anyone looking at that graph knows it's not sustainable. We can't play pretend.

We would have to play pretend that all seniors have access to physicians. Go into my district in rural areas where seniors tell you they don't have

access to primary care already because the Medicare program currently squeezes the payments, the providers to where providers no longer choose to take on as many Medicare patients as they can. The President's plan makes it even worse.

Finally, we would be pretending that patients get to choose and their physicians get to choose their care because under the President's plan, there are 15 unelected bureaucrats who decide, that President's rationing board, who decide what care my mother now will get, what care I'm going to get in 10 years, what care my son is going to get in 39 years when he reaches retirement age. Fifteen unelected bureaucrats, Mr. Chairman, by law only a minority of that board can ever have practiced health care. The majority are bureaucrats never having taken care of a patient. That's the plan that we have now.

Mr. Chairman, it will break if we don't take care of it.

I applaud the chairman of the Budget Committee for the bravery; and, Mr. Chairman, you know what the ads are going to be. You can see it now. You can hear all the talking points. America knows health care in America needs repair. They know the Medicare program needs repair if we're going to preserve it for future generations.

I urge my colleagues to choose this as the repair for our future generations.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, put up a chart with the red showing the rising costs of Medicare and said the President has no plan. Well, I wish the gentleman had looked at the chart of the chairman of the Budget Committee. We've seen it a couple of times today. It shows the black line being the House Republican trajectory, the blue line being the President's plan to contain costs. The difference again being that the Republican proposal puts all the risks of rising health care costs onto seniors, whereas the President's plan talks about changing the delivery system in a way to encourage the value of care, focus on the value of care, rather than the volume of care.

I would only point out that we keep hearing about the IPAB. The reality is that anything they would propose, number one, by law cannot ration care. But number two is subject to review and a vote by Members of Congress, the people in this body.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. I've been listening to this debate; and you know, the Republicans' claim that they're saving Medicare is political mythology.

Essentially, what they're doing is shifting coverage to the private sector.

They have a cap more stringent than that in the Affordable Care Act. So over time, more and more there is the erosion and the end of Medicare.

I want to say just a few words about the tax provisions in the Republican budget.

On Sunday, this is what was said: I don't know. That's what the Republican budget chairman said on Sunday when asked whether the middle class would suffer under his tax proposal.

□ 1800

It's important for the American public to know the facts. The Republican budget would cut taxes for the very wealthy. The top tax rate would be reduced by such a significant extent that, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, the average millionaire would receive \$265,000 in tax cuts. To pay for this tax cut, the Republicans would have to put on the chopping block provisions in the Tax Code relating to health, education, the home mortgage interest deduction, and pensions.

Mr. RYAN, you call these loopholes. No, these are policies. For example, four-fifths of the benefit of the health care exclusion goes to households earning less than \$200,000. Half goes to those earning less than \$100,000. Then 70 percent of the benefit provided through the home mortgage interest deduction goes to families who earn less than \$200,000.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HARRIS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Yet the provisions that, in fact, disproportionately benefit the wealthy, including the reduction for capital gains and dividends, the Republicans would protect from any changes.

The Republican priorities could not be clearer when it comes to Medicare: end it. As to their tax provisions: help the very wealthy.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 5 minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee and also a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I want to commend Mr. RYAN for standing up for the future of our country and for his dedication to fundamental American principles.

Mr. Chairman, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Michael Mullen, said last year that the greatest threat to our national security—the greatest threat to our national security—was our debt. Now, there are clear differences—you've heard them here today—about how we should address that debt. Americans have a choice to make, and it is a choice that will determine the future of our great country. By ignoring the drivers of our debt, by ignoring Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, the President's most recent budget proposal ensures a future of ever-increasing debt and doubt and

decline. In fact, before the Budget Committee, Mr. Chairman, we had earlier this spring Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, who admitted of the administration that they don't "have a definitive solution to our long-term problem. What we do know is we don't like yours."

Now there is real leadership.

The President's health care law, the current law of the land, cuts Medicare by more than \$500 billion for more government programs. The President's health care law ends the Medicare guarantee and puts us on this red path over here, Mr. Chairman, increasing the amount of debt that gives the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff pause to say that the greatest threat is our debt.

The President's health care law empowers the Independent Payment Advisory Board to effectively deny care to seniors. You've heard about it—15 unelected bureaucrats. None of them—none of them—can be actively practicing physicians. As a physician, I can tell you that gives me great pause.

You heard the gentleman from New Jersey down here, saying that, in their program, if a doctor says that you need cardiac surgery, you get it. Well, on the contrary, Mr. Chairman. In fact, if a doctor says you need cardiac surgery and if the board of unelected bureaucrats says you don't get it, guess what? You don't get it.

Then my friend from Maryland says, Oh, no. You can bring it to the floor of the House. You can bring it to Congress. You could have a review and vote on the floor of the House for your cardiac surgery.

Hardly, Mr. Chairman. It just isn't going to happen. The fact of the matter is this unelected board is charged with finding \$500 billion in reductions in payments to Medicare physicians. Consequently, what will happen is that it will essentially deny care to seniors.

As a physician, I believe that the President's health care law threatens all of the principles that we hold dear: accessibility, affordability, quality, responsiveness, innovation, choices. Every single principle of health care is violated by the President's health care law. It destroys the doctor-patient relationship. Yet it's not just devastating to the future of our health. It's also devastating to the future of our economy, which is, again, what drives the chart. Where is the middle class, Mr. Chairman, on this chart? In the red. Where are the American Dreams of our kids and grandkids? In the red.

So we are committed to the full repeal of the President's health care law, and today we advance bipartisan solutions to improve and to strengthen Medicare. Where the President and Democrats fail to act here in Washington, we will lead.

Our plan has no changes for those in or near retirement. It allows choices, including the Medicare option, so that patients control their health decisions,

not bureaucrats. When bureaucrats choose, patients lose. In the future, Americans, through a guaranteed system—read the bill, Mr. Chairman—will be able to select the health coverage that is right for them, not what Washington says they must have. Our solution is guaranteed, it's voluntary, and it's bipartisan—something our friends on the other side of the aisle simply cannot say.

Our plan also includes commonsense tax reform—closing loopholes, lowering rates, broadening the base, helping job creators. It's a system that is more fair and more simple and that allows us to compete in the world because a vibrant and robust, growing economy is necessary to get us back on the right track, and the right track is the green path here, Mr. Chairman, that gets us to a balanced budget and paying off our debt.

Now, we know that the Senate won't adopt our budget. Remember, they haven't done one in over 3 years. So the solution to the Senate and to the Presidential gridlock is with the American people. It's the people of this great country who will decide the direction that we take, not Washington. It's the people who will decide. We offer a positive budget, a positive plan, for both our health care and our economy. It's a path to prosperity, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I would just urge my friend Mr. PRICE to again look at the chart presented by the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, which makes it clear that we have different paths, different approaches, with respect to containing costs. Yet, at the end of the day, the trajectories are the same.

I'll say again that if Republicans think the notion of the premium support plan—the voucher plan, whatever you want to call it—which doesn't rise with health care costs, is such a good deal for seniors, why are they giving themselves a different deal in the health care plan for Members of Congress?

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize that we are facing difficult fiscal challenges and that we absolutely have to get our fiscal house in order. Obviously, that means that we have to make smart budgetary decisions and invest our dollars wisely in those things that will yield the greatest benefit. However, it doesn't mean that we just cut for the sake of cutting.

I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget, which eliminates the Medicare guarantee as we know it. Particularly, it eliminates the Medicare guarantee for my constituents in Rhode Island, our seniors. It also cuts

programs that keep my constituents' homes heated, that help families afford college, and that ensure proper access to health care.

I rise in opposition to slashing infrastructure spending that literally prevents our bridges from falling down, as well as gutting investments in education, medical research, and emerging technologies, which provide key areas for job creation.

Finally, I rise in the strongest opposition to cutting these vital programs and economic investments while at the same time maintaining tax breaks for millionaires, Big Oil, and Wall Street.

Mr. Chairman, our budget reflects our values and our priorities, and the Republican budget prioritizes the wealthiest Americans at the expense of everyone else. I urge my colleagues to reject this measure and to support the Democratic alternative, which keeps our promises to our seniors, preserves our social safety net, invests in education for our children, invests in creating a 21st century infrastructure for a 21st century economy, and that asks all Americans to pay their fair share toward reducing our deficit.

□ 1810

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I just have one more request for time, and then I will reserve the right to close. And I understand the gentleman has a number of other requests, so perhaps he would like to continue with his speakers?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership.

I rise in very strong opposition to the Republican budget, which really is a path to more prosperity for the 1 percent.

Once again, the Republicans are proposing a budget that pays for tax cuts for the very wealthy at the expense of senior citizens and the most vulnerable Americans. At a time when America faces the greatest—mind you, the greatest—income inequality since the Great Depression, this Republican budget would continue the largest wealth transfer in history to the top 1 percent. It would recklessly deny support services to the poor and the hungry, end the Medicare guarantee, and destroy American jobs, while preserving tax breaks for millionaires, special interests, and Big Oil.

That's not all. While the Republican budget crushes the American Dream for those striving to become part of the middle class—of course, that's the poor and the working poor—it would increase spending for an already bloated Pentagon budget and continue the war in Afghanistan at a time when seven out of 10 Americans believe the war should come to an end.

We cannot do this to America's struggling families and our seniors or low-income individuals. I urge all

Members to reject this Republican budget and, instead, support the budget proposals put forth by Congressman VAN HOLLEN and the Democrats, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and the Congressional Black Caucus.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from California.

Ms. LEE of California. A budget is a moral document that shows our Nation's priorities and our values.

How can we allow this Medicare guarantee that our seniors have contributed to throughout their lives to be turned into a privatized voucher plan? Where is our sense of morality? Allowing our seniors to really just begin to fall through the cracks, that is just wrong.

We need a budget that puts Americans back to work, that invests in our future, that protects the safety net, including Medicare, and works to reignite the American Dream for all and not crush it for all but the wealthiest 1 percent.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Education Committee, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And just like last year, some Members of Congress and beltway talking heads are declaring the Republican budget proposal as bold and courageous. But just like last year's Republican budget, this budget proposal is neither bold nor is it courageous.

It's not bold to balance your budget on the backs of working families, low-income families, and the children of this Nation. This Republican budget, in fact, mortgages an entire generation of children's education and young people's education. It mortgages their educational opportunities by making cuts at the very earliest of early childhood education, at the elementary level of education, the secondary level of education; and it's going to allow the doubling of interest rates on student loans that families have taken out to provide for the higher education that these young people need to get jobs in this economy, to get the skills that they need to be able to go to work in this economy. Yet that is going to be slashed with their cuts, with their increased costs to those individuals.

It also sacrifices the health care benefits of a generation, of these same people, because under their proposal they envision the Affordable Care Act somehow going away, that they can repeal it, they can get rid of it. And that means that young people will not be able to stay on their families' policies as they finish their education or they seek out their first job, their first beginning of a career.

It also ends the Medicare guarantee. It follows the path that George Bush followed when he wanted to privatize it and then again in last year's budget, when they sought to end the guarantee.

They're back again to end that guarantee to our senior citizens. It's not bold. It's just plain wrong.

The Affordable Care Act, in fact, strengthened Medicare. It made it more sustainable for seniors and sustainable for the taxpayers. It extended the Medicare trust fund.

But that's not what the Republican budget's about. It's about extending the deficits out until sometime in 2014, while at the same time not looking at the impact of military spending or continuing the war in Afghanistan, as they accept it in their budget.

And what it says is, therefore, we will shift the entire cuts to the young, to the old, to middle class families. But that cannot be allowed. The Republican budget must be rejected by this House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman for yielding and for his good work on this budget.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote:

To preserve the independence of the people, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

In this choice of two futures, unfortunately, Congress has all too often chosen the latter path of out-of-control spending and expansion of government power. There is a spending addiction in Washington, D.C., and it has proven to be an addiction that Congress has not controlled on its own.

The Nation has gone, in a few short years, from a Federal deficit of billions of dollars to a deficit of trillions of dollars. The government is printing money at an unprecedented pace, which presents significant risks of inflation. Our debt is currently an unfathomable \$15.5 trillion and mounting rapidly, as is the waste associated with paying the interest on that debt. Yet Congress has done little to address this crisis.

Families all across our Nation understand what it means to make tough decisions each day about what they can and cannot afford. Yet far too often, this fundamental principle has been lost on a Congress that is too busy spending to pay attention to the bottom line. Americans must exercise restraint with their own funds, then government officials must be required to exercise an even higher standard when spending other people's hard-earned money.

While I believe that the House budget we are considering today is a good budget and I support it, it is dependent on fiscally minded Congresses being elected for the next 28 years who will be committed to upholding this budget, as well as a President who will sign fiscally responsible appropriations meas-

ures into law. That is why I am also a supporter of the Republican Study Committee budget. While this RSC budget is bold and some say drastic, these measures are needed to solve our Nation's fiscal crisis.

Mr. Chairman, unless each Congress—regardless of party affiliation—is forced to make the decisions necessary to actually set a budget—unlike the U.S. Senate—and create a balanced budget, the temptation will always be there for Congress to spend more than it receives in revenues. And that is the advantage of a constitutional balanced budget amendment which would ensure that the principle of fiscal responsibility is forced upon all future Congresses.

The balanced budget amendment is a commonsense approach to ensure that Congress is bound by the same fiscal principles that America's families face each day. I am pleased that the Republican Study Committee proposal seeks to balance the budget in 5 years and puts us on a path to save Medicare.

Finally, I urge this Congress to demonstrate leadership and make the tough but bold decision to stop the government spending spree. We cannot continue to saddle our children and grandchildren with debt that is not their own.

I support the Republican Study Committee budget. I support fiscal responsibility.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1½ minutes to Mr. WELCH of Vermont, a gentleman who has been focused on fiscal responsibility.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the budget challenge we face requires two things: first, it requires the confidence to invest in the future and rebuild the middle class; second, it requires the discipline to bring down our debt with a plan that recognizes what is obvious to all Americans, that any plan with any prospect of success must include spending cuts and revenues.

This budget, instead, makes things worse and delivers a body blow to the middle class. It doubles down on tax cuts, adding \$150,000 in cuts to the wealthiest Americans. It increases Pentagon spending, fencing it off from it being required to make any contribution to reducing our debt. And that body blow to the middle class, it's delivered by cutting Pell Grants, kicking kids off of work study, by taking away things that the middle class needs, a functional Food and Drug Administration, FAA, cuts in national science. It is really bad for the middle class.

Americans know that a budget is much more than line items on a spreadsheet. It's about who we are and what we aspire to be. And the question is this:

This budget believes in austerity. It leads to prosperity; no evidence for that. This budget believes that tax cuts for the wealthy will create jobs; no evidence for that.

In our budget, we believe something very simple:

We're all better off when we're all better off, and that requires a budget that reflects what has always made America great: investment in a middle class that's strong and that's enduring. Our hope in passing any budget has to be that the middle class will be strengthened and that parents will have some confidence that their kids will be better off than they were.

□ 1820

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I am the last speaker. I reserve the right to close. So I will let the gentleman from Maryland use up all his time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I stand in strong opposition to the Republican budget that we are considering here today.

How easy it is for some to forget that when President Bush took office, we had surpluses as far as the eye could see, and when President Bush left office, we were left with a deep pool of red ink.

My friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the urgency of reducing our deficits, but where were my deficit-concerned colleagues when Congress passed tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, adding trillions to the deficit? Where were my deficit-concerned colleagues when President Bush took us into two wars without paying for either?

I find it hard to believe that after voting time and again to add trillions to the deficit, that the only solution they offer to create economic growth in this country is to end Medicare and to hand out more tax cuts to the wealthiest among us.

The Republican vision in this budget doesn't reflect the America that I grew up in, and their vision of an America that can't is not the country that I want my children to inherit.

Budgets are about choices, and this Republican budget chooses billionaires over seniors and oil subsidies over college dreams for our middle class.

The same Republican budget that replaces the Medicare guarantee and gives us "coupon care" that immediately and dramatically increases seniors' health care costs and that cuts college aid for over 9 million students and slashes investments in our K-12 schools, turns around and showers hundreds of thousands of dollars on millionaires and billionaires. You can't make this stuff up.

What's most astonishing to me about this budget is the absence of any talk about real Americans, those fighting to hold on to their jobs and their homes.

America has always been the land of opportunity, where those who work hard and play by the rules have a chance to succeed and to achieve the American Dream.

Instead of turning America into a can't-do country where you begin by dismantling Medicare and Medicaid and dismantling our programs to help our children trying to go to college and all of those institutions that we rely on, the Institutes of Health and all of those that do all the science research for us, we should recognize that this is still a great country.

We need to come together in this debate with the conviction that America's best days are yet to come.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this can't-do Republican budget and for the Democratic alternative.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget.

Once again, the Republicans move a slash-and-burn budget that would turn Medicare into a private voucher system and force seniors to spend more than \$6,000 out of pocket every additional year. It would gut Medicaid, education programs, medical research, and transportation among other things. You name it, they devastate it.

First, the Republican budget calls for a staggering \$10 trillion in tax cuts for the wealthy and large corporations over 10 years. It would pay for it by closing unspecified tax loopholes, but this is a fraud. For loophole closing of this magnitude, the Republicans would have to get rid of all the tax breaks the middle class depends on, loopholes like the mortgage interest deduction, the tax exclusion for employer-sponsored health insurance, and charitable donations. This won't happen, which is why the Republicans won't name any of their loophole closings.

The Republican budget then proposes \$5.3 trillion in non-defense discretionary spending cuts, beyond what was agreed to in last year's debt ceiling, \$1.2 trillion beyond. It would slash \$860 billion from Medicare and all to pay for tax cuts because it wouldn't balance the budget until 2040, because these cuts are to pay for the tax cuts for the wealthy.

For shame.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget for FY13 as offered by Mr. RYAN.

Last year, the Republicans moved a slash-and-burn budget proposal that would have eliminated Medicare and substituted for it a private voucher system, and would have implemented devastating cuts to Medicaid, education programs, medical research, and transportation, among other things. You name it, they wanted to devastate it.

Now we turn to this year's Republican budget proposal and, as one famous New Yorker would say: It's déjà vu all over again.

First, the Republican budget calls for a staggering \$10 trillion in tax cuts for the wealthy and large corporations over ten years. They claim to pay for this giveaway by closing unspecified tax loopholes. But this is a fraud. For loophole closing of this magnitude, the Republicans would have to get rid of all the tax

breaks the middle class depends on—"loopholes" like the mortgage interest deduction, tax exclusions for employer-sponsored health insurance, and charitable donations. This won't happen—which is why the Republicans won't name any of their "loophole-closings."

So this would make the budget deficit \$10 trillion larger—which is why they do not anticipate balancing the budget until 2040. But they make devastating spending cuts—not to balance the budget, but to pay for their tax cuts for the wealthy. What priorities!

The Republican budget seeks even deeper spending cuts than last year's proposal. It proposes \$5.3 trillion in non-defense discretionary spending cuts—\$1.2 trillion (22 percent) beyond the cuts agreed to in last year's Debt Ceiling deal. More than 60 percent of these cuts would come on the backs of middle- and low-income families.

For example, the Republican budget would slash \$860 billion (34 percent) from the Medicaid program while turning it into an unguaranteed block grant. These severe cuts would shift the cost burden to the states, who would have to decide between investing even more of their own money, cutting benefits, shifting the cost onto beneficiaries, doctors, and hospitals, throwing people out of the program, or all of these. The Urban Institute estimated that the Republican plan would result in between 14 and 27 million people being dropped from Medicaid by 2021.

Additionally, the Ryan budget would reduce food stamps by \$134 billion, knocking 8 to 10 million people from the program and leaving them to go hungry. WIC, which provides nutritional assistance to women and children, would also be cut, taking food out of the mouths of 700,000 pregnant women, new moms and their kids. Over the next decade, nearly two million women and children would be left without access to critical food. What kind of cruel and heartless country do the Republicans want us to live in?

Seniors on Medicare don't fare much better. First, Republicans would raise the eligibility age to 67, leaving seniors aged 65 and 66 out in the cold. They would force seniors to go it alone in negotiating with private insurance companies for coverage. Seniors would receive vouchers to offset the cost of private insurance—vouchers whose value would increase much more slowly than the cost of buying medical insurance. CBO estimates that within ten years seniors would have to pay \$6,000 more out of pocket for medical care annually. All this, mind you, while promising to do away with all of the provisions in the Affordable Care Act, like medical ratio requirements, which actually help to stem the cost of private insurance.

Don't look to the Republican plan for investments in infrastructure, medical research, or education—primary or collegiate, for students or for teachers—because they are not there.

And the Republican budget would greatly increase unemployment. According to the Economic Policy Institute, Republican spending cuts would result in the loss of 1.3 million jobs next year and an additional 2.8 million jobs the year after that. That's 4.1 million jobs lost in just two years, thereby eviscerating all the jobs added to the economy in the last 23 months and then some.

Mr. Chair, the sheer gravity of the cuts proposed by the Republican budget is staggering and disastrous. While no budget is perfect,

any of the Democratic proposals under consideration today is head and shoulders better for America, and for Americans, than the Ryan Budget Against America: Part Two.

While we may disagree on how to continue to support and grow our economy, let's stop using the working poor, the middle-class, women, kids, and seniors as pawns. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Ryan budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield myself the remaining time.

The debate we've had this afternoon is not whether we should reduce the deficit, whether we should reduce the debt, but how we do it, the choices that we make in reaching that goal.

We support what has been described as a balanced approach, the same approach taken by every bipartisan group that has looked at this challenge. That approach says, yes, we need to make cuts. But we should also cut special interest tax loopholes for the purpose of reducing the deficit. We should also ask folks at the very high end of the income ladder to go back to the same tax rates they were paying during the Clinton administration.

Our colleagues reject that balanced approach. I have not heard one of our Republican colleagues say that they're prepared to take one penny from closing a tax loophole, one penny from getting rid of an oil subsidy for the purpose of deficit reduction. When you do that, when you say we're not going to ask the wealthiest to share a greater responsibility, you have to take your budget cuts out on everyone and everything else. That's why they slashed the transportation funding next year by 46 percent, kicking the economy when it's down. That's why they end the Medicare guarantee for seniors. That's why they reopen the prescription-drug doughnut hole. That's why their budget cuts Medicaid by a third, by the year 2022, in the name of repairing the social safety net. That's not repairing the social safety net. That's blowing a hole in protections for the most vulnerable Americans.

That is not a choice the American people want to make. The American people would choose a balanced approach. They would not choose another round of tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans at the expense of seniors, at the expense of middle-income Americans, at the expense of important investments. They would reject that approach.

I urge my colleagues to reject that approach and adopt the balanced Democratic alternative.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

When we confronted the 2008 economic crisis, which launched us into

the worst recession since the Great Depression, which threw millions of people out of work, which lost trillions of dollars in wealth in retirement savings for millions of Americans, that crisis caught us by surprise. We didn't see it coming. Out of that came very ugly legislation that lots of us supported.

Mr. Chair, this one is the most predictable economic crises we've ever had, and we have a Senate that has chosen for 3 years in a row to just do nothing. We have a President who, for the fourth budget in a row, proposes to do nothing to fix it. In fact, he makes it worse.

Here is what we're trying to do. We're trying to go to the country and offer them a solution. We don't think the country is headed in the right direction right now because a debt crisis is coming. So we feel morally bound and actually legally bound because the Budget Act requires that we pass a budget to offer a solution and an alternative: fundamental tax reform to get job creators creating jobs; take away the special interest loopholes and tax shelters and treat everybody fairly; stop raising the tax rate on successful small businesses to 45 percent, like is going to happen in January, and instead keep their tax rates low so they can create jobs; control spending; reform our welfare system.

We believe the American idea is essentially an opportunity to decide if the safety net—and we believe in a safety net that is there to help people who cannot help themselves, and to be there to help people who are down on their luck get back on their feet. But we do not want to convert this safety net into a hammock that lulls able-bodied people into lives of dependency and complacency which drains them of their will and their intentions to make the most of their lives.

□ 1830

We believe in a system of upward mobility and opportunity. We believe when we see Medicare and Medicaid going bankrupt that we should fix that. Let's let the States innovate, create, and have good solutions that meet the needs of their populations by giving them more control over Medicaid. They run it already right now. They just have all these government rules and regulations from Washington.

Stop the rationing board from denying care to current seniors. Get rid of that, and replace it with a guarantee that current seniors get the promise made to them and future seniors actually have a program that's solvent. So instead of having 15 bureaucratic elites price-control their program, allow 50 million seniors in the future to choose which one they want the best. One-quarter of seniors already today pick among the private plans that meet their needs. We want to keep giving them the choices.

At the end of the day, it's about a choice of two futures: Do we want this path of debt, doubt, and decline where

we have a debt crisis, where the people that get hurt first and the worst are those who need government the most—the poor, the people in the safety net, and the elderly who depend on Medicare—or are we going to get this debt under control and pay it off and give our children a better future?

At the end of the day, it's a philosophy. What the other side is doing and what the President is proposing is that elites in the bureaucracy who are unelected, they make the decisions. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, that is paternalistic, it's arrogant, and it's condescending.

So the question really is: Who do you want to be in charge of your life, you or these cronies in government?

Do we want to keep taking money from job creators and from families and sending it to Washington so they can distribute it to their cronies, so they can distribute it to whoever has the clout, and so they can make all these decisions in our lives on health care, financial services, education, the environment, and energy? If we keep surrendering our liberties and our freedom and our dollars, we won't have the right to pursue happiness as we see happiness in our own lives.

The idea of this country is that our rights come from nature and God to us automatically before government. Our rights don't come from government. But the idea that's being perpetrated, the path the President is putting us on, is one where he and his elites in Washington know better. They define our rights for us. They regulate, ration, and redistribute them for us. Whatever you call that, Mr. Chairman, that is not the American idea.

We have a profound responsibility to look our children in the eye, like our parents did to us, and fix this country's problems so they can have a more prosperous future. We know, without a shadow of a doubt—it's irrefutable—the next generation is going to be worse off. We know that if we allow this debt crisis to continue, if we allow it to kick in—and the experts tell us it could be as little as 2 years away—everybody is going to get hurt and the economy is going to go down.

We have a moral obligation to do something about that. What we're saying is do it now, do it on our own terms, do it in a way where people can see the reforms that are necessary so they are gradual, and do it in a way so that we can keep the promises the government has made to people who have already retired who count on government the most.

At the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, this is about choices. And we are going to give the country a choice of two futures so they can decide whether or not we want to maintain the American idea in this country.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) each will control

30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

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

At the end of the day, the Republican budget developed by our Budget chairman, PAUL RYAN, is a jobs bill. We know America faces an unemployment crisis today greater than at any time during the Depression. We know roughly 23 million Americans can't even find a full-time job. We know that while government spending has rebounded and how other factors have rebounded in this economy, what we know is that jobs haven't rebounded. In fact, there are fewer jobs in America today than when this President took his oath of office.

So we're going to talk about this budget and its impact on America's economy. The truth of the matter is, if you like the way our economy is going, if you think this is the best we can do, stick with the President's budget and stick with the Democrats' budget. It stays the course. But if you think we can do better for American hard-working taxpayers and jobseekers, there is a choice of two futures.

Mr. Chairman, it's a privilege to serve as the vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the lead Republican for the House and Senate. I'd like to acknowledge the contributions that my fellow House Republicans, such as Dr. BURGESS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. MULVANEY make as members of the Joint Economic Committee.

We are here as a matter of law. Established in 1946 as the congressional counterpart to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the Joint Economic Committee has provided timely insight on economic issues to the Congress for more than half a century. We helped lay the intellectual groundwork for the Kennedy tax cut in 1964, and its 1980 report plugging in the supply side established the credibility of supply-side economics and paved the way for the Reagan tax cuts in 1981. The Joint Economic Committee examines economic developments and evaluates economic ramifications of policies being considered by the Congress, such as this budget, and work by the JEC Republicans received national attention during the debate over President Obama's plan to nationalize health care in the 111th Congress.

Since the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, the Joint Economic Committee has performed an important function in this, the annual budget process. Advising Members of Congress on the potential economic impact of the policies set forth in the President's budget and the budget resolution we consider today, it's for this purpose we come to the House floor this evening.

Well, let's begin our assessment of the House budget by discussing some very key economic principles.

Real growth in the economy, which is the foundation for creating jobs along Main Street for hardworking Americans, comes from the private sector and not from government. The Joint Economic Committee examined for the last 40 years the relationship between changes in government spending and jobs along Main Street and private payroll employment. And what's clear is that there is not a tight relationship; there's an inverse relationship.

As Federal Government spending grows, jobs along Main Street shrink. Likewise, when the Federal Government takes a smaller share of resources from Main Street, more hard-working taxpayers find jobs as payroll employment increases. And this chart shows—the blue being Federal Government spending and the red being jobs along Main Street—every time Washington grows, Main Street shrinks.

My colleagues across the aisle argue that Federal spending should increase when private job growth plummets, but even during periods of sustained increases in Federal spending and investments, jobs along Main Street have remained low or negative. And put simply, Federal spending doesn't create jobs. Only when Federal spending subsidies do jobs grow.

Next, there's a very close economic relationship, though, between what we call private nonresidential fixed investment growth. What that means is, when businesses invest in building and software equipment technology, jobs along Main Street grow. This chart shows, again, since 1971, in blue the private investment, businesses software, equipment, and building; in red, job growth along Main Street. And it shows almost a nearly identical correlation.

So, in the end, growing jobs in America depends upon more investment in America, not Federal Government spending, more investment that creates those jobs. In spite of that evidence, 40 years of proven evidence, the White House, President Obama, and Congressional Democrats have only pushed us deeper and deeper into debt.

□ 1840

We have to remind ourselves that both the debt we hold to the public and our gross Federal debt are reaching new post-war levels. They've never been this high since World War II.

Publicly held Federal debt roughly doubled to nearly 70 percent of the size of our economy in just the 4 years leading up to 2011. The same can be said of the gross Federal debt, again, reaching 100 percent of our economy—dangerous levels: dangerous levels to the economy, dangerous levels to our credit rating, dangerous levels to our investment. According to the President's latest budget estimates, this gross debt isn't expected to go under 100 percent for years and years. In fact, he proposes a budget that never balances. The President proposes a budget that takes us deeper and deeper and deeper

into debt and hangs an anchor around America's economy.

There is a better solution, and the model is right in front of us. All you have to do is compare President Obama's spending-driven approach to the economy and look at the last serious recession, that which President Reagan had to tackle. Despite bailouts and Cash for Clunkers and auto bailouts and stimulus and deficit-spending in the trillions of dollars, you can tell this recovery continues to struggle. A good comparison is the Reagan recovery because that recovery was fueled by Main Street, by private investment and free enterprise, just the opposite of President Obama and congressional Democrats.

The White House's current focus on massive increases in Federal spending, expanding government beyond imaginable levels to encourage growth has been a failure. Meanwhile, the smaller government, free-market approach utilized by the Reagan administration proved to be much more successful.

Looking at the comparisons between the two, at this same point in the recession, President Reagan's increase in jobs was up almost 10 percent; President Obama's is less than a third of that. The unemployment rate had dropped 3.5 percent at this point in the recovery under President Reagan. It's less than half of that under President Obama.

In average growth, how did the economy grow under the free-market, less-spending approach of President Reagan? It grew by 6 percent. President Obama's record is about a third of that.

These policies by this President and this Democrat Congress of the past 2 years, prior to Republican control, has failed. The point of the matter is government needs to get out of the way. We need to cut government spending. We need to hold the line and reform our terrible tax system. We need to free our small businesses from the oppressive level of regulation coming out of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, in a moment I'm going to talk about the tax reality. We're going to talk about how the current budget that we've living with today inflates our prices and damages real business. But at this time, I have a number of key speakers from the Joint Economic Committee in our conference that I want to get to.

So at this point I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am afraid that our colleagues have made a slight mistake in naming their plan. This budget should be called the "Road to Austerity" because it is a plan that is most noteworthy for the rather harsh austerity it demands of the many and the lavish benefits it extends to the few.

It clearly envisions a rising tide of selective tax cuts that would lift all



yachts, but leave most dinghies. Our Republican friends like to talk about making the hard choices. What they propose here would indeed make things much harder for millions of Americans, but it will also make things much easier for a fortunate few—millionaires and billionaires. That's their plan.

But before we get to the specifics of the plan tonight, it's important to examine where we are before we decide where we want to go.

Because of President Obama's economic policies, there are continuing signs of economic progress and recovery. For example, in the fourth quarter of 2011 and through the beginning of this year, there is fresh new data showing that the recovery is gaining strength. The economy has added more than 200,000 jobs for 3 straight months. As you can see from this chart, private sector employment has increased for 24 consecutive months; and during these past 24 months, the economy has added almost 4 million private sector jobs.

On this chart, the red bars are the Bush administration. It shows that in the closing days, the closing months, this country was losing over 700,000 jobs per month. The blue bars are the Obama administration. And you can see the steady, slow gains and the 24 months of gains of jobs in the private sector.

This chart is similar to one that was presented by Chairman Bernanke in his testimony before the Financial Services Committee in the Humphrey-Hawkins hearings. This is from his report. It shows the low, deep area we were in when President Obama took office, losing so many jobs, and because of his policies, the steady gain and the continuing gain we hope to see.

Actions taken by the President and Congress, including passage of the Recovery Act and recent legislation to continue Federal Unemployment Insurance and extend the payroll tax cut through 2012, have played an important role in driving this economic recovery and private job gain.

Few would disagree, however, that to reach this point has taken longer than we would have liked. It has required fiscal interventions to sustain and strengthen the economy and to support those harmed by the Great Recession. And it has required a variety of creative and effective approaches from the Federal Reserve to ease monetary policy and boost growth.

I would also like to show the chart on unemployment. It shows that the unemployment rate has fallen significantly, from 9.1 percent last August to 8.3 percent in February, which is well below the peak of 10 percent reached in October 2009. So, again, these are positive signs under the Obama administration.

Still, there are far too many Americans hurting. The reality is that we have a long way to go to regain the ground that we lost during the Great Recession: 12.8 million Americans remain unemployed, and more than four

out of 10 unemployed have been jobless for more than 6 months. The share of those unemployed and out of work for more than 6 months has been greater than 40 percent since December of 2009, a period of time that has been unprecedented.

Clearly, cutting further into the unemployment rate and bringing down the rate of long-term unemployed must be continuing priorities of this Congress. I can say that Democrats will not be satisfied until every American who wants a job can get a job. So while we have made some economic progress, there are many challenges ahead.

While GDP has grown for 10 straight quarters, GDP growth in the first quarter of 2012 is projected to slow to an annual rate of just 1.9 percent. This is far from robust economic growth. The European community's economic weakness may present new headwinds in the months ahead. And the recent spike in U.S. oil and gas prices leaves consumers with fewer dollars in their wallets for other purchases, putting new pressure on the recovery.

Clearly, we need Congress to stay vigilant on the fiscal side. Part of this fiscal vigilance is rejecting austerity plans and short-sighted budget cuts that will jeopardize the recovery while harming the most vulnerable among us, including low-income Americans and senior citizens.

□ 1850

The reality is that the majority's Ryan budget harms those who need help and doles out tax breaks and benefits to those who don't. Let me be as clear as I possibly can. The Ryan budget, if it were passed by this House, would risk our recovery.

The majority's budget resolution for 2013, the Ryan budget, abandons the economic recovery, contains policies that ship American jobs overseas, and harms our Nation's economic competitiveness. And by slashing programs that low-income and elderly Americans count on, while cutting taxes for corporations and the wealthiest individuals, the Ryan budget provides the latest, clearest example of Republican economic priorities.

Just like last year, the Ryan budget ends the Medicare guarantee, shifts the burden of rising health care costs onto seniors, and shreds our Nation's social safety net. These are bad choices for America.

The Ryan budget extends the Bush tax cuts and lowers the current top tax rate from 35 percent to 25 percent, giving millionaires and billionaires a 10 percentage-point tax cut.

Instead of asking the wealthiest Americans to do what they can to help restore fiscal responsibility and preserve vital services, Republicans would choose to slash support for tuition assistance and other services in order to pay for tax cuts that provide a huge benefit to millionaires and hurt America's working middle class.

The Ryan budget includes the latest attempt to end Medicare as we know it.

Instead of strengthening Medicare, Ryan's plan would replace Medicare's guaranteed benefits with a voucher for Medicare or private insurance, creating higher costs for seniors and unraveling the traditional Medicare program.

Initial analysis shows that the plan would cut future spending by \$5,900 per senior, shifting costs to seniors and diminishing their access to quality care. Republicans continue to propose ideas to end Medicare, even though 70 percent of Americans support keeping the program as it is.

The Ryan budget would strip away health care benefits for millions of American families. By repealing the Affordable Care Act, Chairman RYAN's plan would eliminate benefits that are providing stable and secure care for millions of Americans and go back to the days when insurance companies would deny coverage or jack-up prices, or just refuse coverage because of pre-existing conditions whenever, and however, they pleased.

The Republican budget would get rid of benefits Americans are already receiving, such as the following:

Free preventive health services for 32 million seniors; \$3.2 billion in prescription drug savings for 5.1 million seniors by reopening the doughnut hole; reducing drug coverage; preventive services like mammograms, cervical cancer screening, and contraception for over 20 million women; coverage for 2.5 million young Americans who have already gained coverage on their parents' insurance plans; protections from insurance companies canceling coverage when people get sick; and denying coverage to children with preexisting conditions.

And the Ryan budget also eliminates benefits slated to help Americans in the coming 2 years, such as access to stable and secure care for 32 million Americans; protections against being discriminated against due to gender or preexisting conditions; or facing limits on coverage for over 105 million Americans.

Chairman RYAN's budget does something else. It breaks the agreement made last year to reduce the deficit, backing out of the bipartisan deal Republicans and Democrats made on government spending. Many will recall last year, in order to avert an unprecedented national default, Democrats and Republicans passed the Budget Control Act.

The Ryan budget breaks that agreement, that bipartisan agreement, by slashing government services by \$19 billion more than was agreed to in the Budget Control Act. Republicans would break their word on spending and reduce services and investments, all while slashing tax rates for millionaires and billionaires.

The Ryan budget block-grants Medicaid, slashing \$810 billion from the program, jeopardizing nursing home care for seniors, and shifting costs to States.

Chairman RYAN's plan reaffirms the Republican call to end Medicaid as a

safety net, jeopardizing vital services that seniors depend on, like nursing home care and home health care aides, and shifts the burden of rising health care costs to cash-strapped States.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, these dramatic reductions in spending “might involve reduced eligibility coverage of fewer services, lower payments to providers, or increased cost-sharing by beneficiaries, all of which would reduce access to care.”

The Ryan budget increases the burden on low-income Americans. The Republican budget block-grants and slashes funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by almost \$123 billion over 10 years, jeopardizing economic security for millions of Americans.

The Ryan budget would also just pull the plug on America’s clean-energy industries. Instead of moving toward a clean economy and reducing dependence on fossil fuels, Chairman RYAN’s plan pulls the plug on support for clean-energy technology and simply calls for opening more land to drilling, even though American oil production is at its highest level since 2003, and the oil and gas industry is using less than one-third of the 75 million acres of land offered for development. And it continues the subsidies to the oil industry.

This plan would pull Americans out of the race to create well-paying new jobs and dominate the growing global market for clean-energy technology.

The alternative, of course, is the Democratic plan, which takes a totally different approach, a balanced approach of shared sacrifice that meets the Nation’s need to invest in the future, keeps our country strong, and preserves Medicare and our social safety net, while continuing tax relief for working families.

For me, the choice is easy, not hard. I urge you to join me in supporting the Democratic plan, supporting Medicare, supporting working families, supporting the middle class, and supporting the firm belief that the American Dream is alive and well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), one of the key new members of the Joint Economic Committee who understands you can’t tax your way back to a strong economy or to a balanced budget.

Mr. DUFFY. To be clear, we owe over \$15 trillion in national debt. This year we’re going to borrow \$1.3 trillion and a couple of years before that. Every year we’ve borrowed \$1 trillion.

And I hear my friends across the aisle talk about a balanced approach. I believe the American people want a balanced budget. I think we need to be clear on what the Democrat proposals are. If you look at what my friends across the aisle have proposed in regard to a budget, it never balances. There are deficits and debt as far as the eye can see.

The President’s budget, there are debts and deficits as far as the eye can see. It never balances.

Then we look at the Democrat-controlled Senate. For 3 years they haven’t passed a budget.

And so I think the American people want honesty. They want to make sure that the Democrats are honest with regard to how much debt we’re going to pass off to our next generation.

□ 1700

They want us to be honest with regard to how much debt the Democrats want the Chinese to buy from America. I think they want us to be honest in regard to tax rates that, as of April 1, America is going to have the highest tax rate in the industrialized world. My Democrat friends across the aisle, they want to raise taxes even further. So when a business is looking at where it’s going to invest, is it going to be in America or somewhere else? Or if you’re looking at investing in America or somewhere else, they look at tax rates.

When we talk about shipping jobs overseas, it’s these tax policies from my friends across the aisle that ship my jobs in Wisconsin overseas.

They talk about fairness and wanting to balance the budget on a fair playing field. Let’s take a look at this chart. Today, the two top tax rates are 33 and 35 percent. If you want to get the deficit down to 3 percent of the economy, you have to raise those top tax rates to 72 and 77 percent. If you want to get it down to 2 percent of debt to the size of our economy, you have to raise the top tax rate to 86 and 91 percent.

The bottom line is, if you wanted to pay off the debt with the current spending agenda of the Democrats, you could never do it by taxing. You could take all of the wealth, all of the income of those top tax earners, and you would never balance the budget.

Americans want you to be honest in regard to the fallacy that you can tax your way out of these debts and deficits.

I think America wants you to be honest in regard to your plan for Medicare, the plan that says you want to take a half a trillion dollars out of Medicare and use it for some other group. Taking seniors’ money that they have invested in that plan for a lifetime, take a half a trillion out and use it for another group of people; that’s unconscionable.

But moreover, you want to set up a board of 15 unelected bureaucrats who are going to ration our seniors’ care, a board that’s going to systematically reduce reimbursements to doctors, hospitals, and clinics, and, in essence, will impact the access and quality of care, not of some future generations of seniors, but of today’s seniors.

So when we talk about taking care of our seniors, let’s have a plan that truly takes care of our seniors, which is the House plan.

I hear about a guaranteed benefit that the Democrats talk about for our

seniors. There is no guaranteed benefit for our seniors. They’re rationing it down to nothing.

I think it’s important we talk about a bold plan, bold leadership that’s going to resolve the problems that we face in this country; a plan that is going to put us on a path of sustainability, that will balance our budget, that will pay off our debt; a plan that implements pro-growth policies so our economy can expand.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOMACK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. DUFFY. A plan that will put us on a pro-growth path, but also a plan that will preserve and protect Medicare and save it for future generations.

I would ask my friends across the aisle to stop pandering but to join us in bold leadership, and I would submit that their children and grandchildren, some not yet born, would applaud their bold leadership to save our country from this massive debt that will be their future if we don’t act.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, a member of the Budget Committee, ALLYSON SCHWARTZ.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to add a few words. Some of these kinds of issues have been talked about all day or all afternoon, but I felt compelled to rise again to talk about what really is at stake here, and what is truly a sharp contrast between the Republican budget and the Democratic budget alternative.

Our budgets as a Federal budget should reflect our priorities and values as a Nation. Our Democratic budget moves America forward by building for the future, by investing in innovation, in education, in energy with confidence and expectation about the opportunities that are available to us in this country.

But it also ensures that we keep our promises to America’s seniors by protecting and strengthening Medicare.

The Republican plan for America moves our Nation backward and harms our economic competitiveness now and into the future by choosing sustained tax cuts for millionaires over small businesses and jobs for the middle class, by choosing tax breaks for our biggest companies rather than investments in our future economic growth.

Their vision is one in which college becomes more expensive for millions of Americans, where investments in innovation and research are slashed and we stop being the leaders in the world on bioscience and energy. It abandons seniors in their most vulnerable years.

Rather than balancing the budget by shifting costs to Medicare beneficiaries, the Democratic budget reduces the rate of growth in health care spending through initiatives that will increase our value and efficiency in our health care system. It will contain costs for Medicare and for all Americans.

Millions of seniors rely on Medicare every day for their life-saving medications, treatments, and doctor visits. We cannot abandon our obligation to our seniors, and the Democratic budget does not.

The Democratic budget takes a balanced approach to meeting our Nation's fiscal challenges. It makes targeted investments needed to spur economic growth, and, yes, it preserves the Medicare guarantee and protects tax relief for middle class families—a high priority for us, one that is much less, if a priority at all, for the Republican budget.

Our budget tackles the Federal deficit by reducing the Federal deficit as a share of GDP by more than 8 percent so that it is 2.7 percent of GDP within 10 years. We make some hard choices about how we cut spending, but our budget is a commitment to cut spending by over \$2 trillion.

So it reduces the deficit responsibly and fairly. It protects our seniors and our middle class, and it does not ask either our seniors or the middle class to shoulder our fiscal challenges alone.

We have a choice to make, and we will be making it this evening and tomorrow as we decide which budget is better for the America that we dream about, that we expect, and that we work for.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for a responsible budget that, yes, makes spending cuts and also makes smart investments; that grows our economy, but also meets our obligations; that respects our values and who we are as Americans. It creates opportunities, and it is fair to America.

I suggest that we vote “yes” for the Democratic budget that protects America and our values and grows our economy.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), who serves on an important Small Business Committee and who is a nurse and understands our health care challenges in America.

Mrs. ELLMERS. I thank the chairman for allowing me to be here tonight to help in this effort.

Mr. Chairman, the President's economic agenda has failed the American people. The President's economic agenda has failed our job creators, our seniors, and future generations.

The President's policies have failed and are making the economy worse. The President's budget calls for more failed attempts to tax, spend, borrow, and bail out our way to job creation.

I'd like to read a quote from a third party that addresses this issue. Bernie Marcus, former chairman and CEO of Home Depot:

If we don't lower spending, and if we don't deal with paying down the debt, we are going to have to raise taxes. Even brain-dead economists understand that when you raise taxes, you cost jobs.

□ 1910

Because the President cannot stand on his record, he has regrettably

turned to the politics of envy and division. There is nothing fair about making our children and our grandchildren pay the bills for what the President's own fiscal commission cochairs called “the most predictable economic crisis in our history.”

I have a couple of more quotes, and these aren't from conservative publications, mind you.

USA Today: “Obama's budget plan leaves debt bomb ticking.”

The Boston Herald:

President Barack Obama has apparently decided that he is not going to be part of the solution to the Nation's enormous deficit, which would make him, yes, part of the problem.

Mr. Chairman, our friends across the aisle continuously discuss the issue of Medicare, which we know is one of the growing problems when we're dealing with the debt. Our Democrat friends continue to say that Republicans are cutting Medicare and are changing it as we know it. Yet, in ObamaCare, they cut a half a trillion dollars out of Medicare.

I have a quote from the Congressional Budget Office as well, and my friend across the aisle had one a few moments ago. This quote is from 12/19/09, and reads that the government takeover of health care “could reduce access to care or diminish the quality of care.”

I also have a quote from the Government Accountability Office: “Medicare remains on a path that is fiscally unsustainable over the long term.”

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

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

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Chairman, House Republicans are going to pass a jobs bill. We are going to pass a budget. This budget includes fundamental pro-growth tax reform and eliminating corporate loopholes and subsidies in order to help create jobs. It addresses the real drivers of our debt, saving our social safety net programs from going bankrupt, and it calls for the repeal of the government takeover of health care and other job-destroying spending.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for the House budget bill.

Mrs. MALONEY. I inquire of the Chair as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman COOPER.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Unfortunately, this is one of the most partisan weeks in Washington as each side presents its own budget. I urge Members to weigh these budgets very carefully. Unfortunately, we have very little time to do so. The entire debate for the Republican and Democrat budgets is some 4 hours. There will be many alternative budgets presented.

The one that I am most interested in, the Simpson-Bowles-endorsed budget, will come up later tonight, which is a big schedule change since it hadn't been expected until tomorrow. We will have a total of 10 minutes to explain the only bipartisan budget that will be offered. There are six or seven budgets being offered, but there is only one that is bipartisan. There are many excellent features in the Democratic budget and in the Republican budget, but there is only one that has the support of folks on both sides of the aisle.

I hope that Members choose carefully even in this, the most partisan of weeks, because it's almost a David versus Goliath situation when you have 10 minutes versus 4 hours. I hope that Members will look at the details of these budgets and will realize that hidden in the details are lots of massive changes to lots of massive programs. Yet, if we don't let ideology control, if we look at the basics and realize that America does have a deficit and debt problem, as the White House acknowledges and as our Republican friends acknowledge, if we respect each other and understand that we have to have real revenues and entitlement reform, there is still really only one plan that offers both. I did not originate it, but I'm thankful that Simpson and Bowles, with their report of a year and a half ago, introduced such a plan. Tonight, later in the debate, in an hour or two, Members will have the first opportunity in either the House or the Senate to consider that.

So these are very important issues that we're facing. I wish it were not a David and Goliath sort of situation. It's almost like David versus two Goliaths, because the institutional infrastructure in Washington supporting either the Republican budget or the Democratic budget is massive.

I think that once you look at the fundamentals, you see that there has got to be a way in which Americans can work together. The folks I hear from back home—and I assume it's true in every State—want us to stop the partisan bickering and want to us work together. I am thankful that our Republican friends allowed the Simpson-Bowles bipartisan budget to be considered, but for Members to only have 10 minutes of debate to consider it is going to be very difficult.

So I'm hopeful that Members, as they're sitting in their offices tonight, as they're interrupting their dinners, as they're contemplating these issues, will focus not only on the important Joint Economic Committee issues that have been raised by both sides this evening but that they will also focus on the details of the budgets they're about to vote on.

We had anticipated that the vote on the Simpson-Bowles alternative would be tomorrow morning, which is what we had been told, but an hour or so ago, they suddenly had a change of plans. We feel that we're gaining momentum, and I think that's evidenced

by the fact that most folks of the interest groups in Washington are gearing up to either support us or to oppose us, so I think that Members should weigh their decisions tonight very carefully.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a key member of the Joint Economic Committee and of the Energy and Commerce Committee, one of the most knowledgeable on health care, a physician who has delivered more than 3,000 babies, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

A lot of people have asked, if you're going to do a Republican budget, why do you even involve yourself in the President's new health care law? They've asked, Why is it necessary for the Republican budget to repeal the President's health care law and advance bipartisan solutions that take power away from the government and give it back to the people?

The Joint Economic Committee prepared a chart dealing with the Affordable Care Act some 2 years ago, and it's an involved chart. You look at it and—it needs to be right side up, of course. But do you know what? It doesn't really matter. It makes just as much sense upside down. The only reason I wanted to turn it over is because, when you look at this thing, instead of the patient being at the center of all of this, the patient is way down here at the bottom. This chart was prepared, again, 2 years ago by the committee staff of the Joint Economic Committee, and this is precisely the reason why the Affordable Care Act has to be pulled up by the roots in order for us to get any semblance of economic sanity in this country.

Ignore the fact for a moment that this thing busts the bank. Ignore the fact that this is a drain on the Federal Treasury unlike anything we've ever seen before. The bottom line is that this just does not work.

Now, I spent yesterday at the Supreme Court, and I got to hear the oral arguments before the Supreme Court. It was astonishing to hear the arguments put forward as to why we had to take over one-sixth of the economy and why we had to expand government power in a way that's really going to fundamentally redefine the relationship of the government with the American people.

The reason was, well, the uninsured cost us so much money. I've got to tell you something—that's nonsense. The uninsured, yes, may cost a little bit at the margin of the total health care system, but what's the real cost driver of health care in this country? What's the real reason that health insurance is going inexorably up and up and up? It is because the Federal Government does not pay its freight for Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP, and it is the cross-subsidization from the private sector to fill that hole by the public

sector that causes the cost of insurance to go up so much.

I was astounded that this argument was not made before the Supreme Court. I was concerned that they might be arguing from false premises. Regardless, what is the solution then to fixing this problem of the health care costs going up? We're going to put a subsidy out there for the middle class in the exchanges. Well, that will help.

Then the worst part is we're going to double Medicaid. Medicaid is the problem. Medicaid is the reason this cost is going up inexorably year over year over year. What was the President's solution? What was Speaker PELOSI's solution? Let's double Medicaid in this country, and see if that won't fix the problem. Will it fix the problem? I submit it will not.

You ask yourself, How could the law be so convoluted as shown on this graph? The reason is, if you look at the language that wrote that graph, this is not two copies of the law; this is one copy of the law in two volumes. How was it so badly done? You need do nothing more than to look at the title page of H.R. 3590 from December 24, 2009, in the Senate of the United States.

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

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

□ 1920

Mr. BURGESS. Christmas Eve, December 24, 2009, Resolved, that the bill from the House of Representatives H.R. 3590 entitled, An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time home buyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

Well, wait a minute. That doesn't sound like a health care law. How did it become a health care law? It's called an amendment. An amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the remaining 2,700 pages.

I submit to you, this thing was flawed from start to finish. It must be struck out by the roots; otherwise, fiscal sanity cannot be restored back to this country.

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FATTAH.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentlelady, and I applaud her work on the Joint Economic Committee.

I come this evening to suggest that it would, indeed, be cheaper for our country if we want to subordinate this great Nation to other nations in this world. If we want to educate less of our children, if we want to invest less in innovation, if we want to do less in terms of providing for the well-being of our country, we could try to operate on the cheap.

I don't think it's worthy of our House to consider a budget that would cut off America's global leadership position. As we see China, India, other countries,

the European Union rising to become more and more economic competitors to the United States, this debate between Democrats and Republicans is much too small for this body. We need to be thinking about our country, thinking about the future of our country and its position in the world.

No one can intellectually argue that somehow it would be better for our Nation to educate less of our children, to have less scientists or engineers or to invest less in manufacturing and innovation. So I would ask the majority this evening, after we get finished with this part of the process, that we try to come together, to think about not our party but positioning our country for future greatness.

We have a grand legacy as a Nation, and for us to come here and to say, well, the way we're going to solve this problem is we're just going to cut, cut, and cut—this is a budget that cuts trillions but doesn't get the budget in balance for the next 30 years. Really, they are using the fiscal circumstances of the country to go after programs that they never supported anyway.

This is not a worthy proposition for our House. I am prepared to support the Democratic budget. I am prepared to support Simpson-Bowles. I'm prepared to support raising additional revenue. The majority of our country believes that we should have a balanced approach, that is, we should cut programs we don't need and we should raise the revenues we do need.

We're at a 60-year low in tax rates, and the young lady who spoke on the other side said earlier that any economist will tell you that by raising taxes you will lose jobs. Well, let me tell you what the facts are:

When, under the Clinton administration we raised taxes, we invested in education, we invested in clean energy, we created close to 23 million new jobs in this country, and every sector of our society improved. Yes, the rich got richer, but every other group of Americans also did better. Those are the facts. Facts are stubborn things.

I hope that, as a Congress, we can rise to meet the needs of this great Nation.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), again, another key freshman member of the Joint Economic Committee and also a member of the Budget Committee who understands, again, what it takes to get this terribly sluggish economy back on track.

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for the opportunity.

There is so much we could talk about here tonight, and it is unfortunate we only have a few minutes to talk about each of these budgets. But one of the things that I heard the gentlelady from New York mention earlier in her presentation was that the budget that we've offered as the Republican Party is noteworthy mostly for its austerity.

I would disagree with that. I think it's noteworthy mostly for the fact that it balances. It balances. It does something the President's budget does not do. It does something that I would expect the Democrat offering later on this evening does not do. It balances.

It's a word that our colleagues across the aisle, Mr. Chairman, like to use from time to time. They want an approach that balances. I used to think that the word "balance" would actually mean that the budget would balance. They would have us believe that what it really means is they want to maybe sort of raise taxes and sort of cut spending.

The truth of the matter is, though, that every single budget that they've offered has only increased taxes and increased spending. That's true of the President's budget, which we'll be taking up later this evening. I imagine it's true of Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget, which we will be taking up later this evening.

And I think it's important to look at what would actually work. We're not the first country to go through this situation. In fact, if you look at other countries that have had debt crises like we are facing now, which you can see that some of them have managed to get out of it, and they have managed to get out of it mostly by cutting spending. In fact, a ratio of roughly seven-to-one on spending cuts versus tax increases is what actually works. And you can do better than this. You can point to other countries that have managed to save themselves without raising taxes by a single penny. You cannot point to a single country that has done it by raising taxes on even a one-to-one basis, as we'll take up tonight with Simpson-Bowles.

But again, the President's budget, the Democrat budget doesn't even come close to this. We couldn't even put it on the graph because it both increases taxes and increases spending, not even coming close to what has worked in every other developed nation that has tried to do exactly what we are trying to do with our budget tonight.

Look, I spend a lot of time back home, and I know that folks back home might be willing, under certain circumstances, to pay more taxes. They might do that, for example, if they could trust us not to waste the money. They might be willing to do that if they could trust us to actually put the money towards the debt and deficits. But we don't do that. What have we always given them, mostly from my colleagues across the aisle but also from my party in past years? New spending now and new waste now in exchange for a promise of spending reductions someplace down the road that never come.

I think it's time for us to acknowledge that our colleagues are trying to sell us a definition of the word "balance" that doesn't make any sense. It's time for us to reclaim the definition of that word and say, look, we are the

ones offering a balanced budget. We are the ones who are offering a balanced approach. We are the ones that are offering a way to pay off the debt.

I think it's a fair question to ask: The money that we borrowed yesterday, do we ever really intend to pay it back?

The Ryan budget allows us a way to do that. The GOP budget allows us a way to do that. The President's budget never moves to surplus.

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

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

Mr. MULVANEY. The President's budget never goes to surplus. There is no plan offered by the Democrats to actually pay back the money that we are borrowing.

It's time to change the word back to what it really means, which is spending less than we take in. And it's the Republican budget that offers that this evening.

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

I would like to respond to my colleague from the other side of the aisle who objected to my calling the Republican plan, which is called the Road to Prosperity—when I said that it actually should be called the Road to Austerity. On the negative side of the Republican plan, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that the Republican austerity plan will destroy 4.1 million jobs through 2014. But at the same time, the Republican budget makes tax cuts for the most fortunate few permanent, while those making over \$1 million per year will get an average tax cut of at least \$150,000, and tax breaks for Big Oil will be preserved. That's their plan.

The alternative, of course, is the Democratic budget plan, which takes a totally different approach, a balanced approach that meets the Nation's need to invest in the future while preserving Medicare and our social safety nets and supporting the firm belief that the American Dream is alive and well by investing in the future of our children and our Nation.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership tonight.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the chairman.

I want to close where the gentlelady began, which is on the economy and on jobs.

As this chart shows, when President Obama was sworn in, we were losing over 800,000 jobs a month. But because of actions taken by the President and the Congress and because of the tenac-

ity of the American people and small businesses, we were able to stop the free fall and begin to climb out of that hole.

□ 1930

We are now at 24 consecutive months of positive private sector job growth. There were close to 4 million jobs created in that period. We need to sustain that recovery, not put the brakes on it.

The Republican proposal unfortunately puts the brakes on it. I'll give you just one example. Next year they would cut our investment in transportation in their budget by 46 percent when we have about 17 percent unemployment in the construction industry. That's putting the brakes on.

We hear from our colleagues that the only way to deal with the budget deficits is to cut, cut, cut. We propose a balanced approach. We do ask that we close some of those tax loopholes. We do ask that folks making a million dollars a year go back to paying the rates that they were in the Clinton administration.

Let's see what happened in the economy back then. What this shows is during the Clinton years, 20.8 million jobs were created. After President Bush took office, they lowered the tax rates. There was a net of 653,000 jobs lost. By the way, in 2001, just before the tax cuts that disproportionately benefited the wealthy, that was the last time we balanced the budget. We balanced the budget, and we had great job growth. That's why we propose a balanced approach.

The issue here is not whether we reduce the deficit, not whether we reduce the debt. It's how. Yes, we have to make spending cuts. I hear colleagues on the Republican side coming down here and saying you can't do this all on the revenue side. We get that. But you know what? If you do it without asking the folks at the very top to pay a penny, by closing loopholes and getting rid of tax breaks, what does it mean? It means everybody else pays the consequences.

Those decisions to support the wealthy and not ask for shared responsibility come at the expense of our seniors and you end the Medicare guarantee and slash Medicaid by \$800 billion. It comes at the expense of middle-income taxpayers, because not only are you locking in the Bush tax cuts for the folks at the top, you're dropping the top rate from 35 percent to 25 percent. That's another over-\$200,000 tax break to people making a million dollars a year.

You say you're going to pay for it. You know how it's going to happen? It's going to happen by increasing taxes on middle-income Americans. That's how you're going to finance it. I've not seen a proposal. Show me a piece of paper that says it won't be taken out on middle-income taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, there's a better approach than the Republican approach. It's the balanced approach. It's the approach supported by bipartisan groups,

and it's the approach that we will propose in our amendment.

I again thank the gentelady and thank the Chairman.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

President Obama made two key promises to the American public. The first was that he would reduce the deficit by half in his first term of office. The second is that he would fix this broken economy in 3 years.

Let's take a close look at those promises, looking first at the economy. This is hard to believe—and I hope those at home are sitting down—but after all of the bailouts, after all the stimulus, after all the Cash for Clunkers, the deficit spending, the housing bailout, everything the President wished for and got in increased spending, we have fewer Americans working today than when this President took office. Think about it: there are fewer Americans working after all the President's economic policies have gone full bore. It's failed the American public in such a way that there are fewer people working today than when this President took the oath of office.

Look at the stimulus. This chart shows he promised the American public if you'll just borrow and spend nearly a trillion dollars of interest, our economy will recover. In fact, he promised right now our unemployment rate would be around 6 percent. It's far above that at nearly 8½ percent. But that doesn't tell the whole picture because so many Americans have given up hope and so many Americans don't even look for a job anymore. They've just dropped out. We have the fewest people in the workforce in almost three decades. They've just given up that much. Our unemployment rate is really nearly 16 percent. It's a little above it, as a matter of fact.

This is an unemployment crisis. The President's policies—no question, he inherited a poor economy, to say the least. His policies have failed. He's made it worse for about 23 million Americans who can't even find a full-time job these days.

If you want more of the same, stick with the President's budget, stick with the Democrats' budget. They deliver more of the same in an economy that is struggling like it hasn't since the Depression, and millions of Americans just can't find work no matter how hard they try.

The President promised he would reduce the deficit and cut it in half in his first term. He should have been able to do that. Instead, he has increased it by almost half. This is the fourth trillion-dollar deficit in a row.

He proposes to spend so that we're the largest government in American history, larger even than World War II when they dropped everything to win the war. He wants a government bigger than that and deficits that go as far as the eye can see.

Republicans believe we ought to have a choice of futures. When you look at

the debt that's being piled on America in the future, let me put that in real terms. We have two young boys, and one is in third grade and one is in seventh. They make our family a joy. I think about what all this means to them, and you may be thinking about it for your kids or your grandkids. All that red ink this President has piled up and the future of America with this debt, today a baby born in America, their fair share of the debt is about \$47,000. A baby born today owes Uncle Sam a new Lexus.

If we don't change our ways by the time they're 13, they'll owe Uncle Sam a second Lexus. By the time they're 22 when they've finished college and they're getting ready to start their life, they'll owe Uncle Sam a third Lexus.

The good news is young people don't actually buy luxury sedans for the Federal Government, but they pay the price another way. For all that debt, they pay the price in a sluggish economy, in higher taxes, in higher interest rates. So that young person starting their life after all that schooling and pursuing their dreams in America, they'll have a harder time finding jobs—there will be fewer of them—and they'll keep less in their paycheck as a result of this. That's the future if we stay the course with this President and Democrats in Congress.

Republicans believe there is a better future for America. The Republican budget does just that. It restores a healthy economy for America in a commonsense way. It gets our financial house in order. It starts limiting this out-of-control spending. It starts to take away all the waste and abuse, sunseting obsolete Agencies, stopping this wasteful spending from stem to stern in the Federal budget. It starts to tighten the Federal Government's belt and budget.

In addition to putting our financial house in order, it shrinks the size of government. It makes it affordable again for America. Not only do we balance the budget; the goal of the Republican budget is to pay off our debt.

Think about it: our goal is not to just break even again. It's to start to whittle down and pay off those huge amounts of debt that we owe to so many in this world. It tackles important issues like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. It preserves them for every generation once and for all.

Last year, America had to borrow \$142 billion from China and other foreign investors just to pay Social Security for our seniors. We know Medicare goes bankrupt in 12 years unless we act. If we don't act today, Medicare ends itself as we know it. It ends itself.

Republicans have a commonsense proposal to preserve those important programs, to make them sustainable for every generation; and we do it without raising taxes.

We know you can't take more from people and hope to grow the economy. We know that Washington ought to

tighten its belt before we ask hard-working taxpayers to tighten theirs. We know that taxing professionals and small businesses, taxing our local energy companies who manufacture here in the United States, we know that taxing companies that are creating jobs in America is the wrong way to go.

□ 1940

We're going to offer, and are offering, not just a choice of two futures; we're offering some hope to a country that despairs it will ever see a balanced budget again. We're offering hope to a country that right now has a second-rate economy and that some parts of the world make fun of, frankly. We're going to offer hope to businesses who want to compete again both in their community and around the world because today what they tell us is they're not adding jobs. With this debt hanging over us, with all the talk of new taxes and new regulation, they're not adding those jobs. Why would they?

The Republican budget makes sure that we don't balance our budget on the backs of America's small businesses. We know the problem isn't that government doesn't take more of what you earn; the problem is that the Federal Government spends too much. We offer a Path to Prosperity to America. It's the only responsible budget that will be offered to this debate. I wish I could say the Senate will take it up; but for 3 years, they've refused to give a budget to the American people.

We're going to change the trajectory of America, we're going to change the future of America, and we're going to give hope back by passing the Republican budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget. This budget makes the wrong choices. We must enact a plan to steadily reduce our deficits and debts, but we must do so in a responsible way.

This Republican budget is irresponsible. It provides tax breaks to millionaires, while ending the Medicare guarantee and shifting more costs to seniors. It slashes health insurance for the working disabled, gutting the program that provides the care they need to stay working. It shifts hundreds of billions in costs on to the States—the same States that are struggling to balance their budgets.

It transfers tens of billions in health care costs on to the backs of the frail elderly in nursing homes and parents with children. And it takes away the guarantee of affordable health coverage—a right that everyone should enjoy—and leaves millions more uninsured.

My Republican colleagues fail to understand that simply cutting the Federal commitment to health care, as they propose, doesn't make the need go away—it just shifts the problem somewhere else. Rather than responsibly address the issue of rising health care costs as the Democrats did in the Affordable Care Act—House Republicans would repeal that bill and leave American families without any protections from insurance company abuses.

The Republican budget doesn't fix our health care problems. To pay for tax breaks for millionaires, it cuts hundreds of billions of



dollars from Medicare and Medicaid and shifts costs to seniors . . . to people with disabilities . . . and to families with children.

Under the Republican budget, the Medicaid program would be gutted. Their budget cuts more than \$1.7 trillion out of the program over the next ten years and turns it into a block grant.

This is deeply misguided. Medicaid serves the poorest children, pregnant women, elderly in nursing homes, and those needing services to live in the community and more. By 2050, when the baby boom generation will be retired and in need of long term care, Medicaid would be cut 75 percent according to the Congressional Budget Office. It's a great talking point if you want to appeal to the Tea Party, but a horrible policy if you really care about America's health.

And of course, every Federal dollar cut from Medicaid means almost \$2 cut from the State economy. As a result, the Republican plan would ultimately sap nearly \$3.4 trillion in health care spending out of state and local economies, causing a significant loss in health care jobs and investments.

The Republican budget makes severe cuts to Medicare, ending the program as we know it. For nearly five decades, Medicare has provided a lifeline for tens of millions of seniors and people with disabilities. Seniors rely on Medicare's affordability, and they depend on its guaranteed benefits. They cherish their ability to pick their own doctors, and they know that their doctors will treat them without interference from insurance bureaucrats. But the Republican plan would undo these protections. They would turn Medicare into a voucher that is virtually guaranteed to not keep pace with rising health care costs—leaving seniors holding the bag.

The adverse impacts on seniors would be immediate. The Republican plan would repeal access to free preventive services, increase prices for prescription drugs in the donut hole, and undo the other improvements to Medicare that were part of the Affordable Care Act.

The proposed cuts wouldn't just hurt Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP. This budget slashes the level of discretionary spending for many critical health programs, including prevention and wellness, health professions training, community health centers, biomedical research, and oversight of food, drugs and medical devices.

These programs—and many others—would face severe cuts if the limit for appropriated programs is reduced below the level agreed to—on a bipartisan basis—less than a year ago.

I want to be clear. This isn't a proposal that would affect people years from now. It will have very real effects immediately. This budget would irreparably harm the basic fabric of our Nation's health care system. It is bad medicine. There is a better way to rein in our deficit. I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican plan.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose the Republican Budget. This budget is another giveaway to the wealthy, balanced on the backs of middle class families, the elderly, and the poor.

The Republican's budget would reduce spending to support Medicare program management by \$207 million in 2013. These cuts hinder the ability to keep pace with growing Medicare and Medicaid enrollment. These cuts

would restrict patient access to care and delay payments to providers.

Under the GOP Budget, 9.6 million students would see their Pell Grants cut in 2012. Their budget would also result in \$430 million in cuts to the Head Start program, with 60,000 low-income children losing access to early childhood education.

The GOP budget would also cut \$350 million from nutritional assistance for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). This would cut off funding for 700,000 women and children from receiving food necessary for healthy child development.

This ill-conceived budget would cut funds for Social Security by 5.4 percent in 2013 and 19 percent in future years, reducing vital services for our Nation's seniors. This budget ends the Medicare guarantee and increases costs for seniors—replacing Medicare's guarantee of health security with a voucher that shifts higher and higher costs onto seniors and the disabled over time. It cuts Medicaid by a third, while turning it into a block grant.

These are the priorities of the Republican majority in the House, Mr. Chair. The Republicans' FY2013 Budget favors tax cuts for the wealthy over the needs of children and seniors. The corporate tax cuts alone would cost \$1 trillion in lost Federal revenue over the next decade. The Republican leadership's budget is a giveaway to the wealthiest Americans, who would receive an average tax cut of at least \$150,000, while inevitably forcing drastic cuts on those most in need.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican Fiscal Year 2013 Budget. Budgets are statements of priorities. Unfortunately, this budget does not reflect the priorities of my constituents and the American people: bolstering a strong middle class, investing in job creation, and ensuring a secure retirement.

The American middle class is the bedrock of our society. But the Republican Budget fails to recognize this. It gives the bulk of its \$4.6 trillion in tax cuts to wealthy Americans. It cuts \$166 billion from Pell Grants and federal student loans, effectively telling students to think twice about a college education. And it puts job creation on hold by cutting \$31 billion from transportation and infrastructure investment in the next fiscal year.

The Republican Budget also cuts \$11 billion from science and medical research by 2014. The two largest employers in my district are Stony Brook University and Brookhaven National Lab. When you factor in the additional \$1 trillion in unspecified non-defense discretionary cuts over 10 years, reductions like these jeopardize the economic recovery and stifle the advances that can make the United States a competitive force in a global economy. And yet, the Republican Budget does not ask those who have benefited from investments of this type made in the past to shoulder any responsibility in resolving our fiscal issues.

After decades of hard work and sacrifice by our Nation's seniors, the Republican Budget replaces Medicare's health coverage guarantee with a voucher to purchase traditional Medicare coverage or a private insurance plan. If one scrutinizes this proposal, they will discover the voucher will very likely fail to keep pace with medical inflation, thereby threatening seniors' financial security by forcing them to bear the bulk of their medical

costs and even leaving some retirees without health insurance as the Medicare eligibility age is raised.

The Republican Budget also makes drastic cuts to Medicaid, jeopardizing the ability of seniors to access nursing home care and threatening the health coverage Americans with meager incomes rely on.

Mr. Chair, it is important that this Congress refocus our efforts on bolstering the middle class, investing in job creation, and ensuring a secure retirement. That is how we will build an economy to last and make a better future in America for our children. The Republican Budget fails at this, and I urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution.

Mrs. CAPPAS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the Majority's misguided budget.

Forty-seven years ago, when seniors were the most uninsured group in our nation, we made a promise that their health care would be guaranteed.

Because of that promise, tens of millions of older Americans have been assured of quality, affordable health care and a life of dignity.

Because of that promise, tens of millions of Americans have avoided bankruptcy and upended lives trying to find a way to ensure they or their aging parents receive the medical care they need and deserve.

But the Majority's budget seeks to break that promise by ending Medicare as we know it.

There are a host of problems with this proposal:

Instead of a guarantee of health care seniors would get a fixed amount voucher to help them partially pay for an insurance policy, assuming they can find one.

And given that the Majority also seeks to repeal the law that outlaws preexisting condition exclusions, as well as annual and lifetime coverage limits, there is no guarantee a senior would be able to find a plan, much less an affordable one.

This voucher would be for a fixed amount, meaning it would be worth less and less with each passing year.

In California, this would mean seniors' out of pocket costs would rise by at least \$6,000 each year.

The bill would also raise Medicare's eligibility age, delaying the promise of a sound retirement for millions of working Americans.

This would mean over 5 million Californians would face the struggle of finding and paying for health care for 2 more years before they even qualify for the limited promise of care of the Majority's voucher program.

In addition to ending Medicare, the Ryan budget would whack away at the Medicaid program, which provides long term care for indigent seniors and the disabled.

Medicaid funding would drop and the responsibilities would be pushed onto the states, where seniors and persons with disabilities would have no assurances of coverage.

Anyone who has seen what has happened to state budgets across the country over the last few years should be under no illusions that hard pressed states won't cut Medicaid funding in tough times—they are doing it today!

Mr. Chair, my colleagues promoting this plan to end Medicare and slash Medicaid have argued that it's really the only choice we have.

They will argue that health care costs are bankrupting our nation and we simply have to

make these changes in order to bring down our deficit to manageable levels.

And they will argue that these changes don't affect seniors today, only those off in some distant future.

None of those arguments hold water.

First, we do need to address our deficit and that means getting health care costs under control.

But their plan doesn't bring down health care costs—it just shifts those costs onto the backs of our nation's seniors.

Second, it is stunning that their plan again puts the onus for deficit reduction completely on seniors and working Americans, while providing huge tax breaks for the wealthy and big corporations.

Under this budget, no sacrifice is too large to ask of our nation's seniors and any sacrifice is too much to ask of our nation's most well off.

Third, this plan will affect today's seniors.

For example, it repeals important benefits—like access to free preventive screenings and annual wellness physicals—that seniors are already enjoying under Obamacare.

These benefits would be taken away from almost 60,000 seniors in my district.

The Ryan plan would also reopen the infamous “donut hole,” immediately increasing annual prescription drug costs for millions of seniors.

This would affect over 6,000 seniors in my district immediately and cost them hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars each and every year.

And finally, the Ryan plan would weaken Medicare as the voucher program draws off healthier seniors and leaves behind the oldest and sickest, thereby undercutting the financial stability of the program.

I can already hear the calls that would come saying we just can't afford traditional Medicare.

Adopting this plan will cause untold harm to our nations' seniors and to the millions and millions of American families who today rely on Medicare for the promise of quality, affordable health care.

We made a promise—a promise that is working for millions of American seniors and their families.

We cannot break that promise.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 112, the budget resolution offered by my colleague Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin, which cuts federal spending, faces our nation's debt crisis head on, and spurs economic recovery and job creation.

When President Obama was running for President four years ago, he promised to cut the deficit in half by the end of his term. Instead, his spending policies have left the American people with our nation's first, second, third and fourth year of trillion-plus dollar deficits—contributing more to the national debt than the 40 previous Presidents combined.

Unfortunately, the budget request that President Obama submitted to Congress last month is more of the same failed policies. It calls for spending increases to record levels, tax hikes on families and small businesses and still it adds more to our nation's debt for future generations to pay off.

President Obama's plan passes this compounding debt on to our children and

grandchildren instead of making the difficult decisions necessary to protect our country's future. But at least he has a plan. The Senate has failed to even pass a budget in three years.

Chairman Ryan's proposal offers a real alternative to these failed policies. H. Res. 112 cuts federal spending by \$5 trillion dollars. It takes on the true drivers of our debt—entitlement spending that takes up more than 60 percent of the federal budget—while strengthening Medicare and Medicaid so that these programs will continue to be available for future generations.

It reduces the size of the federal government to the historic average of 20 percent of the economy by 2015—allowing the private sector to grow and create jobs.

It reforms our broken tax code to spur job creation and economic opportunity by lowering tax rates, closing loopholes, and putting hard-working taxpayers ahead of special interests.

And it places our country on a path to pay off our national debt in as few as seven years. Americans need real jobs, real solutions, and real results—not more budget tricks or accounting gimmicks.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me creating an efficient, effective government that spends less and serves better, by supporting the Ryan budget resolution.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, as I have said before, the federal budget is a moral document. It reflects, in dollars and cents, our national priorities. My priorities as a member of this body are supporting middle class families, helping to foster job creation, and promoting education, research and innovation that will help our economy grow over the long-term.

Unfortunately, for the second year in a row, the Republican budget resolution before us today fails to meet these goals and moves us in the wrong direction. At a time when economic inequality has risen to its highest level in decades, according to the Census Bureau, and after more than a decade of stagnant wages for middle-class Americans, we need a budget that strengthens our middle class, not weakens it.

And, once again, for the second year in a row, Republicans want to end the promise of Medicare to our seniors. Instead, seniors would receive a voucher to buy either private insurance or traditional Medicare—but what's so egregious about this proposal is that the voucher will fail to keep pace with projected health care costs over time. This budget puts insurance companies in charge of seniors' health. Our seniors would be forced to pay thousands more out of their own pockets on premiums for a plan that provides the same benefits seniors on Medicare are currently receiving. What if they don't have those extra thousands? In my home State of New Jersey, for example, the Republican budget will increase seniors out of pocket expenses by nearly \$6,000. Moreover, this plan reopens the “donut hole” for seniors' prescription drug costs, by \$2.2 billion this year and \$44 billion by the end of the decade. More than 1 million New Jersey seniors will be forced to pay more for preventive services this year if this plan is enacted—services that are currently covered by Medicare, including mammograms, colonoscopies, and annual physicals.

This budget plan abandons investments in research and innovation—exactly the kind of investment we need to grow and sustain our

economy over the long-term. This budget plan is a direct assault on Medicaid—it slashes \$810 billion over 10 years. It turns Medicaid into a block grant and leaves it to already cash-strapped States to decide what to do next.

This budget plan cuts education funding on all levels—from pre-K through college—by \$166 billion over the next decade. My home State of New Jersey, for example, will lose \$8.4 million this year for Head Start—this will eliminate more than 1,000 enrollment slots for underserved children. Another 3,100 slots would be eliminated in Fiscal Year 2014. More than 20,000 New Jersey students would be negatively impacted by cuts to Title I. And for college-bound students, this plan freezes the maximum Pell Grant level and takes no action to prevent a doubling of interest rates on student loans starting this summer. We should be investing in education, not gutting it.

This budget cuts highway funding by 25 percent, weakening our ability to support our economic recovery and putting thousands of jobs at risk. This budget slashes food stamps by \$133.5 billion over 10 years during a time when millions of Americans are still struggling to make ends meet.

While this budget all but dissolves the safety net, it maintains the costly tax breaks for corporations and the wealthy. How can we justify billions of dollars in tax breaks to the “Big 5” oil companies—which made more than \$1 trillion in profits over the past decade—while tens of millions of Americans are still looking for work?

Despite all of these cuts, this budget resolution still fails to balance the budget over the next decade.

Getting our Nation's fiscal house in order is a task my colleagues and I take seriously. Of course, we always should be looking to remove wasteful spending and ineffective programs. I have supported, and will continue to support, thoughtful budget cuts that reduce the deficit by eliminating unnecessary spending and costly tax giveaways to industries reaping enormous profits. At the same time, though, we must also preserve investments in infrastructure, science, and education, along with safety net programs that assist the most vulnerable among us in obtaining housing, health care, and food. The budget before us today fails to strike this essential balance.

There are better ways, and I will be supporting alternative approaches that take a more balanced approach to our Nation's fiscal challenges. They protect the most vulnerable members of our society while making the investments in research, education, and innovation that are absolutely critical to sustaining our economic recovery. These alternatives invest \$50 billion to fund jobs that address our urgent transportation needs. They include \$5 billion to help keep cops on the beat and firefighters on the job. They protect Social Security from privatization and promote tax relief for working families. They invest in research and development and science education. And, at the end of the day, these alternatives achieve a balanced budget in 10 years.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget resolution and support one of these viable alternatives.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 112

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

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.**

(a) **DECLARATION.**—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2013 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.  
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

**TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND DIRECTIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET**

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.  
Sec. 202. Directive to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to replace the sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011.

**TITLE III—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2030, 2040, AND 2050**

Sec. 301. Policy statement on long-term budgeting.

**TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS**

Sec. 401. Reserve fund for the repeal of the 2010 health care laws.  
Sec. 402. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the sustainable growth rate of the Medicare program.  
Sec. 403. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.  
Sec. 404. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for rural counties and schools.  
Sec. 405. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation.

**TITLE V—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT**

Sec. 501. Limitation on advance appropriations.  
Sec. 502. Concepts and definitions.  
Sec. 503. Adjustments of aggregates and allocations for legislation.  
Sec. 504. Limitation on long-term spending.  
Sec. 505. Budgetary treatment of certain transactions.  
Sec. 506. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.  
Sec. 507. Congressional Budget Office estimates.  
Sec. 508. Budget rule relating to transfers from the general fund of the treasury to the highway trust fund that increase public indebtedness.  
Sec. 509. Separate allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.  
Sec. 510. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

**TITLE VI—POLICY**

Sec. 601. Policy Statement on Medicare.  
Sec. 602. Policy Statement on Social Security.  
Sec. 603. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.  
Sec. 604. Recommendations for the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal programs.

**TITLE VII—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS**

Sec. 701. Sense of the House regarding the importance of child support enforcement.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,058,604,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,248,773,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: \$2,459,718,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$2,627,541,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$2,770,342,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$2,891,985,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,021,132,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,173,642,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,332,602,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,498,448,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: -\$234,735,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: -\$302,411,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: -\$356,566,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: -\$388,565,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: -\$423,997,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: -\$460,304,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: -\$497,440,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: -\$534,378,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: -\$574,350,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: -\$617,033,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,793,848,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,681,566,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: \$2,756,471,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$2,888,570,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$2,998,681,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,117,133,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,290,908,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,455,514,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,570,712,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,780,807,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,891,589,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,769,702,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: \$2,784,233,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$2,892,523,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$2,977,372,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,080,794,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,248,524,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,398,470,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,531,790,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,748,801,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: -\$832,985,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: -\$520,930,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: -\$324,515,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: -\$264,982,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: -\$207,030,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: -\$188,810,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: -\$227,392,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: -\$224,828,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: -\$199,189,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: -\$250,353,000,000.

(5) **DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$17,072,810,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$17,769,762,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: \$18,277,348,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$18,752,806,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$19,216,661,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$19,676,545,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$20,168,534,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$20,657,588,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$21,121,620,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$21,627,396,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$12,261,337,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$12,860,706,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: \$13,260,430,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$13,597,083,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$13,874,203,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$14,125,515,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$14,417,373,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$14,717,285,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$15,005,091,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$15,363,610,000,000.

**SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 for each major functional category are:

- (1) **National Defense (050):**  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$562,166,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$621,469,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$574,807,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$589,720,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$588,501,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$586,446,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$602,958,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$599,658,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$618,519,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$607,874,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$635,241,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$617,648,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$653,094,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$639,165,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$671,528,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$656,950,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$690,261,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$675,190,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$709,450,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$699,316,000,000.
- (2) **International Affairs (150):**  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,128,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,999,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,113,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,758,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,271,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,707,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,082,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,041,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,446,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,529,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$42,366,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,777,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,303,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,780,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,294,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,774,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,329,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,737,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,649,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$47,872,000,000.
- (3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,001,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,204,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,154,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$28,535,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,633,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$28,591,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,176,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,006,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,759,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,526,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,412,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,127,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,066,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,719,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,747,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,377,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,454,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,973,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,173,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,680,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,025,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,407,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,670,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,220,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$952,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,375,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$990,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,128,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$960,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,832,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$960,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,903,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,017,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,103,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$975,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$863,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,130,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,221,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,274,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,882,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,554,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,144,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,181,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,058,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,868,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,832,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,848,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,756,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,140,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,245,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,981,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,845,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,132,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,707,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,338,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,178,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,046,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,666,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,691,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,611,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,145,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,113,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,395,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,107,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,142,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,761,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,962,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,571,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,291,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,849,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,556,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,152,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,045,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,667,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,543,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,154,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,571,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,187,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$7,095,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,151,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$1,455,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$12,070,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$711,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,591,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,675,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$12,166,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,135,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,195,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,515,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$10,525,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,778,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$15,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,491,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$14,115,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,206,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,446,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,311,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,533,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,139,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,729,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,829,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$84,541,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,602,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$77,294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,512,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$79,831,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,561,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$80,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,640,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$81,412,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$81,636,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$81,348,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,165,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$84,201,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,486,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$79,090,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$93,104,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$91,180,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,047,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,732,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,307,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16,886,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,389,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,927,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,415,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,647,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,427,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,848,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,435,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,044,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,410,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,673,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,501,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,691,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,604,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,805,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,726,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,997,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,626,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$78,335,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,151,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$60,269,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,904,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,931,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,626,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$71,719,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,630,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$78,652,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,076,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$84,121,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,738,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$87,647,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,329,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$89,911,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,305,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$91,272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,458,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$92,408,000,000.

(11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,596,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$365,614,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$358,322,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$362,556,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$365,058,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$369,455,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$376,993,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$376,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$393,219,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$394,754,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$404,124,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$406,143,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$419,428,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$417,557,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$446,427,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$433,169,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$449,759,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$446,710,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$471,657,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$468,212,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$510,144,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$510,056,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$532,701,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$532,004,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$554,995,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$554,555,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$601,515,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$601,281,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$615,386,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$614,665,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$634,539,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$634,089,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$692,173,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$691,921,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$737,284,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$736,531,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$784,647,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$784,158,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$866,591,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$866,448,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$517,076,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$516,848,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$475,714,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$474,603,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$472,820,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$471,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$453,169,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$455,843,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$450,453,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$448,404,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$453,608,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$447,336,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$469,525,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$467,922,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$481,660,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$480,331,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$494,347,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$493,341,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$511,458,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$515,356,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$53,216,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$53,296,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$31,892,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,002,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$35,135,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$35,210,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$38,953,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$38,991,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$43,140,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,140,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$47,590,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,590,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$52,429,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$52,429,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$57,425,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,425,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$62,604,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$62,604,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$68,079,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$68,079,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$134,635,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$135,222,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$137,004,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$137,230,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$139,862,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$139,774,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$148,556,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$148,044,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$147,499,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$146,846,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$146,341,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$145,634,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$156,034,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$155,291,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$160,511,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$159,760,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$165,065,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$164,272,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$175,431,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$174,607,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$54,277,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,623,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$51,201,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$54,168,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$52,499,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$54,276,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$55,868,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,929,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$55,704,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,547,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$57,407,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$60,053,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$59,263,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$60,828,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$61,091,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$62,003,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$63,137,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$64,045,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$68,922,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,817,000,000.
- (17) General Government (800):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$23,155,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,051,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, 23,415,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,042,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$23,067,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,435,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$22,814,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$22,961,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$23,149,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,170,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$23,734,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,699,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$24,304,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,897,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$24,751,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,365,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$25,358,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,896,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$25,881,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,449,000,000.
- (18) Net Interest (900):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$344,415,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$344,415,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$356,352,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$356,352,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$391,014,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$391,014,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$447,356,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$447,356,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$506,642,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$506,642,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$565,014,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$565,014,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$618,628,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$618,628,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$664,102,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$664,102,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$696,908,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$696,908,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$730,179,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$730,179,000,000.
- (19) Allowances (920):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$22,607,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$859,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$87,771,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$50,682,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$90,146,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$80,035,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$94,030,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$93,943,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$96,411,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$101,325,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$101,394,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$106,211,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$106,767,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$111,171,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$113,223,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$117,350,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$120,493,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$123,784,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$121,281,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$125,413,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
- Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, -\$84,736,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$84,736,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, -\$78,697,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$78,697,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, -\$84,531,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$84,531,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, -\$86,226,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$86,226,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, -\$94,507,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$94,507,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, -\$98,066,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$98,066,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, -\$104,845,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$104,845,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, -\$103,878,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$103,878,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, -\$108,168,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$108,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, -\$110,655,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$110,655,000,000.

(2) Overseas Contingency Operations/Glob-  
al War on Terrorism:

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$96,725,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$51,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$54,010,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$48,034,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,422,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,284,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,912,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,770,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,741,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,727,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,727,000,000.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND DIREC- TIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

### SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF SPENDING REDUCTION.—Not later than April 27, 2012, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations, such committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$8,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by \$19,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by \$33,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its juris-

dition sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$3,750,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by \$28,430,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by \$96,760,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

(3) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$3,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by \$16,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by \$29,800,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

(4) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by \$11,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by \$39,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

(5) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$2,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by \$30,100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by \$78,900,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

(6) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,200,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 and 2013; by \$23,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017; and by \$53,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2022.

### SEC. 202. DIRECTIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE HOUSE OF REP- RESENTATIVES TO REPLACE THE SE- QUESTER ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.

(a) SUBMISSION.—In the House, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a bill carrying out the directions set forth in subsection (b).

(b) DIRECTIONS.—The bill referred to in subsection (a) shall include the following provisions:

(1) REPLACING THE SEQUESTER ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.—The language shall amend section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to replace the sequester established under that section consistent with this concurrent resolution.

(2) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—The bill referred to in subsection (a) shall include language making its application contingent upon the enactment of the reconciliation bill referred to in section 201.

### TITLE III—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2030, 2040, AND 2050

#### SEC. 301. POLICY STATEMENT ON LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

The following are the recommended budget levels for each of fiscal years 2030, 2040, and 2050 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—The appropriate levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 19 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 19 percent.

Fiscal year 2050: 19 percent.

(2) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 20.25 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 18.75 percent.

Fiscal year 2050: 16 percent.

(3) DEFICITS.—The appropriate amounts of deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 1.25 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: -.25 percent.

Fiscal year 2050: -3 percent.

(4) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 53 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 38 percent.

Fiscal year 2050: 10 percent.

## TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

### SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

### SEC. 402. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act, if such measure would not increase the deficit in the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

### SEC. 403. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

### SEC. 404. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that makes changes to the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-565) or makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation would not increase the deficit or direct spending for fiscal year 2013, the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2017, or the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

### SEC. 405. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

## TITLE V—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

### SEC. 501. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRI- ATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.



(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts referred to in subsection (c)(1) or identified in the report to accompany this resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2014, the aggregate amount of advance appropriation shall not exceed—

(1) \$54,462,000,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—

- (A) Medical Services;
- (B) Medical Support and Compliance; and
- (C) Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(2) \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all other programs.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014.

#### SEC. 502. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing for a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any appropriate levels and allocations in this resolution accordingly.

#### SEC. 503. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS FOR LEGISLATION.

(a) ENFORCEMENT.—For purposes of enforcing this resolution, the revenue levels shall be those set forth in the March 2012 Congressional Budget Office baseline. The total amount of adjustments made under subsection (b) may not cause revenue levels to be below the levels set forth in paragraph (1)(A) of section 101 for fiscal year 2013 and for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—(1) The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations and aggregates of this concurrent resolution for—

(A) the budgetary effects of measures extending the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001;

(B) the budgetary effects of measures extending the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003;

(C) the budgetary effects of measures that adjust the Alternative Minimum Tax exemption amounts to prevent a larger number of taxpayers as compared with tax year 2008 from being subject to the Alternative Minimum Tax or of allowing the use of non-refundable personal credits against the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(D) the budgetary effects of extending the estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer tax provisions of title III of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010;

(E) the budgetary effects of measures providing a 20 percent deduction in income to small businesses;

(F) the budgetary effects of measures implementing trade agreements;

(G) the budgetary effects of provisions repealing the tax increases set forth in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010;

(H) the budgetary effects of provisions reforming the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(I) the budgetary effects of measures reforming the tax code and lowering tax rates.

(2) A measure does not qualify for adjustments under paragraph (1)(H) if it—

(A) increases the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022; or

(B) increases revenues over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022, other than by—

(i) repealing or modifying the individual mandate (codified as section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); or

(ii) modifying the subsidies to purchase health insurance (codified as section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

(c) OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—If a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2013 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(d) DETERMINATIONS.—For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution on the budget in the House, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2013 and the period of fiscal years 2013 through fiscal year 2022 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust the applicable levels of this resolution.

#### SEC. 504. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, if the provisions of such measure have the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of \$5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the first four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning with fiscal year 2023.

#### SEC. 505. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust allocations and aggregates for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, but does not cause a net in-

crease in the deficit for fiscal year 2013 and the period of fiscal years 2013 to 2022.

#### SEC. 506. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this resolution.

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—Any legislation for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments in the allocations or aggregates of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 504.

#### SEC. 507. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—

(1) REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate prepared for a measure under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, “credit reform”, as a supplement to such estimate of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

(b) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The Congressional Budget Office shall estimate the change in net income to the National Flood Insurance Program by this Act if such income is included in a reconciliation bill provided for in section 201, as if such income were deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

#### SEC. 508. BUDGET RULE RELATING TO TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND THAT INCREASE PUBLIC INDEBTEDNESS.

For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the Rules of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, or any Act that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

#### SEC. 509. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for overseas contingency operations and the global war on terrorism. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2013. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for overseas contingency operations

and the global war on terrorism under section 302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act does not apply to such separate allocation. The Committee on Appropriations may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under section 302(b) of such Act. Spending that counts toward the allocation established by this section shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, for purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2013, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### SEC. 510. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—The following provisions of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) shall no longer have force or effect:

(1) Section 3(e) relating to advance appropriations.

(2) Section 3(f) relating to the treatment of off-budget administrative expenses.

#### TITLE VI—POLICY

##### SEC. 601. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in and near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2022 and unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.3 percent per year, and under the Congressional Budget Office's alternative fiscal scenario, direct spending on Medicare is projected to reach 7 percent of GDP by 2035 and 14 percent of GDP by 2085.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in and near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits and offer future beneficiaries the same health care options available to Members of Congress.

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in and near retirement, without changes.

(2) For future generations, when they reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs.

(3) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(4) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

##### SEC. 602. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the "three-legged stool" of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2016, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2036, according to the Social Security Trustees Report the combined Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted, and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the trust funds in 2036, benefits will be cut 23 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The current recession has exacerbated the crisis to Social Security. The Congressional Budget Office continues to project permanent cash deficits.

(4) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower-income Americans' retirement security.

(5) Americans deserve action by their elected officials on Social Security reform. It is critical that the Congress and the administration work together in a bipartisan fashion to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to make Social Security permanently solvent. This resolution assumes reform of a current law trigger, such that—

(1)(A) if in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund in its annual Trustees' Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees should, not later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year; and

(B) such recommendations provided to the President should be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees;

(2)(A) not later than December 1 of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submits its recommendations, the President shall promptly submit imple-

menting legislation to both Houses of Congress, including recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year; and

(B) the Majority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader of the House should introduce such legislation upon receipt;

(3) within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction to which the legislation has been referred should report such legislation, which should be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures; and

(4) legislation submitted by the President should—

(A) protect those in and near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who rely on Social Security, including survivors and those with disabilities;

(C) improve fairness for participants; and

(D) reduce the burden on, and provide certainty for, future generations.

##### SEC. 603. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies will hold \$698 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2013.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending made available by Congress that remain available for expenditure beyond the fiscal year for which they are provided.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from unneeded balances of funds.

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—Congressional committees shall through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of the Federal Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans' affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

##### SEC. 604. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs "could potentially save tens of billions of dollars".

(3) The Rules of the House of Representatives require each standing committee to hold at least one hearing every four months on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(4) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.**—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated. Such recommendations shall be made publicly available.

**TITLE VII—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS**

**SEC. 701. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.**

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) additional legislative action is needed to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty; and

(2) when 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112–423.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY**

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112–423.

Mr. MULVANEY. I rise to claim time in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2022:

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

- (A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:
- Fiscal year 2013: \$2,065,796,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014: \$2,373,500,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015: \$2,640,705,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016: \$2,835,767,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2017: \$2,996,291,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$3,123,888,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,262,770,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$3,434,833,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$3,606,140,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$3,782,963,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 2013: -\$227,543,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014: -\$177,683,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015: -\$175,579,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016: -\$180,339,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: -\$198,048,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: -\$228,401,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: -\$255,802,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: -\$273,187,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: -\$300,812,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: -\$332,518,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2013: \$2,981,518,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014: \$3,036,509,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015: \$3,183,712,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016: \$3,388,753,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$3,545,013,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$3,713,179,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,903,527,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$4,116,158,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$4,299,370,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$4,504,615,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2013: \$3,078,221,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014: \$3,098,134,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015: \$3,197,095,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016: \$3,385,620,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$3,506,849,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$3,653,640,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,875,989,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$4,070,744,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$4,264,323,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$4,472,110,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2013: -\$1,012,425,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014: -\$724,634,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015: -\$556,390,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016: -\$549,853,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: -\$510,558,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: -\$529,752,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: -\$613,219,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: -\$635,911,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: -\$658,183,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: -\$689,147,000,000.

(5) **DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2013: \$17,314,780,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014: \$18,251,238,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015: \$19,050,579,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016: \$19,855,892,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$20,624,430,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$21,419,275,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$22,288,175,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$23,197,859,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$24,143,484,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$25,123,397,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2013: \$12,517,072,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014: \$13,330,583,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015: \$13,981,546,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016: \$14,618,296,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$15,215,406,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$15,824,696,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$16,518,942,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$17,245,767,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$18,007,496,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$18,818,701,000,000.

**SEC. 2. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget author-

ity and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 for each major functional category are:

- (1) National Defense (050):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$559,695,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$623,942,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$566,879,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$583,766,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$579,817,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$573,914,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$590,329,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$583,897,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$602,399,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$589,346,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$615,052,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$596,095,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$628,979,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$613,977,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$642,907,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$628,324,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$656,291,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$641,663,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$673,651,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$662,113,000,000.
- (2) International Affairs (150):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$50,338,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$52,377,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$49,241,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$51,977,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$47,643,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$50,994,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$47,666,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$51,503,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$50,315,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$52,115,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$52,464,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$52,434,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$53,679,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$51,545,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$54,906,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$51,701,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$56,141,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$52,805,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$57,909,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$54,168,000,000.
- (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$29,556,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,840,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$30,091,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,964,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$30,654,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,335,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$31,244,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,890,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$31,920,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,523,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$32,623,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,200,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$33,357,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,859,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,089,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,576,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,824,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,212,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,667,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,996,000,000.  
 (4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,925,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,042,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,434,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,079,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,072,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,335,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,929,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,653,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,244,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,594,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,215,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,534,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,348,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,545,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,207,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,507,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,133,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,618,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,174,000,000.  
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,430,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,460,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,447,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,559,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,804,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,130,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,608,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,030,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,727,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,879,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,121,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,015,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,011,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,972,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,307,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,148,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,558,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,715,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,419,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,362,000,000.  
 (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,834,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,722,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,804,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,373,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,079,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,842,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,488,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,059,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,025,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,578,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,448,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,945,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,112,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,656,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,524,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,098,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,155,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,718,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,965,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,538,000,000.  
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,968,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,769,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,357,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,293,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,366,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,783,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,145,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,537,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,758,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,533,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,253,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,945,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,773,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$8,348,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,613,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,240,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,563,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$474,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,101,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,275,000,000.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,386,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$102,364,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$101,243,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$105,524,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$107,661,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$104,782,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$114,471,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$107,766,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$120,819,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$112,009,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$127,262,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$115,782,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,354,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$113,424,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,123,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$107,580,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,934,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$105,310,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,877,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$104,566,000,000.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,509,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,695,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,125,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$26,292,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,339,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,812,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,573,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,110,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,843,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16,523,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,121,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,301,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,410,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,848,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,705,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,046,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,999,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,583,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,343,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,958,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,028,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$122,483,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,194,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$107,191,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,938,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$101,331,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,960,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$92,781,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,143,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$92,808,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$99,647,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$98,392,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$103,464,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$102,181,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$104,120,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$104,073,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$105,157,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$105,085,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$106,690,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$106,209,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$372,835,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$375,955,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$473,879,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$464,352,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$542,160,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$538,003,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$590,904,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$594,729,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$626,658,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$629,150,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$664,032,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$662,930,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$707,099,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$706,061,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$761,258,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$749,868,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$800,618,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$799,481,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$851,615,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$849,973,000,000.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$525,876,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$525,716,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:

- (A) New budget authority, \$553,675,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$552,981,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$570,815,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$570,407,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$617,954,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$617,756,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$633,488,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$632,808,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$653,683,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$653,276,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$715,518,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$715,315,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$763,016,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$762,316,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$810,664,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$810,230,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$885,513,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$885,426,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$545,622,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$542,562,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$537,970,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$534,946,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$538,691,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$533,883,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$546,156,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$545,811,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$544,282,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$539,685,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$546,446,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$538,021,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$561,786,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$558,295,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$573,480,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$570,338,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$586,855,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$583,571,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$604,517,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$605,786,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$53,416,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$53,496,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$31,892,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,002,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$35,135,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$35,210,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$38,953,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$38,991,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$43,140,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,140,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$47,590,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,590,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$52,429,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$52,429,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$57,425,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,425,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$62,604,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$62,604,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$68,079,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$68,079,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$135,651,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$135,289,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$136,996,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$137,447,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$139,827,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$139,964,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$148,005,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$147,807,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$146,445,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$146,074,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$144,620,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$143,993,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$153,568,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$152,909,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$157,302,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$156,643,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$161,056,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$160,370,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$170,839,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$170,088,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$53,772,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$58,831,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$55,029,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,404,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$55,792,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,371,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$58,542,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$58,214,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$57,889,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,538,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$58,992,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$60,408,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$60,204,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$60,504,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$61,406,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$61,011,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$62,772,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$62,348,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$67,988,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$67,496,000,000.
- (17) General Government (800):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$25,808,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,408,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$27,256,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,706,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$29,196,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,376,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$31,275,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,459,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$33,433,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,300,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$35,613,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$35,417,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$37,969,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$37,513,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$40,338,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$39,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$42,762,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$42,226,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$45,219,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$44,669,000,000.
- (18) Net Interest (900):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$347,234,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$347,234,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$360,341,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$360,341,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$400,112,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$400,112,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$466,938,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$466,938,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$539,743,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$539,743,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$614,473,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$614,473,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$686,716,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$686,716,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$751,343,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$751,343,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$804,643,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$804,643,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$858,474,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$848,474,000,000.
- (19) Allowances (920):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$19,353,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$10,338,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$20,761,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$17,171,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$20,286,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$18,947,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$19,802,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$19,342,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$19,873,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$19,674,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$20,905,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$20,297,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$26,857,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$23,804,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$18,232,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$20,916,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$60,069,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$61,008,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$79,096,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$79,095,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$80,150,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$80,149,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$85,787,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$85,786,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$87,260,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$87,259,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$91,024,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$91,023,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$94,141,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$94,140,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$100,689,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$100,688,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, -\$99,551,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$99,550,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, -\$103,660,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$103,659,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, -\$105,959,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$105,959,000,000.

(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism:

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$96,725,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$51,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$54,010,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,034,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,422,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,284,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,912,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,770,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,741,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,727,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,727,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it occurred to me during the budget debate that something was missing from the debate. As my colleagues across the aisle offered their various amendments through the course of the day and into the evening, it occurred to me that the President's budget had not been offered as an amendment by the Democrat Members of the House Budget Committee, and that as we were getting information about which amendments were being offered here today on the floor as amendments to the overall GOP budget, it occurred to me that, again, that same oversight had taken place.

Clearly, it must be an oversight. Clearly, my colleagues meant to offer the President's budget as an amendment and simply failed to do so. And so in a pique of bipartisanship, I thought I would help my colleagues across the aisle out a little bit and offer the President's budget, which is exactly what this amendment is.

This amendment is the President's budget as analyzed, not scored, but analyzed by the CBO, nothing more and nothing less. It has a lot in here that I imagine my colleagues would like. It

has, for example, \$1.9 trillion in new taxes. It has new taxes on income, new taxes on the giving of gifts, new taxes on gasoline, and even new taxes on dying.

It has \$1.5 trillion in new spending, spending on welfare, spending on unemployment, and spending on green energy. The term "Solyndra" comes to mind, I would imagine. In fact, it has so many new taxes and new spending, it seems to be bringing the phrase "tax-and-spend liberal" back into fashion here in Washington, D.C. So, clearly, it must simply be an oversight that has not been offered by my colleagues.

But that's not all. The budget that the President offered and that is contained in this amendment never balances—never balances. It is a balanced approach to reach a never-balancing budget. It also fails to deal completely with our entitlement problems.

So, again, I say, Mr. Chairman, I think there's a lot here for my colleagues to like. I look forward to their defense of the President's budget. And in many ways, I would suppose this is a landmark document for the Democrats as we go into this election year.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition to speak on this important issue.

The Acting CHAIR. Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. And I'm opposed for a simple reason. This document filed by Mr. MULVANEY is not the President's budget. And it's being portrayed as a very misleading—it was a very misleading presentation of the President's budget.

This is the President's budget.

If you look at all the other budgets presented today, you'll find numbers and you'll find policy statements that describe the policies behind the budget. The thing Mr. MULVANEY filed—no policy. In fact, he just said the President's policy raises gas taxes, I believe? That's just a false statement.

The other issue is why you have a number for revenue in the President's budget. You mentioned that there was a revenue number. The President never pretended otherwise. The President's budget takes a balanced approach to deficit reduction. It makes cuts, and it raises revenue.

Let's talk about how he raises revenue. He raises revenue, in part, by getting rid of subsidies on the big oil companies. We think at a time of record profits, we don't need to have taxpayer subsidies for big oil companies. Our Republican colleagues, almost every one of them, have signed this pledge to Grover Norquist saying they won't get rid of one oil subsidy or one tax loophole for the purpose of deficit reduction. Well, the President thinks we need a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

Now, you wouldn't know from reading Mr. MULVANEY's document, what he puts in place as the President's budget, that that's how the President raises revenue. You wouldn't know from Mr. MULVANEY's document that the President also asks the very top 2 percent of taxpayers to go back to paying the same top rate they were during the Clinton administration, a time when the economy was booming, because the President thinks we need to take a balanced approach, again, a combination of revenues and spending cuts, because the President believes, and I agree, that if you do it the way the Republicans do it, without asking the folks at the very top to share some responsibility, it means you deal with the budget at the expense of everybody else, at the expense of seniors, at the expense of middle-income Americans, and at the expense of important investments in our economy like investments in transportation.

Their budget cuts transportation next year by 46 percent at a time when we have 17 percent unemployment in the construction industry. Their budget puts the brakes on the budding economic growth.

So, Mr. Chairman, let's end this charade. The gentleman said he wanted to get beyond politics. This is politics at its absolute worst, presenting something as the President's budget without the policy detail, without the explanation to the American people about what's in the President's budget. As a result, he presents a very misleading version of what the President has asked us to do.

In fact, the Democratic alternative that we will propose later adopts the general framework of the President's budget. We don't adopt every single proposal he makes in here, but we take the general framework. The difference is we have those policy statements, and we make it clear that we want to get rid of the subsidies for the big oil companies at a time they're making record profits. We make it clear that we want millionaires, people making a million dollars a year, to go back to paying what they were during the Clinton administration. We make that clear in our alternative.

So let's not play this political charade. We're going to have the Democratic alternative that, as I said, takes the framework of the President's proposal. Our Republican colleagues will have an opportunity to vote against that. But this is not the President's budget, and let's not pretend it is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, we really find ourselves in an interesting spot here. The ranking member of Budget finds himself in a very difficult position, standing in opposition of the President's budget. And he says, well, this isn't the President's budget. And for a moment, let's assume it's not.



Where is it? Where is it? If it was such a good document, why didn't they present it? We don't understand it.

I was in a committee meeting today, and the Secretary of the Treasury was just going on about how good the President's budget was, how it had this balanced approach, and it had this glide path to reducing the deficit. I asked him, well, who from your party is going to present that? He said, I don't know. You would think with such an awesome document that puts us on this great path of a future for our Nation that surely the Democrats would present their own budget. But they have yet to do that.

□ 1950

In fact, their side is empty right now. You'd think it would be full with them lining up to speak in favor of the President's budget, but they have yet to do that. In fact, there's much of an exodus here.

But let's talk about what the budget really is, because it's more than the framework or the document; it is a vision. It's a vision for where we think we're going to take our Nation. What the President's budget is is a vision of debt and dependency. Maybe that's why they didn't present it. But yet we're presenting a much different approach, one of opportunity and prosperity.

As we conclude these debates—and they may call it a gimmick. And if they want to call the President's budget a gimmick, let them call that a gimmick. But as we conclude this debate, we're all going to be making a decision. We've been empowered with the opportunity to vote for our constituents. They've given us that voting card, and we're going to have a decision to make. We're going to be choosing between a balanced approach that raises taxes, increases the size of government, increases our debt—it's debt and dependency—or we can choose the balanced budget approach. The Republican budget lowers taxes, has an energy plan, puts us on that path to a balanced budget. That is the choice that will be before us.

So I hope that my colleagues, as they debate the President's budget, will reject that debt and dependency and choose that path of the balanced budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I guess we're going to spend the next I don't know how many minutes talking about something that's not the President's budget. It's an attempt to be misleading about what the President's budget does because it leaves out all the content, leaves out the substance.

You look at the Republican budget, they've got a lot of sections on policy. You look at the other alternatives that are being presented, they have alternatives and policy statements. This is a bunch of numbers without the explanation.

Now, do the Democrats, for example, think that the President invested

enough in his budget in LIHEAP, the low-income energy program for low-income individuals. We actually have a majority in our caucus that thinks the President should have put a little more into that. But that's only the kind of detail you would know if you went through the President's budget, not this thing that Mr. MULVANEY claims is the President's budget, which it's just not. So just to be clear: This is not the President's budget, and therefore it obviously is a political gimmick.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina for bringing up this debate.

And this is the President's budget we're discussing. When you look at this resolution, this contains the same kind of language as any resolution that's brought to the floor contains. But let's talk about what it seems like some Members of the Democratic Party on the other side are so afraid to talk about, and that is what the President's budget really does.

The President's budget never even comes close to balancing, first of all. So this President, who campaigned 4 years ago on reducing the deficit, on trying to bring fiscal responsibility to Washington, goes the opposite way, adding trillions more dollars of debt, mountains of debt on the backs of our children and grandchildren.

What's worse, if you look at the policies, \$1.9 trillion of job-killing tax increases. What does that mean to families? Hardworking families out there are looking at this, and they're knowing just what this is going to do to jobs in this country when you add another \$1.9 trillion.

Just look at one part. They love bragging about all the taxes they're raising on American oil. In fact, their budget, President Obama's budget that we're talking about right now, President Obama's budget adds \$40 billion a year in new taxes on American energy. The irony is the President's tax increase on American energy doesn't apply to OPEC nations, so OPEC countries are now incentivized to send more oil here. But if you make it in America—it's in the President's budget, go look at it—\$40 billion of new tax increases if you make it in America. What is that going to do to gas prices that are already skyrocketing under President Obama's policies?

American families out there know what that means. If you add \$40 billion a year in new taxes on American-made energy, that will only increase the price that is already too high. What's worse is that it kills American jobs because it says—and President Obama said this; in his budget President Obama says, if you're OPEC and you're sending us oil, we're not going to raise your taxes in the President's budget. But if you make energy in America, he'll raise taxes \$40 billion a year.

This is the most warped policy I've ever seen. I hope we reject it, and then take up the budget that we're going to present that actually puts us in balance and has good, sound policy to create jobs.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let's talk a little bit about energy policy. One of the things you wouldn't know from the document that Mr. MULVANEY put forward claiming it's the President's budget is that the President actually provides the resources to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to help police speculators in the oil market. Because what we're seeing today is that, because of conditions around the world, a lot of those are being taken advantage of by people who are engaged in excessive speculation on the oil market, driving it up. But the Republican budget doesn't want the cop on the beat. The Republican budget doesn't want to police the speculators because, you know what, they're just doing fine. But again, Mr. MULVANEY's budget—what he pretends is the President's budget—you wouldn't know that. But if you looked in the President's real budget, you would know that kind of thing. That's why this exercise is such a farce.

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Thank you to my good friend.

We actually did this on the floor last night. Part of it was an attempt to sort of help folks through some of the absurdity of the rhetoric compared to the reality of math.

One of the fun slides we brought on is using the current budget numbers and the fact that we're borrowing about \$3.5 billion a day. We actually have this one board—and we're putting it up on our Web site—that actually shows a clock. On that clock it has some of the President's budget policies. And one in there is one we've already sort of heard talked about or alluded to, and people like to call it the "Buffet Rule." Well, do you realize that all of the rhetoric around something like the Buffet Rule and those new taxes and those needs for those folks to pay more would pay for—I think we came up with 3 minutes and 30 seconds. It would cover 3 minutes and 30 seconds of borrowing a day.

We did some slides earlier that talked about not just taxing Big Oil, but if you taxed all fossil fuels. And what we're talking about is getting rid of their depletion allowance and actually going after their depreciation tables. That came out to about 2 minutes

and 30 seconds of covering borrowing a day.

The reason I stand behind this microphone right now is the political theater of—it's great rhetoric. I'm sure it's nice and poll tested. But it doesn't solve any of the problems. That's why this is a joyous moment to see the other side stand up and embrace the President's budget with such enthusiasm.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from South Carolina is prepared to close, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hear my good friend from Maryland. I understand he thinks it's a charade. I got the same press release that he got from the White House. They called it a gimmick, he calls it a charade. And they go on to talk about how they lack any details.

I've got the same stack that my colleague from Maryland has. I have the President's budget here. But we also have what we used to formulate the amendment, which is the analysis of the President's 2013 budget from the Congressional Budget Office. In there, if you take the time to review it, you'll find a summary of the way the President treats the 2001-2003 tax reductions, the alternative minimum tax, limiting deductions and exclusions, modifying estate and gift taxes, other revenue proposals, more tax provisions, OCO, the automatic procedures in the Budget Control Act, the President's cap on deductions and exclusions, deals with initiatives that will widen the deficit, transportation, Medicare, Medicaid, the Build America Bonds Program. The President's budget does not include reductions, and increases mandatory outlays.

It goes on to talk about overseas contingency, disaster relief, \$2 billion for a program, integrity initiatives. The details are here. The details are here. Let's make no mistake about what we're voting on. This is the President's budget.

Again, I got the White House memo and it says, you know, we encourage Democrats to vote against our own budget—that's what the President said today—because what could be in this amendment is raising taxes on the middle class.

□ 2000

It could be in here, Mr. Chairman, but only if it's in here. They go on to say that this amendment could include severe cuts to important programs, and I guess, in theory, it could, but only if it's in here.

Let's make one thing and one thing extraordinarily clear. This is the President's budget. This is the CBO, the nonpartisan analysis of what the President gave us of what I guess, several millions of dollars, of tax dollars, were spent in preparing. We spent an entire day debating this and examining this in the Budget Committee.

It's not a charade. It's not a gimmick unless what the President sent us is the same.

We are voting on the President's budget. I would encourage my Democrats to embrace this landmark Democrat document and support it. Personally, I'll be voting against it.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, my friend from South Carolina wants to play make-believe today, but the reality is that this is not the President's budget, and we've already shown you the President's budget.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, let me just say one thing. You know, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time; and I can tell you, the Republican budget is not fooling anybody.

I just want to talk about one aspect of the President's budget on transportation. We know for every billion dollars that we spend, it generates 44,000 jobs. However, the Republicans refuse to pass a budget.

The Transportation Committee, throughout the history, has been bipartisan. We have worked together. The Republicans and the Democrats over in the Senate have passed a bill. The Republicans refuse to take up the bill on transportation because, for once, you don't want to put the American people back to work.

I say again, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Again, we can stand here all we want and play let's pretend. The reality is that the budget that's before us is not the President's budget.

As I indicated earlier, the Democratic alternative later takes the framework of the President's budget and adopts some of the policies of the President's budget. We don't accept every single spending proposal or spending cut which is laid out in great detail here. But that presents a framework.

And I should say to my colleagues that one of the things you would not know from reading this Republican version of the President's proposal is that, unlike the Republican budget, the President's plan does not end the Medicare guarantee. It does not extend tax breaks for the highest income Americans. It doesn't provide another windfall tax cut for those Americans financed by increasing taxes on middle-income Americans. It doesn't cut the transportation budget by 46 percent next year, at a time when we have high unemployment in the construction industry. The President's budget doesn't

do that. The Republican budget does do that.

We will later present that balanced approach that says, in order to tackle our deficits, we have to make some cuts, some tough cuts. Congress has already made \$1 trillion in cuts. We have more cuts. But we should also close some of those special interest tax loopholes for the purpose of reducing the deficit, because if we don't do that, it means that we're providing—essentially asking nothing of the very wealthy, and that means we have to reduce the deficit at the expense of everybody else in America.

So let's end the charade. Let's end this game of make-believe. This is not the President's budget, and unless there's some of our colleagues who want to play fantasyland, I suggest we get down to reality, and that's why we're opposing this document, the Mulvaney amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MULVANEY. I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A  
SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112-423.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,335,291,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,680,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: \$3,004,405,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$3,219,867,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,399,791,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,545,388,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,701,670,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,890,233,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$4,078,241,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,272,162,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: \$41,776,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$129,432,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: \$187,945,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$203,234,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$204,691,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$192,105,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$181,937,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$180,911,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$169,741,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$154,993,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$3,128,317,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$3,111,395,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,189,733,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,395,345,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,546,170,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,698,240,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,867,601,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$4,063,783,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,230,729,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,423,309,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$3,169,119,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$3,176,782,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,237,481,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,397,122,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,511,256,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,639,385,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,840,278,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$4,018,250,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,195,261,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,390,772,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: -\$833,825,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: -\$496,081,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: -\$233,078,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: -\$177,254,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: -\$111,464,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$93,996,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$138,607,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$128,017,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$117,020,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$118,609,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$17,147,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$17,822,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$18,241,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$18,632,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$19,003,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$19,371,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$19,777,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$20,172,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$20,556,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$20,932,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$12,336,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$12,913,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$13,224,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$13,476,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$13,661,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$13,820,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$14,026,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$14,231,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$14,439,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$14,668,000,000,000.

**SEC. 2. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$553,925,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$585,924,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$564,074,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$568,196,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$574,336,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$565,518,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$585,581,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$578,055,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$598,841,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$585,091,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$612,097,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$592,763,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$625,362,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$610,522,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$639,661,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$625,015,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$653,962,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$638,965,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$671,019,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$659,506,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$56,338,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$52,222,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,241,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$52,512,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,643,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$51,706,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,666,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$52,352,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,315,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,085,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,464,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,391,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$54,679,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$52,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$55,906,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$52,664,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$57,141,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$58,909,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$55,145,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,556,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,268,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,091,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,988,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,654,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,987,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,244,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,095,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,920,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,687,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,623,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,182,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,357,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,841,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,089,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,558,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,824,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,667,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,978,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,925,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,128,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,434,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,209,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,072,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,367,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,929,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,653,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,258,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,594,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,206,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,534,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,339,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,545,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,198,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,507,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,124,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,618,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,165,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,430,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,003,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,947,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,124,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,304,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,108,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,531,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,227,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,386,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,621,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,510,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,511,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,467,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,807,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,643,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,058,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,210,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,919,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,857,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,334,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,536,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,304,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,085,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,579,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,407,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,988,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,577,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,525,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,096,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,948,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,440,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,612,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,151,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,024,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,593,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,655,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,213,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,465,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,003,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$2,968,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$5,769,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,357,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$2,293,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$7,366,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4,783,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,145,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$6,537,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$9,758,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$6,533,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12,253,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4,945,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,773,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$8,348,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,613,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$2,240,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,563,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$474,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,101,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,275,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$138,386,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$129,503,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$126,243,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$133,784,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$117,661,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$122,449,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$124,471,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$120,261,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$130,819,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$123,333,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$137,262,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$126,032,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$102,354,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$123,333,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$104,123,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$117,489,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$105,934,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$115,219,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$107,877,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$114,475,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,509,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,409,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,125,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,304,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,339,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,138,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,573,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,213,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,843,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$17,605,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,121,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,292,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,410,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,839,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,705,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,037,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$14,999,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,574,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,343,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,949,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$107,028,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$136,053,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$102,194,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$122,678,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$96,301,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$113,711,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$104,104,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$105,916,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$114,347,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$111,578,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$118,943,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$117,633,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$122,868,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$121,414,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$123,647,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$123,418,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$124,802,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$124,551,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$126,461,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$125,796,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$382,159,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$380,707,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$482,752,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$471,591,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$546,803,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$545,420,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$596,809,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$601,541,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$638,350,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$641,242,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$676,122,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$675,168,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$719,320,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$718,259,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$773,097,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$761,684,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$813,176,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$812,016,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$869,043,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$867,378,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$526,636,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$526,476,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$562,063,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$561,369,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$588,473,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$588,065,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$639,731,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$639,533,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$659,125,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$658,445,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$682,905,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$682,498,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$747,240,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$747,037,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$801,602,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$800,902,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$855,814,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$855,380,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$938,731,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$938,644,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$580,622,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$572,990,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$547,970,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$543,312,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$548,691,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$543,228,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$556,156,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$555,492,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$554,282,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$549,594,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$556,446,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$547,930,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$571,786,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$568,204,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$583,480,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$580,247,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$596,855,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$593,480,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$614,517,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$615,695,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53,416,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,496,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,892,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,002,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$35,135,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$35,210,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,953,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,991,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,140,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,140,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$47,590,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$47,590,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$52,429,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$52,429,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,425,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,425,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,604,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,604,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$68,079,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$68,079,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$140,651,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$138,003,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$141,996,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$141,630,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$144,827,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$144,636,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$153,005,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$152,648,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$151,445,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$151,028,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$149,620,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$148,947,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,568,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$157,863,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,302,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$161,597,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$166,056,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$165,324,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$175,839,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$175,042,000,000.  
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,772,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$59,917,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,029,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$58,534,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,792,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$57,403,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,542,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$59,216,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,889,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$58,552,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,992,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,399,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,204,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,495,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,406,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$62,002,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,772,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$63,339,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,968,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,487,000,000.  
 (17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,808,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$27,408,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,256,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$27,706,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,196,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,376,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,275,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,459,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,433,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,613,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,417,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,969,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,513,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,338,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,762,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,226,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,219,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,669,000,000.  
 (18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$346,034,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$346,034,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$356,872,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$356,872,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$390,660,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$390,660,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$444,699,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$444,699,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$500,673,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$500,673,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$555,019,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$555,019,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$604,374,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$604,374,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$645,680,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$645,680,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$674,506,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$674,506,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$703,024,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$703,024,000,000.  
 (19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,325,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,272,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$18,028,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$9,013,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$19,436,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$15,846,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$18,961,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$17,622,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$18,477,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$18,017,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$18,548,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$18,349,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$19,580,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$18,972,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$25,532,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,479,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$16,907,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,591,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$58,744,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$59,683,000,000.  
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$79,230,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$79,229,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$80,576,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$80,575,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$86,663,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$86,662,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$88,673,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$88,672,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$92,938,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$92,937,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$96,445,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$96,444,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$103,169,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$103,168,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$102,135,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$102,134,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$106,354,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$106,353,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$108,766,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$108,766,000,000.  
 (21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Glob-  
 al War on Terrorism:

Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$96,725,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$92,230,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,159,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,766,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$28,845,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,173,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,650,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$706,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$192,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$52,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chair, I first want to acknowledge all 42 members of the Congressional Black Caucus who endorsed this presentation, but especially our Budget, Appropriations, and Taxation Taskforce and the FY13 Budget chairs, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, and Congresswoman KAREN BASS, who is the emcee at a dinner and cannot be here with us.

This budget, Mr. Chair, itself, is a statement of our beliefs as a Nation. It is the way we choose to run government and help the people we serve. Our FY 2013 alternative Federal budget will address the deficit while protecting important safety net programs needed by our communities.

The CBC's top priorities for the 112th Congress are promoting job creation and economic development, providing lifetime educational opportunities, protecting access to health care, and protecting the right to vote and justice for all Americans. We can only make these priorities a reality by sustaining and strengthening the programs that invest in and protect all Americans, whether it is workforce investment, unemployment insurance, investment in unemployment, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, or with the onslaught of these voter laws across the country, proper funding of the Election Assistance Commission. These programs are vital to national interest because they train our workforce, stabilize our economy, and provide funding for our cities and States throughout the Nation.

I understand that now is the time for us, as Americans, to sacrifice in order to protect our children and our children's children. However, we struggle,

as a caucus, to understand how the proposed majority budget helps achieve this goal.

More recently, due to many strategic investments led by the President, the Nation's overall unemployment rate has been lowered; however, the African American unemployment rate remains nearly double the national average. In order to improve this dire situation and to ensure every American's full recovery, we must make smart and targeted investments for all America's vulnerable communities.

Government investment in people, education, infrastructure, and innovation can create jobs. Over time, the jobs created by these strategic investments pay for themselves and then some. Investments allow people to earn, learn, spend, and save. Cutting programs that assist hardworking Americans, help families with their most basic needs, maintain our crumbling infrastructure, and expand access to educational opportunities will only make unemployment statistics worse.

Our success as a Nation is interwoven in the success of all communities. Until we grasp that concept as a Nation, we will never see the full potential of the United States of America; and for that, I am truly concerned.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of our committee, BOBBY SCOTT of Virginia.

□ 2010

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget is a more credible and responsible alternative than the underlying Republican budget. The CBC budget is a plan that significantly reduces our deficit over the next decade while increasing economic opportunities and promoting job creation in every corner of our society. Deficit reduction is about making tough choices, but the path to fiscal responsibility must not be on the backs of our Nation's most vulnerable communities.

Our budget makes those tough choices, but it doesn't jeopardize Social Security, turn Medicaid into a block grant, or dismantle the Medicare guarantee. The fundamental choice we have to make is a choice between millionaires and Medicare.

The CBC budget extends the Bush-era tax cuts only for hardworking middle class American families but pays for this extension through tax reform by closing corporate loopholes and giveaways, deterring aggressive speculation in the stock market—the speculation that helped create the 2008 fiscal crisis and the recent gas price increase—and we ensure that millionaires who benefited most from income growth, tax cuts, and bailouts in the last decade contribute their fair share.

With additional revenue, the CBC budget restores funding for important programs cut in the Budget Control Act of 2011, we cancel the sequester for security and nonsecurity programs, and we match the Democratic alter-

native on defense spending. Our budget also makes targeted investments that will create jobs in the short term by funding transportation and infrastructure projects, and our budget will ensure our long-term prosperity by investing in education and job training initiatives, including an increase in the maximum Pell Grant by nearly \$1,000, to \$6,500.

The CBC budget will positively impact every sector of our economy, cement the foundation of a strong economic recovery, and reduce the deficit by \$770 billion more over the next decade than the Republican budget, as this chart shows.

The CBC budget outlines specific recommendations to achieve this goal. The Republican budget, on the other hand, simply instructs the Ways and Means Committee to find \$4 trillion in new revenues and then instructs the Appropriations Committee to find spending cuts in the range of almost a trillion dollars. In light of the fact that the supercommittee failed to find \$1.2 trillion, it is unlikely that anybody will figure out how to fill this \$5 trillion hole in the Republican budget. But even if they do, the CBC budget still has \$770 billion more in deficit reduction than the Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, there is a clear difference between the Republican budget and the CBC budget, and that difference is the CBC budget chooses Medicare over millionaires. I urge my colleagues to support the Cleaver amendment to ensure a fairer and more prosperous future for America.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this budget. I am proud of the fact that we are actually debating a budget; for you see, you look over to the other body, you look to the United States Senate, and you'll see it's been more than 1,050 days, an exceptional amount of time—years, in fact—since the United States Senate has actually discussed a budget.

And here we are debating a budget. There's a contrast in vision. There's a contrast in priorities, but we're debating this. On some issues, there is some common ground; but on other things, there is a divergence in our approach.

This budget that's being presented here as an amendment raises taxes by more than \$6 trillion. Mr. Chairman, let me put in context what \$1 trillion is. If you spent \$1 million a day every day, it would take you almost 3,000 years to get to \$1 trillion.

So what we have to have is a realization of the fiscal woes that we face ourselves. I didn't create this mess, but I am here to help clean it up.

The reality is we cannot face tens of trillions of dollars in debt because there's a consequence of that. The consequence of this massive debt: rising

interest rates, devaluation of the dollar. There's so many things. Inflation as you throw more money into the marketplace.

Imagine what this world would be like if we didn't have what will be, at the end of this year, nearly \$16 trillion in debt. Right now we're paying more than \$600 million a day in interest on that debt.

So, while I think there is common ground and appreciation of what needs to happen for our kids and our future and investments that we do need to make, what they would like to do in terms of infrastructure and roads and all of these types of things and our military, we're saddled with a \$16 trillion debt. So we don't have that \$600 million. We really don't get anything for that. We have to pay that as interest on the debt.

That's where you see a contrast. What is being proposed here versus what the Republicans are offering in their budget, which has passed through the Budget Committee, is they would have to spend \$5.3 trillion more over 10 years than what we have proposed.

So I stand in opposition to this. I appreciate the passion and commitment they have to their agenda, but I do want to recognize, and I hope we can applaud on both sides of the aisle at least here in the House of Representatives, we're actually debating a budget.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. I thank you so much, Mr. CLEAVER.

Mr. Chairman, prior to 1994, Congress acted to ensure that Americans had guaranteed support under the Social Security Act. It was a three-legged stool. The American social contract provided retirement security for retirees through Social Security, health coverage for elders with Medicare, dignified care for the infirm and disabled under Medicaid and sustenance for low-income families with children.

Now, in 1994, on a bipartisan basis, this body breached the Social Security Act's contract with the people and "ended welfare as we know it."

Now, this Republican budget says that that is a model for what this budget should do. It recalls that victory, and I quote from the narrative under the Path to Prosperity, a blueprint for American Renewal:

This budget completes the successful work of transforming welfare by reforming other areas of America's safety net to ensure that welfare does not entrap able-bodied citizens into lives of complacency and dependency.

We've heard on this floor that we're going to make sure that the safety net does not become a hammock. So, in other words, Medicare and Medicare recipients are now welfare recipients.

So what this budget does is it ends the guarantee of health care for retirees, turning it into a voucher program,



and cuts \$30 billion over the next decade.

The program, Medicaid, it is now a welfare program, and Grandma, who is in the nursing home, is now a welfare recipient who is lying in a hammock instead of living out her life in dignity, and you cut \$810 billion out of that fund over the next decade.

Another entitlement program, food stamps, which served 45 million people during this recession, half of all Americans are now poor. You're going to amend that entitlement program by cutting \$134 billion out over the next decade.

The CBC budget rejects the breach of the Social Security Act and renews that contract with Americans. It rejects the 62 percent of the Republican budget that cuts \$5.3 trillion—62 percent of it taken from those Americans who are most vulnerable—yet it provides deficit reduction of \$3.4 trillion over a 10-year period of time.

Yes, we do have different priorities. We prioritize retirees, elders, the disabled, and infirm over millionaires.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire about the remainder of my time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on the previous offering by Mr. MULVANEY. I'd like to rise and speak in opposition to the administration's proposed 2013 budget plan. I'd like to speak about one particular issue of concern.

Despite the administration's emphasizing of the importance of cybersecurity and the need to retain our technological edge, this budget presents a stark contradiction to these priorities. Key program areas that are essential to maintaining our Nation's 21st century defense initiatives have been unreasonably slashed in this proposal.

For example, the Air Force's science and technology cyber funding has been cut 17 percent. Over \$1 billion has been cut from the Air Force's total funding level for research, development, testing, and evaluation programs.

□ 2020

I can personally attest to the innovative accomplishments that are produced by the Air Force Research Labs, such as Rome Lab in Rome, New York. For instance, the Air Force Research Labs were the first to institute computer network attack and exploitation as a formal science and technology discipline.

Secretary Panetta has warned that a cyberattack could very well be the next Pearl Harbor that our Nation confronts. Both our defense enterprises and our commercial economy have become dependent on information tech-

nology, which makes it critical that we protect our networks. We can't say one thing and do another when it comes to prioritizing our 21st century cyberdefenses.

I urge my colleagues to support our national security by voting against this budget plan.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the U.S. Virgin Islands, Dr. DONNA CHRISTENSEN.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong and proud support of the Congressional Black Caucus' budget, which builds on the President's and the Democratic budget, is fiscally responsible, and restores America's promise and invests in our future. As a physician and chair of the Health Braintrust, I am particularly pleased with the investment we make in health.

The CBC budget provides an additional \$10 billion in 2013, which protects Medicare and Medicaid, and which fully funds the Affordable Care Act, the Minority AIDS Initiative, and the AIDS Drug Assistance Program. It supports the Office of Minority Health. Finally, it provides adequate funding for the new institute at NIH.

We provide robust funding for important prevention and public health programs like the block grant, maternal and child health, oral health programs, and community-centric efforts to address the socioeconomic determinants of health. We also increase funding for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, for the training of underrepresented minorities for the health workforce and, for the first time, for health facilities improvements and construction.

Health care is a right. The CBC, through this budget, ensures that all Americans will enjoy that right. We make a strong investment in health and much more, and we still reduce the deficit by \$3.4 trillion over the next 10 years. I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of the moral obligations, I think, is not only to the current generation but to the older Americans who have poured their hearts and souls into this contract. They've lived with the assumption that certain things are going to be there. We have to live up to those obligations, but we also have to live up to the obligations that we have for our kids and our grandkids.

One of my goals and objectives is to leave this country better than how I found it. One of the things that the House Republican budget does over the course of time is balance the budget and pay off the debt, which is something we have to do. So the fundamental question becomes, How do you do that?

Now, I think where we have some common ground is that we want to broaden the base. The Republicans are suggesting that we lower the rates. Let

people keep their own money and spend their own money. That is fundamentally what the United States of America is all about. The contrast here in what's being proposed is that they want to broaden the base—again, common ground—but they want to raise the rates, and that's where I think we have a fundamental challenge. We talk about what people have to pay, their fair share and whatnot. Yet let's look historically at what has happened in the United States of America.

Historically, we have spent less than 20 percent of our gross domestic product. When the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate and the Presidency, they raised that up over 24 percent. That is more than 24 cents out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government in this country. I think that's immoral. I think that's wrong. We have an obligation—we have a duty—to live within our means and to provide opportunity and liberty for people to thrive. No matter where they are in life, the United States of America is about freedom, it's about liberty, it's about the opportunity to succeed—and that's the foundation of this country. That's what I'm committed to. That's what a responsible Federal Government does.

The proper role of government is limited in its scope, and the proper role of government is a role of government. To me, that means the Department of Defense and other things to protect our Nation. That's where we should put our priorities, and that's why I think that this budget that the House Republicans have proposed is so responsible. I don't think we're just one good tax increase away from prosperity in this country, and that's, in part, why I stand in opposition to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I want to first thank the Congressional Black Caucus for their leadership. The fact is that they are the conscience of this Congress. Thank you so very much.

Let me say that transportation and infrastructure, if adequately funded, will generate thousands of jobs. In fact, for every \$1 billion we invest in transportation it generates 44,000 permanent jobs and \$6.2 billion in economic activity. With the CBC's initial investment of \$50 billion in infrastructure funding, this budget would create over 2 million good-paying jobs. It would also allow us to fix our failing bridges, aging transit systems, and crumbling roads.

In addition, let me mention one thing about the VA. The Republicans often mention, What did the Democrats do when they were in charge? We passed the largest VA budget in the history of the United States of America.

Republicans often talk the talk. Democrats walk the walk.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You have to recognize how much money the Federal Government is spending here. We're going to spend in the range of about \$3.5 trillion to \$3.6 trillion in a 12-month period. Part of my rhetorical question here is: If that's not stimulative to the economy, why isn't it? What are we spending our money on if it's not intended to, in part, stimulate the economy? There are things that we have to do in terms of security and in providing for the FAA and for the Department of Defense, but we have to utilize those resources in a very wise way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would now like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first thank chairman EMANUEL CLEAVER for his tremendous leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and of many caucuses in this House. I also thank Representative BOBBY SCOTT and Representative GWEN MOORE and all of our CBC colleagues for their tireless efforts on this budget.

At a time when America is facing the greatest income inequality since the Great Depression, we must stand up and put the needs of the most vulnerable over the wants of the most wealthy, the special interests, and Big Oil. The Congressional Black Caucus' budget is a moral document that shows our Nation's priorities and our values.

This budget makes important investments in job creation, transportation, health care, and education. The CBC budget also protects the safety net without cutting Social Security or destroying Medicaid or by ending the Medicare guarantee, as the Republican budget does. We must ensure that those who have borne the brunt of this recession, who have experienced the highest unemployment rates, and the highest rates of poverty—communities of color—have an opportunity to return to the workplace in order to support their families, have access to education and to the American Dream.

These should be the values and priorities of a budget—a budget for everyone in mind, not just for the 1 percent. These are the priorities that will ensure our country and all of its people, not just the 1 percent, recover fully from this devastating recession.

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out that the gentleman from Utah has suggested the need to reduce the deficit. The Congressional Black Caucus budget beats the Republican budget by \$770 billion. Then he talks about tax increases, but doesn't mention the fine print in the Republican budget that instructs the Ways and Means Committee to find \$4 trillion in tax increases.

So, if fiscal responsibility is the idea, the budget of the Congressional Black Caucus beats the Republican budget by \$770 billion over 10 years.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time both sides have.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to yield the gentleman some additional time. I know he has a number of speakers who are still left. I am happy to do that. So that is my intention as you allocate the rest of your time.

For now, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah for his generosity and courtesy.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 2030

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for yielding to me and, again, join my colleagues in thanking him for his leadership, as well as the chairman of our CBC Budget Committee, Mr. SCOTT, the work that Congresswoman MOORE does on this committee, and all the others that have gathered here.

And I thank my good friend for a vigorous debate. I would only say to you that in the course of our debate this evening and today, we've heard of the mountain of debt and the need to cut, cut, cut. It is all right to have a difference of opinion, but what I would argue is that there are documented economists that say that if you invest in human capital, if you invest in people, then you build up the economy, you make things, you make things in America.

I don't want to leave Americans, if you will, on the trash heap of despair. I don't want to leave bodies straddled all along the highways, those who are knocking on doors of colleges, those who are trying to get into primary and secondary education, seniors who are cast out on the streets out of nursing homes. That's where we're going.

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

Mr. CLEAVER. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

So I am standing here to try to end the elimination of Medicare and the destruction of jobs and the taking of money from the poor.

The CBC budget is responsible in that it's ending the mortgage interest deductions for vacation homes and yachts. It provides additional tax relief for the middle class. It provides a \$25 billion increase for education and job training; \$50 billion in transportation infrastructure, creating jobs; rolling back the harmful cuts to American

Federal employees, recognizing that they provide services that are needed; \$12 billion above the President's budget regarding NASA, with advanced research and development programs—that's the genius of the 21st century, providing more funding for the National Science Foundation.

And, yes, we believe in justice. We support full funding of the Department of Justice, with funding for Cops on the Beat, Second Chance, the civil rights division. I will tell you that the message tonight has to be that we don't want to take food from poor people. We don't want to make it harder for low-income students to get a college degree, squeeze funding for research, education, infrastructure. We want to take people off that trash heap of despair and let them walk into glory. Let's support the CBC budget.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, let me ask, with the generosity of the gentleman from Utah, how much time do we have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman if he needs it and has additional speakers.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri will control that time.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus' alternative budget for fiscal year 2013. This budget should be considered and made in order by all of our colleagues.

Minority communities took the hardest hit during the economic recession. In my district, we suffer rates of unemployment ranging as high as 25 percent and home foreclosures that are significantly higher than the rest of the country.

The CBC alternative budget deals with these issues, helping us to have a skilled, educated workforce that can tackle the 21st century. It increases the maximum Pell Grant award, which we desperately need; invests an additional \$25 billion of the President's budget in education and job training; invests an additional \$50 billion in job-creating transportation infrastructure projects; and provides an additional \$5 billion for the President's budget to help people in our communities with foreclosures.

Mr. Chair, I stand in support of the CBC budget and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, let me close on our side by thanking the gentleman from Utah.

And first of all, let me call attention to one thing, and I think it's important. It may be more important than the discussion of the budget because I

think it helps us eventually reach budgets.

Not one speaker on this side called this the Ryan budget. I was in an interview this morning and someone asked me about what I thought about the Ryan budget. And I said, this is the Republican budget. And if I attack the budget, it seems as if I'm attacking the man whose name seems to be attached to it. This Institution is far too important for us to get down into that kind of thing.

We have some real differences in this budget. I believe, and our budget reflects, that budget is an x-ray of our inwards. It is a moral document. It tells who we are. And I say, in another position in my life, if you show me your checkbook, I can tell you what you believe in.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do appreciate the gentleman's comments, Mr. Chairman, the generosity and the approach that he took that, yes, we should debate the issues, but we don't need to attack the person. I think it is the right attitude, and I appreciate the comments about our chairman, Chairman RYAN.

I remember what Speaker BOEHNER said at the beginning when I started. He said, We may disagree, but we shouldn't be disagreeable. So I appreciate the spirit in which we do this today.

This is a contrast. There is a difference in opinion in the direction that we should go. I fundamentally don't believe that we're just one good tax increase away from prosperity in this country. I think one of the problems and challenges in this Nation is that our government has overreached. It is spending too much money. It is borrowing too much money. And it is regulating too much. Is there a proper role for regulation? Absolutely, absolutely. And where it's a necessity, we need to prioritize it. We need to fix those things that aren't working.

But what we have proposed, as the House Republicans, in our budget is a responsible, bold budget. It's also a realistic budget that, over the course of time, balances the books and pays off the debt. That is the imperative of our Nation. Because, as I cited earlier, we have to leave—we should leave this Nation better than the way we found it; and that means creating opportunity for this Nation to thrive. We need to remember that manufacturing is good in this Nation. We need to remember that, yes, we have to make investments, but to protect our Nation.

I look at the President's budget, and the only thing I see that it cuts is defense; and the only thing it drills is your wallet. I don't believe that that is the direction of our Nation, and that is why we are debating this issue in contrast to the United States Senate which, for more than 1,050 days now,

has not even brought a budget to the floor to debate. That is fundamentally and morally wrong. I am proud of the fact that this body is doing this.

I encourage a "no" vote on what has been offered as the substitute, but I do encourage Members to vote for what passed out of the Budget Committee. I think it's responsible. I think it's bold. I think it's the right move for our Nation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be postponed.

□ 2040

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. COOPER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112-423.

Mr. COOPER. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.**

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2013 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.  
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

**TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND DIRECTIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET**

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.  
Sec. 202. Directive to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to replace the sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011.

**TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS**

Sec. 301. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the sustainable growth rate of the Medicare program.  
Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.  
Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for rural counties and schools.  
Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation.

**TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT**

Sec. 401. Discretionary spending limits.

Sec. 402. Enforcement of discretionary spending limits.  
Sec. 403. Current policy estimates for tax reform.  
Sec. 404. Limitation on advance appropriations.  
Sec. 405. Concepts and definitions.  
Sec. 406. Limitation on long-term spending.  
Sec. 407. Budgetary treatment of certain transactions.  
Sec. 408. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.  
Sec. 409. Congressional Budget Office estimates.  
Sec. 410. Budget rule relating to transfers from the general fund of the treasury to the highway trust fund that increase public indebtedness.  
Sec. 411. Separate allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.  
Sec. 412. Adjustments to discretionary spending limits.  
Sec. 413. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

**TITLE V—POLICY**

Sec. 501. Policy statement on tax reform.  
Sec. 502. Policy statement on Medicare.  
Sec. 503. Policy Statement on Social Security.  
Sec. 504. Policy statement on budget enforcement.  
Sec. 505. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.  
Sec. 506. Recommendations for the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal programs.

**TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS**

Sec. 601. Sense of the house on a responsible deficit reduction plan.  
Sec. 602. Sense of the house regarding low-income programs.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,078,076,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,318,693,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: \$2,570,303,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$2,761,728,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$2,922,355,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,061,602,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,219,541,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,388,521,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,564,364,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,744,062,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: -\$215,263,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: -\$232,491,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: -\$245,981,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: -\$254,378,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: -\$271,984,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: -\$290,687,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: -\$299,031,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: -\$319,499,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: -\$342,588,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: -\$371,419,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,870,262,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014: \$2,946,241,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015: \$3,054,353,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$3,233,324,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,363,711,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,497,732,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,688,807,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,870,702,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,994,601,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,162,314,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,918,761,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$2,976,823,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,071,338,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,251,164,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,354,859,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,468,791,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,657,676,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,826,568,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,967,541,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,143,424,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: -\$840,685,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: -\$658,130,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: -\$501,035,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: -\$489,436,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: -\$432,504,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$407,189,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$438,135,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$438,047,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$403,177,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$399,362,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$17,078,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$17,904,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$18,574,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$19,253,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$19,916,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$20,560,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,222,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$21,873,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,459,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,015,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$12,267,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$12,994,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$13,557,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$14,097,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$14,574,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$15,009,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,471,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$15,933,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,342,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$16,751,000,000,000.

#### SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$551,925,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$577,486,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$554,250,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$562,264,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$556,697,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$557,062,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$560,232,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$562,378,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$564,905,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$560,727,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$570,166,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$559,637,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$576,041,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$569,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$582,007,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$575,432,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$588,032,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$581,313,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$594,125,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$592,693,000,000.  
 (2) International Affairs (150):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,260,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,938,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,573,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,130,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,248,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,555,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,582,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,036,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,930,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,771,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,442,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,192,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,955,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,640,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,484,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,019,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,256,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,551,000,000.  
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,488,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,967,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,606,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,838,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,724,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,775,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,901,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,907,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,140,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,110,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,410,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,353,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,713,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,590,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,019,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,885,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,328,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,641,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,413,000,000.  
 (4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,662,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,448,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,012,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,856,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,446,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,631,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,338,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,648,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,998,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,157,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,767,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,512,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,636,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,556,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,575,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,337,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,468,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,187,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,485,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,153,000,000.  
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,230,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,115,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,704,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,634,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,406,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,839,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,479,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,960,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,133,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,268,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,123,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,867,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,533,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,260,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,379,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,893,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,174,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,420,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,092,000,000.  
 (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,837,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,745,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,645,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,537,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,846,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,420,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,182,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,823,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,640,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,268,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,988,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,562,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,575,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,197,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,909,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,566,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,462,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,113,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,172,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,838,000,000.  
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2013:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,820,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,488,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,692,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,784,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,397,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,276,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2016:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$6,640,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, -\$7,260,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$8,045,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, -\$7,854,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$9,332,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, -\$7,379,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$10,297,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, -\$12,237,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$11,391,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, -\$11,766,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$11,476,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, -\$4,579,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
  - (A) New budget authority, \$11,119,000,000.
  - (B) Outlays, -\$5,902,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
  - Fiscal year 2013:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$60,053,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$51,979,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2014:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$83,894,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$87,609,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2015:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$75,899,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$79,265,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2016:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$77,076,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$80,930,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2017:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$78,050,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$81,348,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2018:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$80,070,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$81,343,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2019:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$80,564,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$80,784,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2020:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$83,365,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$82,933,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2021:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$78,427,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$77,578,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2022:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$90,193,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$88,853,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
  - Fiscal year 2013:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,876,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$23,755,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2014:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,761,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$20,081,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2015:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,787,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$18,000,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2016:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,384,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$14,387,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2017:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,554,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$12,442,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2018:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,496,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,426,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2019:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,562,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,203,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2020:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,610,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,158,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2021:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,679,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,225,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2022:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$11,730,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$11,335,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
  - Fiscal year 2013:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$73,081,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$83,403,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2014:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$66,083,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$74,994,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2015:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$72,234,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$74,032,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2016:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$79,848,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$79,869,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2017:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$89,238,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$87,213,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2018:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$93,216,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$93,638,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2019:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$96,259,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$96,624,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2020:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$95,955,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$97,590,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2021:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$95,776,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$97,437,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2022:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$95,877,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$97,325,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
  - Fiscal year 2013:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$372,016,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$367,939,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2014:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$459,021,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$448,912,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2015:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$529,180,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$524,554,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2016:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$557,667,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$580,571,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2017:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$620,385,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$623,165,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2018:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$655,600,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$654,839,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2019:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$696,256,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$695,600,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2020:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$748,320,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$737,316,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2021:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$775,692,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$774,927,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2022:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$825,197,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$824,069,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):
  - Fiscal year 2013:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$504,884,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$504,776,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2014:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$530,189,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$529,657,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2015:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$554,449,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$554,255,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2016:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$605,756,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$605,793,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2017:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$621,150,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$620,723,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2018:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$641,367,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$641,237,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2019:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$699,350,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$699,450,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2020:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$747,812,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$747,435,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2021:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$786,084,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$785,993,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2022:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$858,585,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$858,866,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):
  - Fiscal year 2013:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$536,342,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$534,683,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2014:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$529,771,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$527,681,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2015:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$526,878,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$524,573,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2016:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$530,473,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$532,642,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2017:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$524,849,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$522,708,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2018:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$524,520,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$518,512,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2019:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$537,417,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$536,176,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2020:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$545,520,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$544,737,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2021:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$556,173,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$555,576,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2022:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$571,200,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$575,528,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):
  - Fiscal year 2013:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$53,381,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$53,497,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2014:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$32,053,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$32,206,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2015:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$35,320,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$35,462,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2016:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$39,003,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$39,134,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2017:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$43,160,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$43,253,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2018:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$47,418,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$47,529,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2019:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$52,051,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$52,179,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2020:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$56,841,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$56,973,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2021:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$61,807,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$61,944,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2022:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$67,097,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$67,237,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
  - Fiscal year 2013:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$133,980,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$135,090,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2014:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$134,668,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$135,585,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2015:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$136,587,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$137,357,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2016:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$143,925,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$144,474,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2017:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$141,458,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$141,884,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2018:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$138,730,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$139,184,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2019:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$146,811,000,000.
    - (B) Outlays, \$147,290,000,000.
  - Fiscal year 2020:
    - (A) New budget authority, \$149,676,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$150,184,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$152,563,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$153,082,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$161,158,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$161,726,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,196,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$59,338,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$54,974,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,953,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$54,934,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,731,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$56,946,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$59,385,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$55,507,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,905,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$55,821,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,197,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$56,261,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,571,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$56,702,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,341,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,305,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,951,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,549,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,220,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,560,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,422,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,667,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,467,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,756,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,412,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,718,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,381,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,875,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,208,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,995,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,196,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,252,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,242,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,433,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,503,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,699,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,677,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,966,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,948,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$344,483,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$344,483,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$357,477,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$357,477,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$395,203,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$395,203,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$458,360,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$458,360,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$526,814,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$526,814,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$595,670,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$595,670,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$659,883,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$659,883,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$715,403,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$715,403,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$757,921,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$757,921,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$799,383,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$799,383,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$13,676,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$7,857,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$15,386,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$13,295,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$17,603,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$16,779,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$20,026,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$19,647,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$22,371,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$22,297,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$25,662,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$25,587,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$28,895,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$28,827,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$31,737,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$31,685,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$34,029,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$34,012,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$78,230,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$78,242,000,000.  
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$76,328,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$76,328,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$79,432,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$79,432,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,712,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$85,712,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,268,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$88,268,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$96,233,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$96,233,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$100,032,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$100,032,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$106,935,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$106,935,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$106,113,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$106,113,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$110,573,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$110,573,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$115,265,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$115,265,000,000.  
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism:  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$86,192,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$82,394,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,019,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$73,453,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$42,667,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$55,979,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,108,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,797,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$37,914,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,014,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$37,807,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,316,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,734,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,218,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,680,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,806,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,653,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,662,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$41,656,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,603,000,000.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND DIRECTIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

### SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF SPENDING REDUCTION.—Not later than April 27, 2012, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations, such committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

#### (b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$148,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by \$22,371,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$2,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by \$51,800,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$4,270,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by \$59,490,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$4,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by \$70,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(5) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$407,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by \$5,157,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(6) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$600,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by \$60,400,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(7) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A)(i) The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to enact fundamental tax reform that reduce the deficit by \$1 trillion relative to current policy through 2021.

(ii) In determining compliance with the revenue instruction the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall calculate deficit



reduction relative to the current policy baseline defined in section 403.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report changes in direct spending laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by \$8,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2013 and by \$100,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

**SEC. 202. DIRECTIVE TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO REPLACE THE SEQUESTER ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.**

(a) SUBMISSION.—In the House, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a bill carrying out the directions set forth in subsection (b).

(b) DIRECTIONS.—The bill referred to in subsection (a) shall include the following provisions:

(1) REPLACING THE SEQUESTER ESTABLISHED BY THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT OF 2011.—The language shall amend section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to permanently repeal the sequester established under that section consistent with this concurrent resolution for fiscal year 2013, and each subsequent fiscal year through 2021.

(2) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—The bill referred to in subsection (a) shall include language making its application contingent upon the enactment of the reconciliation bill referred to in section 201.

**TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS**

**SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act, if such measure would not increase the deficit in the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022. Areas for savings may include, but are not limited to, reducing Medicare fraud, increasing drug discounts, reforming cost sharing requirements, and accelerating or strengthening payment reforms.

**SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

**SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that makes changes to the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-565) or makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation would not increase the deficit or direct spending for fiscal year 2013, the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2017, or the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

**SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon:

(1) For surface transportation programs by providing new contract authority by the amounts provided in such measure if the total amount of contract authority does not exceed the additional revenue deposited into the Highway Trust Fund and made available over the authorized period.

(2) Such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022.

**TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT**

**SEC. 401. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**

Spending limits for total discretionary Federal spending are:

(1) with respect to fiscal year 2013—  
 (A) for the security category, \$684,000,000,000 in new budget authority;  
 (B) for the nonsecurity category, \$359,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and  
 (C) for overseas contingency operations (OCO), \$86,192,000,000 in new budget authority;

(2) with respect to fiscal year 2014—  
 (A) for the security category, \$686,000,000,000 in new budget authority;  
 (B) for the nonsecurity category, \$361,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and  
 (C) for overseas contingency operations, \$61,019,000,000 in new budget authority;

(3) with respect to fiscal year 2015—  
 (A) for the security category, \$689,000,000,000 in new budget authority;  
 (B) for the nonsecurity category, \$362,000,000,000 in new budget authority; and  
 (C) for overseas contingency operations, \$42,667,000,000 in new budget authority;

(5) with respect to fiscal year 2016—  
 (A) for the discretionary category, \$1,057,669,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, \$38,108,000,000 in new budget authority;

(6) with respect to fiscal year 2017—

(A) for the discretionary category, \$1,066,130,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, \$37,914,000,000 in new budget authority;

(7) with respect to fiscal year 2018—

(A) for the discretionary category, \$1,075,725,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, \$37,807,000,000 in new budget authority;

(8) with respect to fiscal year 2019—

(A) for the discretionary category, \$1,086,482,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, \$38,734,000,000 in new budget authority;

(9) with respect to fiscal year 2020—

(A) for the discretionary category, \$1,097,347,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, \$39,680,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(10) with respect to fiscal year 2021—

(A) for the discretionary category, \$1,108,321,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for overseas contingency operations, \$40,653,000,000 in new budget authority.

**SEC. 402. ENFORCEMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING OR REPEALING ANY DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMIT.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or

joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that—

(1) increases the amount of any discretionary spending limit for any fiscal year set forth in this concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(2) repeals any discretionary spending limit set forth in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY RESOLUTION SETTING 302(a) ALLOCATIONS ASSUMED IN THIS RESOLUTION.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget or any resolution deeming any budget allocations or aggregates to be in effect, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that provides for allocations under section 302(a) for any fiscal year that, in the aggregate, would exceed the discretionary spending limit for that fiscal year pursuant to this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) POINT OF ORDER AGAINST WAIVER OF SUBSECTIONS (a) OR (b).—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a) or (b).

(d) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER.—In the House of Representatives:

(1) As disposition of points of order under subsection (a) or (b), the chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is subject to the points of order.

(2) A question of consideration under this paragraph shall be debatable for ten minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for ten minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(3) The disposition of the question of consideration under this paragraph with respect to a bill or resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this paragraph with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

**SEC. 403. CURRENT POLICY ESTIMATES FOR TAX REFORM.**

For the purposes of section 201, the term “current policy baseline” is the baseline, as defined at section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 based on laws in effect as of March 1, 2012, modified to assume—

(1) a permanent extension of the provisions of titles I, II, III, and IV of the Economic Growth and Tax Reconciliation Act of 2001, and any later amendments;

(2) a permanent extension of the provisions of titles I, III, and IV of the Jobs, Growth and Tax Reconciliation Act of 2001, and any later amendments;

(3) a permanent increase in the limitations on expensing depreciable business assets for small businesses under section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as in effect in tax year 2011, as provided under section 202 of the Jobs, Growth and Tax Reconciliation Act of 2001, and any later amendments;

(4) a permanent extension of the Estate and Gift Tax provisions from the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010, beginning January 1, 2013; and

(5) a permanent extension of relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax, as defined in section 7(e) of the Statutory-Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, beginning January 1, 2012.

**SEC. 404. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts referred to in subsection (c)(1) or identified in the report to accompany this resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2014, the aggregate amount of advance appropriation shall not exceed—

(1) \$54,462,000,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—

- (A) Medical Services;
- (B) Medical Support and Compliance; and
- (C) Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(2) \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all other programs.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014.

#### SEC. 405. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing for a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any appropriate levels and allocations in this resolution accordingly.

#### SEC. 406. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, if the provisions of such measure have the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of \$5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the first four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning with fiscal year 2023.

#### SEC. 407. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust allocations and aggregates for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, but does not cause a net increase in the deficit for fiscal year 2013 and the period of fiscal years 2013 to 2022.

#### SEC. 408. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this resolution.

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—Any legislation for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments in the allocations or aggregates of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 504.

#### SEC. 409. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—

(1) REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate prepared for a measure under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, “credit reform”, as a supplement to such estimate of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

(b) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The Congressional Budget Office shall estimate the change in net income to the National Flood Insurance Program by this Act if such income is included in a reconciliation bill provided for in section 201, as if such income were deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

#### SEC. 410. BUDGET RULE RELATING TO TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND THAT INCREASE PUBLIC INDEBTEDNESS.

For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the Rules of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, or any Act that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

#### SEC. 411. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for overseas contingency operations and the global war on terrorism. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2013. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for overseas contingency operations and the global war on terrorism under section 302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act does not apply to such separate allocation. The Committee on Appropriations may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under section 302(b) of such Act. Spending that counts toward the allocation established by this section shall be des-

igned pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, for purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2013, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT.—The amount of the adjustments shall not exceed the amounts specified in section 501, except to the extent the additional increase is offset pursuant to subsection (d) or by the amount not to exceed a request submitted by the President pursuant to subsection (e).

(d) PERMISSIBLE OFFSETS TO ALLOW INCREASES IN OCO LIMITS.—The discretionary spending limit for the overseas contingency operation (OCO) category for any fiscal year may be increased—

(1) by the amount of any reduction in the security category, nonsecurity category, or the discretionary category, as applicable, for that fiscal year, if the statute making such reduction sets forth the amount of the reduction in such category that is to be used to increase the overseas contingency operation category; or

(2) by the amount of any reduction in direct spending or increase in revenues if the statute making such reduction in direct spending or increase in revenues sets forth the amount of such reduction or increase that is to be used to increase the overseas contingency operation category.

(e) REQUEST OF THE PRESIDENT.—If the President requests revisions for the overseas contingency operation limit set forth in this concurrent resolution on the budget by June 30, 2012 to accompany any supplemental budget request for such operations for fiscal year 2012 through fiscal year 2021 with an explanation of strategy consistent with the proposed adjustments, then such adjustments shall not be subject to the offset requirements in subsection (d).

(f) LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT.—The adjustment may only be made for spending meeting the definition of overseas contingency operations spending, defined as any operations the funding of which is only used in geographic areas in which combat or direct combat support operations occur, and would be limited to—

(1) operations and maintenance for the transport of personnel, equipment, and supplies to, from, and within the theater of operations; deployment-specific training and preparation for units and personnel to assume their directed mission; and the incremental costs above the funding programmed in the base budget to build and maintain temporary facilities; provide food, fuel, supplies, contracted services, and other support; and cover the operational costs of coalition partners supporting United States military missions;

(2) military personnel spending for incremental special pays and allowances for Service members and civilians deployed to a combat zone; and incremental pay, special pays, and allowances for Reserve Component personnel mobilized to support war missions;

(3) procurement costs to replace losses that have occurred, but only for items not already programmed for replacement in the Future Years Defense Plan;

(4) military construction spending for facilities and infrastructure in the theater of operations in direct support of combat operations; and

(5) research and development projects required for combat operations in these specific theaters that can be delivered in a 12-month period.

**SEC. 412. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates \$315,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$751,000,000, and that amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates \$7,979,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$3,132,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(3) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates up to \$299,000,000, and the amount is designated to the health care fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates \$60,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$10,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

**SEC. 413. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such

they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—The following provisions of H. Res. 5 (112th Congress) shall no longer have force or effect:

(1) Section 3(e) relating to advance appropriations.

(2) Section 3(f) relating to the treatment of off-budget administrative expenses.

**TITLE V—POLICY****SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) America's tax code is broken and must be reformed.

(2) The current individual income tax system is confusing and complicated, while the corporate income tax is the highest in the world and hurts America's ability to compete abroad.

(3) Tax expenditures are simply spending through the tax code, and cost taxpayers approximately \$1.3 trillion annually. They increase the deficit and cause tax rates to be higher than they otherwise would be.

(4) Tax reform should lower tax rates, reduce the deficit, simplify the tax code, reduce or eliminate tax expenditures, and help start and expand businesses and create jobs.

(b) POLICY ON FUNDAMENTAL TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that fundamental income tax reform shall be based on the principles and framework outlined in the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Moment of Truth report and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Restoring America's Future report including:

(1) lowering individual and corporate income tax rates across-the-board with the top rate reduced to between 23 and 29 percent unless the top rate must be higher than 29 percent to offset preferential treatment for capital gains;

(2) shifting the corporate income tax from a worldwide to a territorial system;

(3) increasing the competitiveness of U.S. businesses;

(4) broadening the tax base by reducing or eliminating tax expenditures;

(5) preserving reformed versions of tax provisions addressing low-income workers and families; mortgage interest for principal residences; employer-provided health insurance; charitable giving; and retirement savings and pensions;

(6) maintaining or improving progressivity of the tax code; and

(7) simplifying the tax code.

**SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. The Medicare Trustees continue to stress the importance of developing and implementing further means of reducing health care cost growth in the coming years. According to the Board of Trustees, Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplemental Medicare Insurance Trust Funds, the official source for Medicare financial and actuarial status:

(A) The Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund will remain solvent until 2024, at which point it would be unable to fully pay all scheduled HI benefits.

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy. Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.3 percent per year, and under alternative fiscal scenario of the Congressional Budget Office, mandatory spending on Medicare is projected to reach 7 percent of GDP by 2035 and 14 percent of GDP by 2085.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave younger generations burdened with an enormous debt to pay and less health care security in old age, for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(4) Medicare spending needs to be put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program needs to become solvent over the long-term.

(b) POLICY OF MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to ensure the future of the Medicare program is preserved. The Medicare changes under this resolution shall reflect the principles and framework outlined in the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Moment of Truth report including:

(1) reforms achieving savings within the budget window from policies including but not limited to:

(A) permanently reforming or replacing the Medicare sustainable growth rate with a system that encourages coordination of care and moves toward payment based on quality rather than quantity;

(B) reducing Medicare fraud;

(C) reforming cost sharing requirements;

(D) accelerating or strengthening payment and delivery system reforms; and

(E) increasing drug discounts; and

(2) setting targets for the total Federal budgetary commitment to health care and requiring further structural reforms if the policies in this resolution and other reforms are not sufficient to limit the growth of total Federal budgetary commitment to health care, including mandatory programs and provisions of the tax code related to health care to GDP plus 1 percent.

**SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the "three-legged stool" of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2016, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2036, according to the Social Security Trustees Report the combined Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted, and will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the trust funds in 2036, benefits will be cut 23 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The current recession has exacerbated the crisis to Social Security. The Congressional Budget Office continues to project permanent cash deficits.

(4) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should

take into consideration the need to protect lower-income Americans' retirement security.

(5) Americans deserve action by their elected officials on Social Security reform. It is critical that the Congress and the administration work together in a bipartisan fashion to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to make Social Security sustainably solvent over 75 years, as certified by the Congressional Budget Office using estimates provided by the Social Security Administration Office of the Chief Actuary. Legislation to ensure sustainable solvency shall reflect the principles and framework outlined in the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Moment of Truth report and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Restoring America's Future report, which:

(1) achieve the following objectives:

(A) protect those in and near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who rely on Social Security, including survivors and those with disabilities;

(C) improve fairness for participants; and

(D) reduce the burden on, and provide certainty for, future generations, and

(2) include, among other proposals:

(A) moving to a more progressive benefit formula;

(B) providing an enhanced minimum benefit for low-wage workers;

(C) increasing benefits for the elderly and long-time disabled, accounting for changes in life expectancy over the next 75 years; and

(D) gradually restoring the maximum wage base that has slowly eroded.

**SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Congressional Budget Office, the Federal Reserve, the Government Accountability Office, the Simpson-Bowles Fiscal Commission, the Rivlin-Domenici Debt Reduction Task Force, and ten former Chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisors all concluded that debt is growing at unsustainable rates and must be brought under control.

(2) According to the Congressional Budget Office, if entitlements are not reformed, entitlement spending on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid will exceed the historical average of revenue collections as a share of the economy within forty years.

(3) According to the Congressional Budget Office, under current policies, debt would reach levels that the economy could no longer sustain in 2035 and a fiscal crisis is likely to occur well before that date.

(7) To avoid a fiscal crisis and maintain program solvency, Congress must enact legislation that makes structural reforms to entitlement programs.

(8) Instead of automatic debt increases and automatic spending increases, Congress needs to put limits on spending with automatic reductions if spending limits are not met.

(9) The budget lacks both short- and long-term spending controls. Greater transparency and the use of spending controls, particularly for long-term entitlement spending, are needed to tackle this growing threat of a fiscal crisis.

(b) **POLICY ON DEBT CONTROLS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that in order to stabilize the debt and bring it under control, the following statutory spending and debt controls are needed:

(1) Enforceable statutory caps on discretionary spending at levels set forth in this concurrent resolution on the budget for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2022, that includes:

(A) separate limits on security and non-security spending and firewalls through fiscal year 2015, and limits on Overseas Contingency Operations through 2021;

(B) a point of order; and

(C) an across-the-board sequester to bring spending back in line with statutory caps if the point of order is waived.

At the end of each session of Congress, the Congressional Budget Office shall certify that discretionary spending approved by Congress is within the discretionary spending caps. If the caps are not met, the Office of Management and Budget would be required to implement an across-the-board sequester.

(2) Establish a debt stabilization process to provide a backstop to enforce savings and keep the Federal budget on path to achieve long-term targets that:

(A) Require at the beginning of each year, the Office of Management and Budget to report to the President and the Congressional Budget Office to report to the Congress whether—

(i) the budget is projected to be in primary balance in 2015;

(ii) the debt held by the public as a percentage of GDP is projected to be stable at 2015 levels for the following five years; and

(iii) beginning in fiscal year 2016, whether the actual debt-to-GDP ratio will exceed the prior year's ratio.

(B) In a year in which the Office of Management and Budget indicates any one of these conditions has not been met, the President's budget submission shall include legislative recommendations that would restore primary budget balance in 2015 or, after 2015, stabilize the debt-to-GDP ratio.

(C) If the Congressional budget resolution also shows that one of these conditions has not been met, the resolution shall include fast-track procedures for debt stabilization legislation to bring the budget back within the deficit or debt targets.

(D) If Congress cannot agree upon a budget resolution in a timely manner, and the report of the Congressional Budget Office predicts one of these conditions has not been met, then any Member of the House may introduce a debt stabilization bill, and a motion to proceed to that bill shall be considered on the floor.

(E) Congressional action on debt stabilization action would be enforced by a supermajority point of order against any legislation that would provide new mandatory budget authority or reduce revenues until a stabilization bill has been passed in years during which a budget resolution includes a debt stabilization instruction. The debt stabilization process would be suspended if nominal GDP grew by less than one percent in the prior fiscal year. The process could also be suspended by the enactment of a joint resolution stating that stabilization legislation would cause or exacerbate an economic downturn.

**SEC. 505. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies will hold \$698 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2013.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending made available by Congress that remain available for expenditure beyond the fiscal year for which they are provided.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from unneeded balances of funds.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**—Congressional committees shall through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of the Federal Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans' affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) **DEFICIT REDUCTION.**—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

**SEC. 506. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs "could potentially save tens of billions of dollars".

(3) The Rules of the House of Representatives require each standing committee to hold at least one hearing every four months on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(4) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.**—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated. Such recommendations shall be made publicly available.

**TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS**

**SEC. 601. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON A RESPONSIBLE DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN.**

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the Nation's debt is an immense security threat to our country, just as Admiral Mullen, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has stated;

(2) the Government Accountability Office has issued reports documenting billions of dollars of waste and duplication at Government agencies;

(3) the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Fiscal Commission and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Debt Reduction Task Force were correct in concluding that everything, including spending and revenue, should be "on the table" as part of a deficit reduction plan; and

(4) any budget plan to reduce the deficit must follow this precept.

**SEC. 602. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS.**

It is the sense of the House that in achieving the deficit reduction targets outlined in section 201, the importance of low-income programs that help those most in need should be taken into consideration.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to make a unanimous consent request.

I believe that we've agreed to divide the time in a different way.

I would like to yield to the gentleman, my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will claim time in opposition, but I will yield half my time, 5 minutes, to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee will control 15 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, a further unanimous consent request. I would like to yield half of my time, 7½ minutes, to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio will control that time.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have the honor tonight of representing the budget that is endorsed by Simpson and Bowles. This is the only bipartisan budget that the House of Representatives will be able to consider in this budget cycle. This is the first time that a Simpson-Bowles budget has been allowed on the floor of the House or the Senate. This is a historic night, and I hope that Members will appreciate this opportunity.

This is one of the most partisan weeks in Washington, and this is the only bipartisan way to solve the Nation's problems. This is the only budget that has a chance of getting through both the House and the Senate. I hope Members will appreciate this opportunity.

Members have expressed interest, but in this partisan week, we've been hammered by forces on both the left and the right, people who do not want America to solve its problems in a sensible and fair manner.

To illustrate what we're doing here, the Wall Street Journal today had a graph of the different budget alternatives.

The top line here is assuming current policies. It is clear trouble for the Nation because we're not reducing the deficit.

The blue line here is the White House budget, which makes considerable progress in solving our problems.

The bottom line here is the GOP plan, which is tough and completely partisan.

There's not a single Democrat in the country that will support that. So it's a budget to nowhere. It's a bridge to nowhere.

In between the White House budget and the GOP plan is the bipartisanship proposal, the Simpson-Bowles-endorsed budget. It's very tough on deficits, it gets the job done, and it gets the job done in a bipartisan fashion.

I hope my colleagues will focus on this budget alternative. We have precious few minutes to debate this, a total of 15 minutes, when the other side had 4 hours. This is a David versus Goliath situation. But I hope not only Members of this body will pay attention, but the public back home, because they want us to solve our problems in a peaceable and fair fashion. They're tired of political bickering. We have the chance in this House tonight to stop the political bickering and pass a good, tough, and fair budget for America.

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

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes. I thank Mr. COOPER for his courtesy and his partnership.

I want to begin by saying something nice about PAUL RYAN. PAUL RYAN has got one of the toughest jobs in the country. It's like herding cats to get new guys, old guys, and everybody else to put together the budget that he has for the last 2 years.

However, as Mr. COOPER indicated, his budget is a Republican budget. Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget is a Democratic budget.

There's an organization called PolitiFact which sort of checks out what public figures say about certain things. This particular chart, Pants on Fire, was awarded for the biggest lie of 2011, and that was those who claimed that Mr. RYAN's last budget ended Medicare as we know it. It got the distinction of being Pants on Fire for all of 2011.

As Mr. COOPER indicated, we have been viciously attacked from the left and the right; and when you know you have a good deal is when the left and the right are pounding the snot out of you. That's what's happening here today.

So I want to give some Pants on Fire to some of the claims that are being made.

The claim that this creates a path for Medicare premium support, if you're making that argument, your pants are on fire.

This slashes benefits for Social Security recipients. False. Your pants are on fire.

This is a \$2 trillion tax hike. False. Your pants are on fire.

Repealing the sequester means \$1 trillion in increased spending. False. Your pants are on fire.

This would decimate the defense budget. False. Your pants are on fire.

This encourages tax avoidance by corporations and will ship jobs overseas. Your pants are on fire.

The recession would worsen under Simpson-Bowles. Your pants are on fire.

GDP+1 requires deep cuts in health care, including Medicare. Your pants are on fire.

The Simpson-Bowles budget would decimate domestic programs and force massive cuts. Your pants are on fire.

Anybody that wants to read about it, come see Mr. COOPER or me and we will put your pants out.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will yield myself 2½ minutes, and I will just do 2½ minutes to close.

First of all, the reason I wanted to yield these gentleman half our time is I don't know why they weren't yielded the same amount of time as the other substitutes were. I don't know why that happened, but it's wrong that it happened the way it did. That's why I wanted to give them those 5 minutes.

I also want to congratulate them for putting a plan on the table. It's nice to see. We don't see that too often these days.

I served on the Simpson-Bowles Commission, and I voted against it. I want to explain why, and I will use the numbers from this budget to show.

Number one, it keeps ObamaCare in place. It keeps PPACA in place. This budget does, too, because it's current law. So unless you rescind it, the spending of it, you're keeping ObamaCare in place, and I have a problem with that health care law. I think it's a bad one. This budget, Simpson-Bowles, keeps it in place.

Number two, it doesn't address the real drivers of our debt, which are these health care entitlement programs. Simpson-Bowles didn't do it. This one doesn't either. To me, you're really not dealing with the driver of our debt unless you do that.

Number three, revenues. Based on the baseline, it has \$1.8 trillion in higher revenues. It does mean higher taxes. The last year of this particular budget has higher revenues than the Democratic substitute and the President's budget.

The spending cuts, when you look at the baseline compared to the current law baseline, the one we all measure against here, and you take out the war gimmick, it only has \$27 billion in spending cuts over 10 years; by contrast, our budget has \$3.3 trillion. So I'm not a fan of the war gimmick. If you take out that war thing, it only cuts about \$27 billion off the current law baseline.

It claims that this cuts \$4 trillion in deficit reduction. I'm not sure what baseline is being used to do that. But on the current policy baseline, this really only has \$2.5 trillion in deficit reduction; 72 percent of that comes from tax increases and 28 percent comes from spending reductions.

I want to simply say amen for bringing a plan to the table. I have tremendous respect for Erskine Bowles and

Alan Simpson and JIM COOPER and STEVE LATOURETTE because they're here being a part of the solution by offering a solution and not being a part of the problem.

I think it goes without saying, but it bears repeating, I just don't like the substance of it. I think it's going to end up pushing people into ObamaCare, whose costs will explode, and I think it's going to be bad for our health care system and it doesn't deal with the primary drivers of our debt. And I don't want to see a big tax increase before you deal with the entitlement programs, because then you're just chasing higher spending with higher revenues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I think there's a consensus in America that we have to reduce our deficit. Most of it should be by cutting spending, and some of it should come in revenue contributions from the wealthiest Americans. This proposal does this, so I support it.

I will tell you the other reason I support it. I want our country to have enough resources that a child can get the best education they should. We won't if we don't control the deficit. I want her mother to get a college education and a good job. We won't if we don't control the deficit. I want her grandmother to have Social Security and Medicare. We won't if we don't control the deficit.

If you believe in the progressive things government can do, you must believe and act on reducing the deficit.

This is the best and bipartisan way in front of us. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would now like to yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who actually helped me with the original Cooper-Wolf legislation that helped spawn the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to take 1 minute of our time and give it to Mr. WOLF for a grand total of 2 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

□ 2050

Mr. WOLF. Simon & Garfunkel said in the song "The Boxer": "Man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest." I tell the gentleman, I'm opposed to ObamaCare. I voted against it 26 times.

America is in trouble. America is facing economic collapse. We have \$15.2 trillion debt, and by the end of this

year when you hang your Christmas tree lights up with Christmas tree lights made in China, it will be at \$17 trillion. We're borrowing money from China where there are 25 Catholic bishops under house arrest and hundreds of Protestant pastors under house arrest, and we're doing nothing about it. We're borrowing money from Saudi Arabia that funded the radical madrassas up among the Afghan-Pakistan border that led to 9/11, and that led to where we are, quite frankly, with regard to Afghanistan.

When I go into every high school in my district, I ask the young people, Is the Social Security system sound and will it be there when you retire? In the last 3 years, not one has raised their hand. The seniors in my congressional district know more than this Congress, and they know more than this administration. The President has walked away and has failed, and the Congress—both political parties—have walked away and failed.

I commend my friends, Mr. COOPER and Mr. LATOURETTE, and ask for a "yes" vote on the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

Mr. Chair, nearly six years ago—during the last Republican House majority—I introduced legislation to create an independent, bipartisan commission to address the deficit.

I called it the SAFE Commission, short for Securing America's Future Economy. Everything would be on the table for discussion—entitlements, all other spending programs and tax policy—and like the BRAC process, Congress would be required to vote up or down on the commission's recommendations.

My colleague and good friend JIM COOPER of Tennessee joined me in sponsoring this legislation in 2007 and in subsequent years. It ultimately became the blueprint for the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, more commonly referred to as the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

The Simpson-Bowles Commission produced a credible plan that gained the support of a bipartisan majority of the commission's 18 members. Called "The Moment of Truth," the commission's report made clear that eliminating the debt and deficit will not be easy and that any reform must begin with entitlements. Mandatory and discretionary spending also has to be addressed as well other "sacred cows," including tax reform and defense spending.

Had just three more members of the Simpson-Bowles Commission supported the recommendations, this plan likely would have passed the Congress and be law today. I was disappointed that the President, and his administration, walked away from the commission. The President failed the country. Leadership on both sides of the congressional aisle has done no better. This town is dysfunctional. If the plan had advanced, we would already be on our way in getting our nation's fiscal house in order.

Over the past year and a half I have repeatedly said that while there are some changes I would make, I would support a budget proposal similar to or based on Simpson-Bowles if it came to a vote on the House floor. I want to commend Mr. COOPER and Mr. LATOURETTE today for offering this substitute amendment, which was drafted using the bipartisan principals of the Simpson-Bowles Commission.

Simpson-Bowles provides the framework for the most comprehensive and realistic solution to our nation's fiscal problems. I have submitted the preamble of the Simpson-Bowles Commission report for the RECORD, which, I believe, is a worthy read as we debate the Cooper-LaTourette substitute.

Every Member of Congress and the President know the dire economic situation facing our country: a debt load over \$15.5 trillion, annual deficits over \$1 trillion and unfunded obligations and liabilities over \$65 trillion on the books to pay for programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

We're borrowing this money from nations such as China—which is spying on us, where human rights are an afterthought, and Catholic bishops, Protestant ministers and Tibetan monks are jailed for practicing their faith—and oil-exporting countries such as Saudi Arabia—which funded the radical madrassas on the Afghan-Pakistan border resulting in the rise of the Taliban and al Qaeda.

We always say we want to leave our country better than we found it, and to give our children and grandchildren hope for the future. Just today, noted historian Niall Ferguson testified before my subcommittee and said that, if we do not change course, the debt burden will not only crush our children and grandchildren but also the current generation in the very near future.

According to the Congressional Budget Office's long term estimate, every penny of the federal budget will go to interest on the debt and entitlement spending by 2025. Every penny. That means no money for national defense. No money for homeland security. No money to fix the nation's crumbling bridges and roads. No money for medical research to find a cure for cancer or Alzheimer's or Parkinson's diseases.

We have to find a solution to this debt crisis. Failure is not an option.

Congress and the President must be willing to support a plan that breaks loose from the special interests holding Washington by the throat and return confidence to the country.

Congress and the President also need to be honest with the American people and explain that we cannot solve our nation's financial crisis by just cutting waste, fraud and abuse within discretionary accounts. The real runaway spending is occurring in our out-of-control entitlement costs and the hundreds of billions in annual tax earmarks. Until we reach an agreement that addresses these two drivers of our deficit and debts, we cannot right our fiscal ship of state.

I am—and have been—willing to make the hard choices to ensure a better future for our children and grandchildren. Every two years I take an oath to support and defend the Constitution. I do not sign pledges to lobbyists or special interest groups.

If the Cooper-LaTourette substitute does not pass today, I will vote to support the Ryan budget proposal so that we may move the budget process forward and continue the necessary discussions to address our nation's financial crisis.

But I hope this substitute passes. It is a balanced and ambitious roadmap to address our deficit.

It also is the only truly bipartisan plan that is being offered, and, I believe, the only plan that has the opportunity to be approved by the Senate.



More important, this proposal calls for difficult decisions by finding savings to completely turn off the Budget Control Act's looming sequestration, which could devastate our defense capabilities.

As I mentioned earlier, I do not agree with every recommendation in the Simpson-Bowles plan. Nor do I support every part of the Cooper-LaTourette substitute. For example, I fully support efforts to repeal and replace the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and regret that Cooper-LaTourette is silent on the need to address this issue. I am also concerned about the instructions proposed for the committee of jurisdiction over the federal workforce. This could impact workers including the FBI and CIA agents serving in Afghanistan, CBP agents stopping illegal immigrants coming across our borders, the VA doctors caring for our veterans, and the NIH medical researchers working to develop cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's and autism.

However, the Cooper-LaTourette substitute is the kind of bipartisan cooperation that we must have. It is the kind of forthright, realistic conversation about our nation's fiscal future in which we must engage across the aisle, across the Capitol and down Pennsylvania Avenue if we are to have any hope of coming up with a credible plan to protect the future for our children and grandchildren.

Every Member should support this substitute.

#### PREAMBLE

Throughout our nation's history, Americans have found the courage to do right by our children's future. Deep down, every American knows we face a moment of truth once again. We cannot play games or put off hard choices any longer. Without regard to party, we have a patriotic duty to keep the promise of America to give our children and grandchildren a better life.

Our challenge is clear and inescapable: America cannot be great if we go broke. Our businesses will not be able to grow and create jobs, and our workers will not be able to compete successfully for the jobs of the future without a plan to get this crushing debt burden off our backs.

Ever since the economic downturn, families across the country have huddled around kitchen tables, making tough choices about what they hold most dear and what they can learn to live without. They expect and deserve their leaders to do the same. The American people are counting on us to put politics aside, pull together not pull apart, and agree on a plan to live within our means and make America strong for the long haul.

As members of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, we spent the past eight months studying the same cold, hard facts. Together, we have reached these unavoidable conclusions: The problem is real. The solution will be painful. There is no easy way out. Everything must be on the table. And Washington must lead.

We come from different backgrounds, represent different regions, and belong to different parties, but we share a common belief that America's long-term fiscal gap is unsustainable and, if left unchecked, will see our children and grandchildren living in a poorer, weaker nation. In the words of Senator Tom Coburn, "We keep kicking the can down the road, and splashing the soup all over our grandchildren." Every modest sacrifice we refuse to make today only forces far greater sacrifices of hope and opportunity upon the next generation.

Over the course of our deliberations, the urgency of our mission has become all the

more apparent. The contagion of debt that began in Greece and continues to sweep through Europe shows us clearly that no economy will be immune. If the U.S. does not put its house in order, the reckoning will be sure and the devastation severe.

The President and the leaders of both parties in both chambers of Congress asked us to address the nation's fiscal challenges in this decade and beyond. We have worked to offer an aggressive, fair, balanced, and bipartisan proposal—a proposal as serious as the problems we face. None of us likes every element of our plan, and each of us had to tolerate provisions we previously or presently oppose in order to reach a principled compromise. We were willing to put our differences aside to forge a plan because our nation will certainly be lost without one.

We do not pretend to have all the answers. We offer our plan as the starting point for a serious national conversation in which every citizen has an interest and all should have a say. Our leaders have a responsibility to level with Americans about the choices we face, and to enlist the ingenuity and determination of the American people in rising to the challenge.

We believe neither party can fix this problem on its own, and both parties have a responsibility to do their part. The American people are a long way ahead of the political system in recognizing that now is the time to act. We believe that far from penalizing their leaders for making the tough choices, Americans will punish politicians for backing down—and well they should.

In the weeks and months to come, countless advocacy groups and special interests will try mightily through expensive, dramatic, and heart-wrenching media assaults to exempt themselves from shared sacrifice and common purpose. The national interest, not special interests, must prevail. We urge leaders and citizens with principled concerns about any of our recommendations to follow what we call the Becerra Rule: Don't shoot down an idea without offering a better idea in its place.

After all the talk about debt and deficits, it is long past time for America's leaders to put up or shut up. The era of debt denial is over, and there can be no turning back. We sign our names to this plan because we love our children, our grandchildren, and our country too much not to act while we still have the chance to secure a better future for all our fellow citizens.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, if no one else is seeking time, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to my friend from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) who, along with Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. COSTA, have been invaluable partners in pushing for the Simpson-Bowles budget.

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I really commend Mr. COOPER and Mr. LATOURETTE for bringing this bipartisan proposal forward. It's really time, America, to focus on things we agree on, not things that we disagree on. America wants to see us as uniters, not dividers, in this business down here.

This is the only bipartisan proposal that's going to be offered. It is going to be the framework for whatever deal we come to at the end of this year when we're staring the Bush tax cuts going off and when we're staring extreme defense cuts in the face. This is the proposal, in some form, that will be adopted.

This proposal recognizes there's a balance. It's not perfect. There are

some groups that are very peeved at the altar, quite frankly. But this is the only proposal that's bipartisan. It actually addresses the two big drivers. Our revenues are at an all-time low, the lowest since World War II. You're not going to have a vibrant economy without revenue to support our schools, our infrastructure, our transportation, and our economic development.

Yes, the entitlements are a problem. The gentleman from Wisconsin, while he's not in favor of some of the aspects of the health care bill, adapts all of the savings that we did in the last Congress because they're good, efficient ways to improve the life and solvency of Medicare. Medicare is not a problem because President Bush was evil or President Obama was evil. It's a problem that we've got more people and the baby boomers are retiring, so there are less workers to support them at the end of the day, and great health care that's being driven. So we need to get our act together and support this proposal.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to my friend and classmate from New Hampshire, a cosponsor of this substitute, CHARLIE BASS.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment. The budget presented by my friend from Wisconsin, Congressman RYAN, is a great statement of principle, and I will vote for it. And I suspect that it will pass the House. But it will not be considered by the Senate. The Senate will not accept or pass appropriations at its levels, and there will be no reconciliation this year.

Mr. Chairman, in 9 short months, the Bush-era tax cuts will end, and taxes will go up by \$4.6 trillion, the biggest tax increase in American history. The mindless across-the-board cuts in spending in the sequester will take effect cutting, amongst other programs, defense by over \$400 billion. We'll have a vote to raise this Nation's debt with no accomplishments to justify it. We will have to either renew or repeal the temporary payroll tax holiday, and we'll have to complete our appropriations at higher levels than in this budget, the base budget, or face the specter of continuing resolutions through next year.

The American people have heard the debate on both sides, and they are crying for solutions—not squabbling, not posturing or policy brinksmanship. We all have principles. Compromise is not a capitulation of principle. It never has been. All of the great policy accomplishments of our Nation's history have resulted from the willingness of men and women of principle to attack and resolve crises together through negotiation and, yes, compromise. We have that chance tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I challenge Republicans and Democrats to vote for the

LaTourette-Cooper-Simpson-Bowles bipartisan budget tonight and make America proud of us once again.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend from Pennsylvania, CHAKA FATTAH.

Mr. FATTAH. I rise in support of this bipartisan budget that's being offered that would approach this in a balanced way, that is, with both cuts and additional revenues. It is the basis under which there is a majority support in our country. We have a responsibility to rise to the occasion, and I would hope tonight that we would have Members of this House that could rise above party and do what's right. Let's move the country in a responsible way so that we can continue to make the investments we need so America can live up to its responsibilities to its citizens and to global leadership.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman seek unanimous consent?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Yes.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. LATOURETTE. And in the spirit of unanimous consents, I would ask unanimous consent that 15 of those precious seconds go to Mr. COOPER and that he be permitted to yield those 15 seconds as ever how he sees fit.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATOURETTE. At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to a new Member of the House from the State of Illinois, who has cosponsored this substitute at great political peril, quite frankly; and he deserves to be rewarded by the citizens of Illinois and not punished by the special interest groups of the right or left, BOB DOLD.

Mr. DOLD. I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this. I also want to take the opportunity to thank my friend, PAUL RYAN, for his work on the budget which I think is so critical. As we look at budgets right now, there are not so many of them over in the United States Senate, and when I think about running a business or the families across the country that need to put together a budget, I think it's wrong that the United States Government doesn't have one.

Mr. Chairman, my children were on the floor today. They were here in Washington, D.C.; and when I think about why I came to Washington, D.C., it's because of them, about the American Dream for my children, about providing a country that's better off for them.

We've got \$15.5 trillion in debt; we borrow 42 cents of every single dollar. It's time that we put people before politics and progress before partisanship

so that we can get something done. It's about providing solutions for our country so that we can come together, have a document that we can use to be able to move the country forward. We need to cut back and rein in spending. We need to be able to provide that certainty for American businesses that are out there.

This is our time. We, Republicans and Democrats alike, have to put the party bickering aside. We have to focus on the solutions that are out there. Am I going to like all of it? The answer is, no, I'm not going to like all of it.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. I yield the gentleman 15 additional seconds.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank Mr. LATOURETTE.

The point is simply this, Mr. Chairman, for my children and yours, for the children of the next generation, the time is now. We have to stand up, we have to put together a budget, we have to do so, and we have to find the common ground and move forward. We have to lower our corporate tax rates so that we can be more competitive in the global marketplace. This is our time. I'm asking everyone for a "yes" vote on the LaTourette-Cooper amendment.

I thank my colleague from Tennessee for his leadership and my colleague from Ohio, as well.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 1¼ minutes remaining, including his additional 15 seconds; the gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. COOPER. Do my colleagues have any further speakers, or should I start the process of closing?

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. RYAN has the right to close on behalf of the committee, and I am the last speaker on our side. Unless Mr. RYAN wants to give us the rest of his time, we can finish this right now.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I'll keep what I have.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

On November 2 of last fall, 100 of our colleagues signed a letter, the so-called "go big" letter, urging the supercommittee to do the right thing. And let me quote:

To succeed, all options for mandatory and discretionary spending and revenues must be on the table. In addition, we know from other bipartisan frameworks that a target of some \$4 trillion in deficit reduction is necessary to stabilize our debt as a share of the economy.

□ 2100

This is what the Simpson-Bowles budget does, and only the Simpson-Bowles budget.

For those of my colleagues who are worried about certain features of this, do not confuse the Simpson-Bowles re-

port with a budget. A budget is just a framework. It's an outline. It instructs the committees to come up with certain savings, and the committees have the discretion to come up with those savings in whatever way they choose. It's true that the Simpson-Bowles report is one way of achieving those savings, but this is a guide, a target for the committees of jurisdiction.

That's what we must do tonight and do on a bipartisan basis. We must come together for the good of the country. We must put our Nation first. We must set partisanship aside. This is the only way that we can pass a budget in the House and Senate this year, which we must have.

It's easy to be critical; it's hard to perform. Let's make it happen for America tonight. We have an opportunity within our hands to give the United States a budget. All of the other plans are purely partisan and they don't have a prayer. Let's build a bridge to the future. Let's build a real budget that can pass both Houses of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support the Simpson-Bowles-endorsed alternative budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Again, I want to thank my partner, Mr. COOPER. I also want to thank all the brave Republicans and Democrats who are going to vote for this, all the brave Republicans and Democrats who cosponsored it, because this is not an easy vote.

Mr. Chairman, the last three elections have been the wildest elections I have seen in my political life. It has swung between party and party and party, and 2012 is going to be the same thing. But I'll tell you what's different. It's not the Democrats are going to take over or the Republicans are going to take over. The mood in the country is: Throw the bums out. Throw them all out and replace them with new people. Americans are screaming for us to take off our red jerseys on this side, to take off the blue jerseys on that side, and put on the red, white, and blue jerseys of the United States of America.

Our proposal, inspired by the Simpson-Bowles fiscal commission, authorized by the President of the United States, has been viciously attacked from the left and the right. And so I think, COOPER, we're on to something.

I want to make an observation, from a pretty famous American, made just a month ago in the Rose Garden down at the White House. The quote is:

This may be an election year, but the American people have no patience for gridlock and just a reflexive partisanship, and just paying attention to poll numbers and the next election instead of the next generation and what we can do to strengthen opportunity for all Americans. Americans don't have the luxury to put off tough decisions, and neither should we.

President Barack Obama, February 21, 2012.

I have heard a lot of people say that this is hard work, that not now. Well, if not now, when? And if not this, what? Ever?

Mr. Chairman, we're asking that Members tonight stand up, that they stand up to the bloodsuckers in this town that take \$5, \$10, \$15, \$25 from our constituents to pretend to defend causes on their behalf. We're asking people to stand up to pledges they had made 20 years ago when we didn't have a \$15 trillion deficit owed to China. We're asking people to stand up to honor their pledge that they made on the opening day of the 112th Congress to defend the United States of America from all enemies foreign and domestic. We ask that our colleagues stand up to America's biggest domestic threat and enemy, the \$15 trillion—soon to be \$22 trillion—that's staring us in the face.

The time is now. We've got to get it done. This is the only bipartisan approach. And this is the only thing that has the chance to be adopted by both parties and the President of the United States, who authorized Simpson-Bowles.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I'll close by saying, Mr. Chairman, how I started.

I want to congratulate the gentlemen for just showing a plan and coming together. But I would simply say that the President disavowed this plan already. The Senator majority leader said he's not doing a budget this year, so I don't think anything is passing over there.

I want to reserve the rest of my comments for the substance of this. And I'll reveal the private conversation I had with Simpson and Bowles as to why I was not supporting Simpson and Bowles, as a member of that commission.

This doesn't go big. This doesn't tackle the problem. It doesn't do the big things. You can never get the debt under control if you don't deal with our health care entitlement programs. They're the ones that are the big drivers of our debt.

So, not only in addition to the fact that this keeps ObamaCare in place and it doesn't do Medicare and Medicaid reform—which are essential toward preventing the debt crisis—by repealing the tax exclusion, as Simpson-Bowles plans on doing, purports to do, you're going to cause all of these employers to drop health insurance for their employees and push everybody into the health care law, into ObamaCare, and the costs will explode. So I believe that it will do more harm than good at the end of the day.

I just don't think it's a balanced plan. I mean, if you look at the raw numbers, 72 percent of it is tax increases and 28 percent of it is spending reductions. That, to me, is just not balanced. We don't want to create a new revenue machine for government without getting these entitlements under

control. Let's not chase ever-higher spending with ever-higher revenues.

So I appreciate the sincerity and the bipartisan nature of this, but I just don't think the substance of this bill is right. I think it's going to worsen our fiscal situation by piling people onto the health care law, and it's going to hasten the bankruptcy of Medicare. It's still going to stretch Medicaid, which grows by a third in eligibility, a program that's falling apart by the seams. And I believe these tax rate increases, the revenue increases, will just be used to fuel more spending. That's why I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, on the substance of it.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-423 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 BY MR. MULVANEY OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CLEAVER of Missouri.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. COOPER of Tennessee.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

Amendment No. 1 in the Nature of a Substitute Offered by Mr. MULVANEY.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 0, noes 414, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

NOES—414

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Amodei

Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow

Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benishak  
Berg  
Berkley

Berman  
Biggert  
Billray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Buchon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah

Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garamendi  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinche  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Kucinich  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta

Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loehsack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Long  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Robby

Roe (TN) Scott, Austin  
 Rogers (AL) Scott, David  
 Rogers (KY) Sensenbrenner  
 Rogers (MI) Serrano  
 Rohrabacher Sessions  
 Rokita Sherman  
 Rooney Shimkus  
 Ros-Lehtinen Shuster  
 Roskam Simpson  
 Ross (AR) Sires  
 Ross (FL) Slaughter  
 Rothman (NJ) Smith (NE)  
 Roybal-Allard Smith (NJ)  
 Royce Smith (TX)  
 Runyan Smith (WA)  
 Ruppberger Southerland  
 Rush Speier  
 Ryan (WI) Stark  
 Sánchez, Linda Stearns  
 T. Stivers  
 Sanchez, Loretta Stutzman  
 Sarbanes Sullivan  
 Scalise Sutton  
 Schakowsky Terry  
 Schiff Thompson (CA)  
 Schilling Thompson (MS)  
 Schmidt Thompson (PA)  
 Schock Thornberry  
 Schrader Tiberi  
 Schwartz Tierney  
 Schweikert Tipton  
 Scott (SC) Tonko  
 Scott (VA) Tsongas

Turner (NY) Turner (OH)  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Webster  
 Welch  
 West  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Woolsey  
 Yarmuth  
 Yoder  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

Jackson Lee  
 (TX)  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Kildee  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lee (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lynch  
 Markey  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 Miller (NC)  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Oliver  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Pelosi  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Price (NC)  
 Richardson  
 Richmond  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard

Rahall  
 Reed  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Reyes  
 Ribble  
 Rigell  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Miller, George  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Myrick  
 Neugebauer  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Nunnelee  
 Olson  
 Owens  
 Palazzo  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Pence  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Petri  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Polis  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price (GA)  
 Quayle  
 Quigley

NOT VOTING—17  
 Cardoza Jackson (IL)  
 Clay Kaptur  
 Deutch Larson (CT)  
 Filner Mack  
 Grijalva Meeks  
 Israel Paul

Adams  
 Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Altmire  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Austria  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Baldwin  
 Barletta  
 Barrow  
 Bartlett  
 Barton (TX)  
 Bass (NH)  
 Benishek  
 Berg  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Bonamici  
 Bonner  
 Bono Mack  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brooks  
 Broun (GA)  
 Buchanan  
 Bucshon  
 Buerkle  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Campbell  
 Canseco  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Carney  
 Carter  
 Cassidy  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Chandler  
 Cicilline  
 Coble  
 Coffman (CO)  
 Cole  
 Conaway  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Cravaack  
 Crawford

NOES—314  
 Crenshaw  
 Critz  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (KY)  
 DeGette  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Dold  
 Donnelly (IN)  
 Dreier  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellmers  
 Emerson  
 Eshoo  
 Farenthold  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Flake  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foy  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gallegly  
 Garamendi  
 Gardner  
 Garrett  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Gohmert  
 Gonzalez  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Griffith (VA)  
 Grimm  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hall  
 Hanabusa  
 Hanna  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayworth  
 Heck  
 Heinrich

Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Southerland  
 Speier  
 Stearns  
 Rivera  
 Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Sullivan  
 Terry  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner (NY)  
 Turner (OH)  
 Upton  
 Visclosky  
 Royce  
 Runyan  
 Ruppberger  
 Walden  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Walz (MN)  
 Webster  
 West  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

□ 2132

Messrs. MANZULLO, DENHAM, CLEAVER, GOWDY, and AUSTRIA changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against: Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 143, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 143, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 314, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]  
 AYES—107

Ackerman Blumenauer Carson (IN)  
 Andrews Brady (PA) Castor (FL)  
 Baca Brown (FL) Chu  
 Bass (CA) Butterfield Clarke (MI)  
 Becerra Capuano Clarke (NY)  
 Bishop (GA) Carnahan Cleaver

Adams  
 Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Altmire  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Austria  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Baldwin  
 Barletta  
 Barrow  
 Bartlett  
 Barton (TX)  
 Bass (NH)  
 Benishek  
 Berg  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Bonamici  
 Bonner  
 Bono Mack  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brooks  
 Broun (GA)  
 Buchanan  
 Bucshon  
 Buerkle  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Campbell  
 Canseco  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Carney  
 Carter  
 Cassidy  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Chandler  
 Cicilline  
 Coble  
 Coffman (CO)  
 Cole  
 Conaway  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Cravaack  
 Crawford

Hensarling  
 Heger  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Hochul  
 Holden  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurt  
 Issa  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Keating  
 Kelly  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kissell  
 Kline  
 Kucinich  
 Labrador  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Landry  
 Langevin  
 Lankford  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Latta  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeb  
 Loebsack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Long  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan  
 Lummis  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Maloney  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCotter  
 McHenry  
 McIntyre

NOT VOTING—10

Cardoza Jackson (IL)  
 Clay Mack  
 Deutch Meeks  
 Filner Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2139

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for: Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 144, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. COOPER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 38, noes 382, answered “present” 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]  
 AYES—38

Andrews Boswell Clyburn  
 Bass (NH) Buerkle Cooper  
 Boren Carney Costa

Cuellar  
Dent  
Dold  
Fattah  
Gibson  
Himes  
Johnson (IL)  
Kind  
Larsen (WA)  
LaTourette

Lipinski  
Lummis  
Meehan  
Perlmutter  
Peterson  
Petri  
Platts  
Polis  
Quigley  
Reed

Schrader  
Schwartz  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Simpson  
Visclosky  
Watt  
Wolf  
Young (AK)

NOES—382

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Amodi  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggart  
Billray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Culberson  
Cummins  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)

DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
LoBiondo  
Loebsack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Long  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem

Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peters  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Rahall  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richardson  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shuster  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Souterland  
Speier  
Stark  
Stearns

Stivers  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner (NY)  
Turner (OH)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Waxman  
Webster  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Woolsey  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

(Rept. No. 112-424) on the resolution (H. Res. 600) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4281) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 597 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 112.

Will the gentleman from Kansas kindly retake the chair.

□ 2147

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, with Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112-423 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HONDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112-423.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2022:

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

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

- Fiscal year 2013: \$2,197,368,000.
- Fiscal year 2014: \$2,612,409,000.
- Fiscal year 2015: \$2,881,422,000.
- Fiscal year 2016: \$3,106,522,000.
- Fiscal year 2017: \$3,301,143,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$3,452,783,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,660,783,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$3,855,297,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$4,043,898,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$4,236,911,000.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Connolly (VA) Moran

NOT VOTING—9

Cardoza Jackson (IL) Paul  
Deutch Mack Rangel  
Filner Meeks Towns

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2146

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 145, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4281, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Mr. WEBSTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

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

Fiscal year 2013: -\$74,614,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$115,212,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$156,357,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$220,790,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$279,347,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$291,219,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$342,648,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$356,393,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$353,732,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$345,788,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$3,309,878,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$3,255,223,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,353,099,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,524,427,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,677,543,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,829,402,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$4,044,242,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$4,257,245,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,444,546,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,698,785,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$3,287,716,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$3,261,796,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$3,352,964,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$3,532,436,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$3,649,001,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,783,230,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,998,222,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$4,194,577,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,395,373,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,657,085,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: -\$1,090,348,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: -\$649,387,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: -\$471,542,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: -\$425,914,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: -\$347,858,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$330,447,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$337,439,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$339,280,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$351,475,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$420,174,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$17,467,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$18,240,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$18,804,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$19,308,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$19,733,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$20,129,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$20,506,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$20,867,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$21,223,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$21,621,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: \$12,655,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2014: \$13,331,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2015: \$13,787,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016: \$14,152,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$14,390,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$14,577,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$14,755,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$14,927,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$15,107,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$15,357,000,000,000.

## SEC. 2. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2022 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$659,719,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$669,687,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$532,574,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$585,818,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$526,836,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$546,976,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$528,581,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$539,638,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$539,841,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$536,425,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$551,797,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$537,397,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$560,862,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$551,693,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$571,661,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$561,905,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$586,462,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$574,908,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$601,815,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$595,149,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$73,837,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,498,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$66,309,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$66,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,079,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$65,518,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$59,507,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,501,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,004,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,334,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,068,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,237,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,148,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$63,132,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$66,977,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$63,515,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$68,872,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$65,132,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$71,074,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$67,005,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,106,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,204,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,096,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,135,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,366,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,957,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,701,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,875,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,331,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,142,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,034,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,687,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,742,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,260,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,821,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,127,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,936,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,068,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,073,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,163,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,101,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,223,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,537,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,344,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,580,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,022,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,198,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,741,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,124,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,586,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,336,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,523,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,308,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,223,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,476,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,896,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,984,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,716,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,693,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,024,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,772,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,969,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,207,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,398,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,941,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,221,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,503,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,558,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,232,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,348,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,517,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,593,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$51,636,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$54,599,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,234,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$55,593,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$54,455,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$57,150,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$55,777,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,228,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,892,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,723,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,721,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,214,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,944,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,796,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,333,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,887,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,362,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:



- (A) New budget authority, \$17,823,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$17,343,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$18,066,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$17,617,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$18,592,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,131,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$18,947,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,495,000,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$10,502,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,855,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$19,282,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,586,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$18,044,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,505,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$17,529,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$3,152,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$19,060,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,846,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$20,636,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$3,592,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$22,134,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$853,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$24,229,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$362,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$25,554,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$8,580,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$30,812,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,616,000,000.
- (8) Transportation (400):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$105,774,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$105,474,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$112,473,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$108,565,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$119,935,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$113,853,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$126,924,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$119,215,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$133,899,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$124,357,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$130,944,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$127,535,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$132,922,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$130,484,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$134,989,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$132,385,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$137,095,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$133,770,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$139,283,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$136,230,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$26,408,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,335,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$29,083,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,381,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$28,155,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,848,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$27,273,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,966,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$27,679,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,929,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$28,124,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,607,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$28,575,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,684,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$29,381,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,194,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$30,215,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,943,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$31,072,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,813,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$215,477,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$216,894,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$133,185,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$134,848,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$108,627,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$108,401,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$113,637,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$113,530,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$124,002,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$120,819,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$128,980,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$127,822,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$133,164,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$131,731,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$135,479,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$134,698,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$138,104,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$137,088,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$141,118,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$139,748,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$392,643,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$383,806,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$490,114,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$475,603,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$558,189,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$552,620,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$605,699,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$609,918,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$649,911,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$652,349,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$687,213,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$685,849,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$729,703,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$728,299,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$784,569,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$772,420,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$825,999,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$823,927,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$882,501,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$879,975,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$528,399,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$528,311,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$553,553,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$552,856,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$579,388,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$578,948,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$629,995,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$629,761,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$648,217,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$647,496,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$670,465,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$670,015,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$733,652,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$733,400,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$786,074,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$785,321,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$837,885,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$837,396,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$917,799,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$917,656,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$600,167,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$589,067,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$622,434,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$611,955,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$620,983,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$617,542,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$611,032,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$614,698,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$604,154,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$602,171,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$607,469,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$600,968,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$625,364,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$623,236,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$640,917,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$638,419,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$658,585,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$655,964,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$681,071,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$683,338,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$53,216,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$53,296,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2014:
- (A) New budget authority, \$31,892,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,002,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2015:
- (A) New budget authority, \$35,135,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$35,210,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2016:
- (A) New budget authority, \$38,953,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$38,991,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:
- (A) New budget authority, \$43,140,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,140,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$47,590,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,590,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$52,429,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$52,429,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$57,425,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,425,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$62,604,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$62,604,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$68,079,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$68,079,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
- Fiscal year 2013:
- (A) New budget authority, \$149,224,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$145,567,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$156,328,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$152,548,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$157,222,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$156,643,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$163,556,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$163,960,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$162,499,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$162,122,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$161,341,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$160,695,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$171,034,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$170,211,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$176,196,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$174,995,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$181,451,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$180,089,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$192,540,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$191,089,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$71,906,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,625,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,516,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,844,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,602,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$68,316,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$68,761,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$70,667,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$68,641,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$70,168,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,425,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$71,745,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$72,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$72,514,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$74,692,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$73,924,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$77,213,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,341,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$83,484,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$82,533,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,636,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,466,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,311,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,862,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,950,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,268,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,692,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,969,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,287,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,231,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,186,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,967,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,097,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,638,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,877,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,490,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,771,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,274,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,715,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,190,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$347,247,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$347,247,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$361,372,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$361,372,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$400,420,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$400,420,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$464,626,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$464,626,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$532,290,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$532,290,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$599,375,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$599,375,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$660,922,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$660,922,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$712,948,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$712,948,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$752,887,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$752,887,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$794,191,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$794,191,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.00  
(B) Outlays, \$0.00  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.00  
(B) Outlays, \$0.00  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.00  
(B) Outlays, \$0.00  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.00  
(B) Outlays, \$0.00  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.00  
(B) Outlays, \$0.00  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.00  
(B) Outlays, \$0.00  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.00  
(B) Outlays, \$0.00  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.00  
(B) Outlays, \$0.00  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.00  
(B) Outlays, \$0.00  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.00  
(B) Outlays, \$0.00  
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2013:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$75,736,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$75,736,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2014:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$77,697,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$77,697,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$83,531,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$83,531,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,226,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$85,226,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$93,507,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$93,507,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$97,066,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$97,066,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$103,845,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$103,845,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$102,878,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$102,878,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$107,168,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$107,168,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$109,655,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$109,655,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2150

Mr. HONDA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this session of Congress represents a unique opportunity in history to accomplish something great. The pending sequester, the overwhelming number of tax provisions set to expire, and the threat of growing debt must force us to make decisions. Inaction is not an option.

The amendment before us today is more than just a set of numbers. It's a pathway forward. It's a solution. The Progressive Caucus developed the solution by listening to what the American people want. They want shared responsibility and prosperity. They want us to protect the social safety network. They want basic fairness. They want fiscal sanity. That is exactly what this plan provides.

First and foremost, we focused our attention where it is needed the most: job creation. This proposal is estimated to create 3.3 million jobs over the next 2 years because it uses every single tool in the Federal Government's arsenal: One, direct and local hire programs; two, targeted tax incentives; and, three, widespread domestic investments.

Instead, the Republican budget relies on trickle-down voodoo economics that haven't worked before and won't work now. Projections show that the GOP plan would kill 4.1 million jobs in the next 2 years alone.

Americans deserve proven solutions, a growing economy, and financial security for themselves and their loved ones. The Progressive Caucus is listening: We invest in America now and lay the foundation for a globally competitive future.

We need to invest in human capital, education, first-class infrastructure, and cutting edge technologies. This is the kind of thinking that built a successful economy in the past, and it is the real roadmap to prosperity.

Secondly, the Progressive Caucus believes that Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security are not up for negotiation. The Republican budget treats our seniors and working families like lab rats, subjecting these important programs to grand conservative experiments.

What the Budget for All proves is that we don't need to put these essential programs on the chopping block. Their assumptions are wrong, and we can do better.

As the primary author of the Budget for All, I'm proud of the transparency of what we put before the American people. What we've released to the public and what we put online is very clear about the policies we stand for and those we oppose.

Instead, the Republican budget focuses so much on what they don't like about the President's proposal that we are left with little details about how they feel they achieve their end goals. It is so scarce on details that The Washington Post referred to it as "dangerous and intentionally vague."

It claims lower taxes for all, but there are no real details on how to get there. It claims substantial deficit reduction, but assumes trillions in lost revenue will magically return.

The Republican plan hides the real substance behind their proposals because that is the truly hard part of governing. Being honest with the American people isn't easy, but in these difficult times it's the very least that we can do.

I urge my colleagues to support honest and responsible solutions.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment,

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I want to congratulate the Progressive Caucus on producing a budget that actually addresses our crushing deficit, unlike the President's budget. Their budget produces deficit numbers that are right in line with the House Budget Committee's path to prosperity.

The difference between the two is that the Republican plan reduces the deficit by reorganizing our government services in a much more efficient and streamlined structure, saving trillions of dollars, while the Progressive Democrats would radically increase spending, supported by \$6.8 trillion in new taxes over the next decade.

What does that mean in real numbers, \$6.8 trillion? It comes to about \$22,000 of taxes for every, man, woman, and child in America. That's about \$88,000 for a family of four. Don't worry, we're told, we're not taxing working class families, just rich people and corporations.

Let's get a few things straight here. First, it turns out that many of the rich people aren't rich, and they aren't even people. They are small businesses filing under Subchapter S, the very same small businesses that we're depending upon to create two-thirds of the new jobs that Americans desperately need. To whack small businesses with crushing new financial burdens and then expect them to create more jobs is simply absurd.

Second, remember that ultimately businesses do not pay business taxes. Business taxes can only be paid in one

of three ways: They're paid by consumers through higher prices; they're paid by employees through lower wages or no wages at all as jobs disappear; or they are paid by investors, mainly pension plans, through lower earnings. That's the only three ways they can possibly be paid.

Let's talk about fairness. In 2008, the top 1 percent of taxpayers, folks earning about \$344,000 per year, earned about 17 percent of all income and paid 37 percent of all income taxes. As a class, they are paying their fair share, but the Progressives are right that some individuals within this class pay less than their fair share because of their disproportionate access to tax loopholes. The Progressives rightly want to get rid of some of these loopholes, and that's a good thing. But at the same time, they want to increase loopholes for others. They don't mind the government picking winners among their friends; they just want to do the picking.

The Republican plan calls for the ultimate elimination of these loopholes while lowering overall tax rates so that no American pays more than a third of their earnings to the government. That is fairness.

The underlying problem that's destroying our Nation's finances can be summed up with three simple numbers: 35, 33, and 76.

Between 2002 and 2012, population and inflation combined grew 35 percent. Despite the recession and the recent tax cuts, Federal revenues have grown 33 percent in the same period. Very close.

The third number is what is killing our country. Seventy-six percent is the increase in spending, twice the rate of our revenues, twice the rate of inflation and population growth. By the way, has anybody seen a 76 percent increase in the quality of our roads or our institutions or our law enforcement or our border security? We paid for it, but we're not getting it. That's what's out of control about this administration.

No nation has ever taxed and spent its way to prosperity, but many nations have taxed and spent their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy.

When we're told this is the worst recession since the Depression, I remember a time much more recently when we had not only double-digit unemployment, but double-digit inflation, mile-long lines around gas stations, interest rates at 21½ percent. That was the end of the Carter administration.

Maybe we don't remember those days as vividly. It's because they didn't last very long. We elected Ronald Reagan, whose policies were very different than the current administration. He cut spending as a percentage of GDP. He cut the top marginal income tax rate from 70 percent all the way down to 28 percent. He reduced the regulatory burdens crushing the economy, and he produced one of the most prolonged periods of economic expansion in our Nation's history. This isn't a partisan pol-

icy. Warren Harding, Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, and most recently Bill Clinton all followed similar policies with similar results.

Phil Graham recently estimated that if the economy today had tracked with the Reagan economy, 17 million more Americans would be working right now and income would be \$5,700 higher per person.

We need to choose wisely, Mr. Chairman, here and at the polls in November.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman ELLISON.

□ 2200

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, allow me to go right to the heart of the matter. We're talking about budgets and how our Nation shall spend money over the course of years. What we're dealing with now is we're dealing with unemployment, and this budget is no decent budget at all unless it deals with jobs. Now, the Budget for All, which is the Progressive Caucus budget, is all about jobs. We make investments in people developing our workforce, developing education and putting Americans back to work.

America has work that needs to be done. We've got about \$2 trillion worth of crumbling infrastructure which Republicans don't invest in. America has jobs that need to be done. We've got people that need to do them, and we have privileged Americans in corporations who have the money that, if they were to give it in the way of taxes as the dues we pay to live in a civilized society, we could combine these three elements to put America back to work.

Now, I'm proud to stand with the Budget for All because it makes the priority of jobs the key thing, but it also invests in America's future and reduces the deficit. We're serious about that. I'd like to make sure that others are, too, and don't just say so.

We've got to put America back to work. The Budget for All does that. We urge support for the Budget for All.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the Member from Indiana, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as our national recession near its fourth year, unemployment stays above 8 percent and gas prices continue to skyrocket, our brave men and women continue to serve in harm's way overseas, this Nation is in trouble, and I wonder which of the following choices would Americans choose if they had to pick one. Would it be A, an across-the-board income tax increase? Would it be B, a new tax increase on gas, electricity, and natural gas? Would it be C, a cut in funding for our soldiers to levels that the Pentagon warns is dangerous to our national security?

Now, I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the American people, if given the choice, would prefer to have an option

D, none of the above. But, unfortunately, they're not given this choice in the Progressive Caucus budget. It forces, instead, all three unpalatable options on the American public that is already struggling.

It raises taxes in every income tax bracket to the tune of \$4.4 trillion, it raises the price at the pump and on utility bills ever higher by creating a new tax on all fossil fuel-based energy sources, and it makes no attempt to offset the defense spending sequester. And while I do commend my colleagues for making the effort to develop solutions to the Nation's problems and getting specific on those solutions, I think the American people can do better.

We House Republicans have given Americans that none-of-the-above option through our own budget. Our budget responsibly solves our Nation's debt challenges, it responsibly cuts our spending, it avoids a tax increase, and it strengthens programs like Medicare and Medicaid, important to so many Americans. Most importantly, it does so by lightening the burden of government on hardworking American taxpayers, not burdening them with more government.

I respect my colleagues, and urge my colleagues, however, to vote against the Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our next speaker, who is the founder of the Progressive Caucus, the proud Congresswoman WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Budget for All rearranges our national security spending priorities in a way that keeps America safe instead of keeping America bogged down in expensive, immoral wars. By bringing our troops home from Afghanistan, we save over \$1 trillion over 10 years. We reinvest that money in the American people, their education, their health care, their infrastructure, their retirement security, and their hopes and their dreams.

There's money left over to beef up SMART Security priorities—development, diplomacy, foreign and humanitarian aid—the tools that will truly combat terrorism and protect our Nation in the 21st century.

We get rid of ancient, obsolete Cold War weapons systems that are doing nothing to address today's security threats as well. We also take care of our veterans, and we dramatically reduce our nuclear arsenal.

I urge all Members, read this budget and embrace it, because it truly reflects the values and priorities of the American people—the Congressional Progressive Caucus' Budget for All.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. I thank my colleague, Mr. McCLINTOCK.

Mr. Chairman, the Progressive Caucus budget amendment creates devastating cuts to our Nation's defense. Our Federal Government's primary responsibility under the Constitution is

to provide for the common defense for the security of all Americans. This budget amendment causes the Federal Government to abdicate this important responsibility.

This substitute amendment guts the Defense Department by calling for cuts that are \$900 billion deeper than the nearly half a trillion dollars that the President already proposed to be cut from the defense plan that he proposed just 1 year ago.

This substitute has no specific plan to replace the sequester, which Secretary of Defense Panetta said would have catastrophic consequences and which would devastate our Department of Defense.

This amendment ignores our constitutional responsibility and tells our troops in the field that, regardless of where the mission is and what state it's in, that we're going to cut all funding. This comes despite the fact that U.S. commanders have made it clear that there will be a continued role for the U.S. in Afghanistan even after Afghanistan security forces assume lead responsibility for security.

This budget amendment also ignores the economic impact that deep defense cuts will have on low- and middle-income Americans that work for the Department of Defense or work for suppliers of the Department of Defense.

Our Nation suffers from a growing number of low-income families and high levels of poverty. We also have more people on food stamps than ever before. This is not the time to cut spending on the one Federal Government function that is specifically called for in our Constitution.

The American people, as you hear from the other side, are looking for fairness. Cutting defense funding, as our colleagues are trying to do here, is not fair to the economic and military security of this country.

This proposed budget amendment, as well as the President's budget, which was soundly defeated a few minutes ago, are not fair for America. What is fair is to set forth a budget which improves the atmosphere for job creation and which stimulates economic growth by relying on Main Street American solutions.

If the Progressive Caucus and the Obama budgets are looking for fairness, they should not be looking to cut the Department of Defense. I urge my colleagues to oppose this substitute amendment so that we can ensure the safety and security of the brave men and women serving our country and for the American workers who support them.

In the alternative, I urge my colleagues to support the House Budget Committee's FY 2013 budget. It is the budget that will restore America's promise, prosperity, and security for future generations.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, next I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California, the gentlelady from where there's a there, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first thank Congressman HONDA, Congressmen GRIJALVA and ELLISON, and all of the CPC members for their tireless effort on this budget, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, and all our members who really put so much time and effort into this. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of the Budget for All because the American people must have an honest budget that does not blame the poor for the problems created by the superrich.

The Tea Party Republican budget for the 1 percent does just that. Their budget only cuts programs for our seniors, our children, and our Nation's working poor and vulnerable, while giving away \$4.4 trillion in tax cuts for the superrich. And for all of their heartless cuts that end Medicare, hurt our children, close schools, and fire police officers, they don't even come close to balancing the budget because they can't stop themselves from giving away trillions to the special interest Big Oil and the top 1 percent.

I strongly believe that a budget is a moral document that shows our Nation's priorities and values. Like the Congressional Black Caucus' budget, the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget is a moral budget, one that invests in the future of all Americans and one that believes that our greatest days lie ahead.

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

Mr. HONDA. I yield the gentlelady 15 additional seconds.

□ 2210

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just mention also, in closing, that our budget also ends the combat operation in Afghanistan. The American people want the war to end. We have decided no more funding for combat operations; there's no military solution. We do provide the funds to protect our troops and contractors and to bring them home safely in an orderly fashion.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my friend and colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is good to get a chance to have this debate that is unique on the House floor, to be able to go through this. Obviously, we look forward to the day that the Senate has this same kind of dialog back and forth on what are spending priorities in the budget. It's now well over 1,000 days since the Senate has had any kind of conversation like this. It's terrific to be able to have this.

There are some areas of this budget that I'd take a look at and I would say I would completely concur with. This budget takes on things like the AMT fix, the alternative minimum tax, and tries to resolve that over time. I think that's a terrific idea, and we need to get a chance to move forward on that. But it does some things that I don't think many people in my district would be in favor of.

Many people in my district look at the tax policy and say it's incredibly

complicated and complex. This budget moves the tax system from six tiers to 10 tiers and dramatically increases the complexity of our Tax Code.

It also changes the death tax to a 65 percent death tax. It puts Uncle Sam squarely on the end of coffins, and as the grieving family is there, Uncle Sam is standing there saying, I'm waiting for my cut. I think that's the wrong way to go.

There's a large carbon tax that's included with this. With gas prices going up, energy prices on the rise, I don't think this is the time to also increase the price of energy again in that.

It also raises taxes, ironically enough, on McDonalds and on fast-food places, to be able to punish them, I guess, for supplying food to people that are on the run. It increases taxes on that. It also provides public funding for elections so that people that are running for office, like myself and others, will actually get public funding for that, which many people don't want to be a part of.

It does also provide State flexibility though, but it's State flexibility for a new system of health care oversight. We'd like to see it have flexibility for things like Medicare and Medicaid and such.

So, with that, I would oppose this and would support the House Republican budget.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from southern California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chairman, this budget is about fairness, where everyone, not just a special few, can succeed.

While the Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee, the Budget for All makes no cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security.

While their budget slashes Pell Grants, leaving 1 million students struggling, the Budget for All actually increases investments in education.

While their budget destroys 4.1 million jobs in just 2 years, the Budget for All actually puts 2 million more people back to work by investing in infrastructure.

The Republicans do all this to keep tax breaks for Big Oil and provide an extra \$150,000 for millionaires. The Budget for All creates a fairer system by asking those who have benefited most from our economy to pay a sensible share.

The Budget for All ensures everyone can achieve the American Dream if they just work hard and play by the rules.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, we have no more speakers. I will reserve my time until the gentleman has concluded.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 20 seconds to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, budgets are about priorities, and the Budget for All sets priorities for the American people. It's about creating jobs and opportunity, investing in education, in-

vesting in our infrastructure, investing in our future.

The Budget for All, the Progressive Caucus budget, also makes significant investments in our military that actually prepare our defense forces for the 21st century.

The Budget for All is about priorities. And make no mistake, the Republican budget sets completely different priorities. It says to our seniors, we want you to pay more out of your pocket for Medicare; destroys Medicare as we know it; creates a system that's not fair, where young people who want to go to college won't be able to do that because there won't be Pell Grants available for them.

The Republican budget says to you that if you actually want to work hard and play by the rules, that you're not going to be treated fairly.

It's time for us to have a budget that reflects the priorities of the American people, that makes investments in the American people. The Budget for All makes those investments.

I urge my colleagues to read the budget, read the Budget for All, and support the Budget for All, the Progressive Caucus budget that makes important investments in the American people and does not destroy Medicare as we know it.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 20 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership, along with Congressmen GRIJALVA and ELLISON.

I rise to support the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget. I announce today that the Republican budget, according to the Economic Policy Institute, is a job killer—1.3 million jobs will be lost in 2013, 2.8 million jobs will be lost in 2014, and 4.1 million jobs will be lost in 2015.

It will also, in essence, defund the Affordable Care Act, which will eliminate access to health care for many women dealing with reproductive health, dealing with essential health benefits, and also coverage of family planning services. It will cut \$1.7 trillion from Medicaid. But the Budget for All will provide a direct opportunity for the School Improvement Corps, the Park Improvement Corps, and Student Job Corps, creating jobs.

It will save TRICARE and personnel. The CBC budget doesn't impact personnel, wages and benefits and pensions for our soldiers, but it ends the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and saves money in doing so.

It extends the earned income tax credit and the child and dependent care credit. It responsibly and expeditiously ends all of our military presence, but, more importantly, it creates an atmosphere for economic improvement and

development by providing jobs to our young people, stopping the taking away of the lifeline of Medicaid.

Support the Budget for All. Support the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlelady from California, the songstress, Congresswoman LAURA RICHARDSON.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Progressive Caucus alternative budget.

This budget, as a member on the Transportation Committee, would help us to be able to create, once and for all, the infrastructure bank that we desperately needed that would allow us to attract private and public partnership. The Progressive budget would also outline a plan to put over 2 million individuals back to work. And my colleague just before me highlighted what some of those would be. Some of them would include the Improvement Corps for public school rehabilitation projects, Park Improvement Corps for young adults, and Student Job Corps, one of which I was able to take advantage of as a young individual.

Mr. Chairman, the CPC budget will assist us to be able to responsibly act to reduce our budget deficit, but to also maintain our domestic priorities.

This budget is the right budget. It will protect our fragile recovery, and it will invest in our future.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you very much, Mr. HONDA.

Tonight, I want to commend my friends on the other side of the aisle, starting with Mr. TOM McCLINTOCK of California and those who are with him this evening, because what has happened is that we have begun to see that, between the leaders in the Progressive Caucus and those who can't possibly vote for the Progressive Caucus bill, we are still finding things that we can agree on. For example, is there anybody, the leader of the other side of the aisle, whose group does not believe that we should invest in our children's education by increasing education, training, and social services?

□ 2220

We all agree on that.

Is there anybody on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, who doesn't believe that our budget makes no cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security benefits?

These are beginnings of agreements. We all, on both sides, agree that we must responsibly and expeditiously end our military presence in Iraq and Afghanistan. And I congratulate the Member leading the other side.

Mr. HONDA. I yield the balance of my time to our closer, the gentleman from Arizona, the great Raul Grijalva.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me thank Mr. HONDA for his yeoman work on the budget.

The Republican majority is asking the American people to, once more, accept the premise that a trickle-down theory of economics is the path to solvency, balanced budget, and fiscal responsibility. Well, this trickle-down theory, as promoted, all it has done is create a dry opportunity for the middle class in this country.

Unemployment is up, and it has increased the number of poor and unemployed in this country, and this kind of insecurity has led us to the situation that we're in.

Our budget, the Progressive budget, Budget for All, reintroduces something fundamental to the American people, its values and its moral imperatives that have made us a great Nation.

Our budget is about fairness in burden and fairness in all. There should be no privileged group that receives that 40 to 50 of the benefit from the tax cuts. That money is needed in this society, and our budget asks for shared burden and shared responsibility.

We create jobs. We front-load jobs in this. We are about fiscal responsibility, reducing the deficit and balancing the budget; and we, more importantly than anything else, invest in the American people. We invest in our people, our greatest resource.

We save and promote Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid from the destructive plan that's being promoted by the Republican majority. This Budget for All by the Progressive Caucus, we are providing the American people and this Congress with a choice and a contrast. Do we repeat the mistakes of the past and pass a budget that's being recommended by the Republicans that takes us down the same destructive economic path that we've been on?

Or do we go in a direction that promotes equity, fairness, fiscal responsibility, and, more importantly, puts the American people back to work and offers their families the opportunities that we all have been able to benefit?

The Progressive Caucus budget is a budget of choice, a budget of fairness and, above all, returns us to our values as America.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I think the reason these times are so impassioned is because we've arrived at a moment when two very different visions of society are competing for our Nation's future, and they're very much reflected in the budgets put forward by the two parties in this House.

America's prosperity and greatness spring from uniquely American principles of individual freedom, personal responsibility, and constitutionally limited government. America's Founders created a voluntary society where people are free to make their own choices, enjoy the fruits of their own labors, take responsibility for their own decisions, and lead their own lives with a minimum of government interference and intrusion.

When someone needs help, we freely give that help, but we ask in return that they make the effort to support themselves to the extent that they can. Our government views no one person or group as more or less worthy than any other.

We are Americans. We'll be judged on our own merits, and we'll make our own choices, including what kind of car we'll drive, what kind of toilets we'll have in our homes, how we'll raise our children, what kind of light bulbs we prefer, what we'll have for dinner tonight.

Today, a very different vision competes for our future, that of a compulsory society, where our individual rights are subordinated to the mandates of government bureaucrats, where innocent taxpayers are forced to bail out the bad decisions of others, and where consumers are compelled to purchase the products or underwrite the losses of politically favored companies.

Under this vision, the purpose of government is not to protect individual freedom, but to improve society, however those in power decide it should be improved, to take from those it declares are undeserving to give to those it declares are deserving or, to put it more succinctly, to take from each according to his abilities and to give to each according to his needs. That's what this is all about.

Not more than 100 steps from where we debate right now, Thomas Jefferson reviewed the bountiful resources of the Nation and asked:

With all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow-citizens, a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government.

This is the Path to Prosperity put forth by the House Budget Committee. And let us be clear: the various Democratic plans, including the one before us now, fundamentally reject these principles and replace them with values alien and antithetical to those that built our Nation.

That is the question that our generation must decide in all of its forms, including the question put to us today by this substitute amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HONDA. I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCLINTOCK) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature on Tuesday, March 27, 2012 to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2038—An Act to prohibit Members of Congress and employees of Congress from using nonpublic information derived from their official positions for personal benefit, and for other purposes.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 27, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3606. To increase American job creation and economic growth by improving access to the public capital markets for emerging growth companies.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 29, 2012, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5457. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a letter of notification to authorize a 90% guarantee on a supply chain finance facility for The Bank of Nova Scotia; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5458. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a letter of notification to authorize a 90% guarantee on a supply chain finance facility for Royal Bank of Scotland; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5459. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 12-14, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5460. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting



annual audit of the American Red Cross consolidated financial statements for the year ending June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5461. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 the semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5462. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Neuse River, New Bern, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0974] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5463. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; New Year's Eve Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port St. Petersburg Zone, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0958] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5464. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; M/V DAVY CROCKETT, Columbia River [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0939] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5465. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 14-Mile Railroad Bridge Replacement, Mobile River, Mobile, AL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0969] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5466. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Captain of the Port Lake Michigan; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0489] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5467. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Isle of Wight (Sinepuxent) Bay, Ocean City, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0697] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5468. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge operation Regulation; Calcasieu River, Westlake, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1020] received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5469. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conductor Certification [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0035, Notice No. 3] (2130-AC36) received March 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5470. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30826; Amdt. No. 3464] received March 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5471. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30827 Amdt. No. 3465] received March 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEBSTER: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 600. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4281) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 112-424). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 4273. A bill to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 4274. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act and title V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permanently extend the provisions of the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act and the Pediatric Research Equity Act of 2003; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 4275. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1991 with respect to the application of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 4276. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 4277. A bill to establish the National Full Employment Trust Fund to create em-

ployment opportunities for the unemployed; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HURT (for himself and Mr. ALTMIRE):

H.R. 4278. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to permit requirements for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 4279. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the 10 percent early distribution penalty with respect to withdrawals by unemployed veterans from certain retirement accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. BACA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4280. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide that Puerto Rico may be treated in the same manner as the several States for the purpose of carrying out the supplemental nutrition assistance program under such Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 4281. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BERG (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. REED, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 4282. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure that the United States can comply fully with the obligations of the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 4283. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require child care providers to provide to parents information regarding whether such providers carry current liability insurance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4284. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 to make it unlawful for a packer to own, feed, or control livestock intended for slaughter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 4285. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to give members of the United

States Capitol Police the option to delay mandatory retirement until age 60; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4286. A bill to restore and extend the grace period before repayment begins on Federal Direct Stafford loans and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4287. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the definition of homeless veteran for purposes of benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4288. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide grants to States to assist veterans with who were trained to drive large vehicles while serving in the Armed Forces in obtaining, upon their discharge or release from active duty service, State commercial drivers licenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H.R. 4289. A bill to enhance the disclosure of information on official foreign travel of Members and employees of Congress, to impose additional restrictions on such travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 4290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the income exclusion for discharge of qualified principal residence indebtedness, to provide exclusions from income for certain payments under the National Mortgage Settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4291. A bill to establish the United States Commission on an Open Society with Security; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. AUSTRIA):

H.R. 4292. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish uniform standards for the exchange of controlled substance and prescription information for the purpose of preventing diversion, fraud, and abuse of controlled substances and other prescription drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 4293. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude loans made to Main Street businesses from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WEST:

H.R. 4294. A bill to limit the end strength reductions for the regular component of the Army and Marine Corps and to ensure that the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy are provided adequate resources

in order to meet the National Security Strategy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. BACA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H. Res. 601. A resolution expressing support for designation of a "Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof. (Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers)

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 4274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which states: "The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 4275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 4276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 4277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 4278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States)

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 4279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 in which Congress has the explicit power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises and Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of land and naval forces.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 4280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 4281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Mr. BERG:

H.R. 4282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (relating to the power to enter into foreign compacts on behalf of States).

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 4283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 4285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Sec. 5, Clause 2: "Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings . . ."

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 4288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H.R. 4289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 5, paragraph 2 that “Each House may determine Rules of its proceedings;” further, in Section 8, Congress has the power to “pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.”

This legislation is within the powers of Congress because it provides transparent accounting of travels by Members of Congress, thereby reducing the debts incurred to pay for said travels. Moreover, this legislation will promote the “general welfare” by promoting the trust in which citizens place in their government to be good stewards of their money.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 4290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 4292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which states that the Congress shall have the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, as well as clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers vested in the government of the United States.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEST:

H.R. 4294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress “to provide for the common Defence”, “to raise and support Armies”, “to provide and maintain a Navy” and “to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces” as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 9: Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. SCALISE.
- H.R. 14: Mr. FARR and Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 140: Mr. GOSAR.
- H.R. 157: Mr. STEARNS.
- H.R. 192: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 212: Mr. CANSECO.
- H.R. 303: Mr. RIGELL and Mr. TONKO.
- H.R. 365: Mr. COSTA and Mr. AUSTRIA.
- H.R. 376: Mr. ACKERMAN.
- H.R. 459: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire.
- H.R. 469: Mr. REYES.
- H.R. 547: Mr. CRAVAACK.
- H.R. 651: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 742: Mr. MCCOTTER.

- H.R. 860: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 876: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. FILER.
- H.R. 1004: Mr. BARTLETT.
- H.R. 1063: Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H.R. 1086: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
- H.R. 1092: Mr. ALTMIRE.
- H.R. 1103: Ms. BORDALLO.
- H.R. 1130: Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 1161: Mr. BERG.
- H.R. 1193: Ms. BORDALLO.
- H.R. 1296: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1356: Mr. FILNER and Mr. TONKO.
- H.R. 1370: Mr. CRAVAACK.
- H.R. 1385: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1386: Mr. ANDREWS.
- H.R. 1477: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
- H.R. 1515: Ms. HAHN.
- H.R. 1517: Ms. SUTTON.
- H.R. 1532: Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 1571: Mr. KISSELL.
- H.R. 1575: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
- H.R. 1620: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H.R. 1653: Mr. BERG.
- H.R. 1672: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 1733: Mr. JONES and Ms. BORDALLO.
- H.R. 1744: Mr. CRAVAACK and Mr. HENSARLING.
- H.R. 1895: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. HALL.
- H.R. 1960: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
- H.R. 2033: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 2104: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 2195: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 2227: Mr. CASSIDY.
- H.R. 2234: Mr. FARR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 2245: Mr. BARTLETT.
- H.R. 2299: Mrs. MYRICK.
- H.R. 2353: Mr. ACKERMAN.
- H.R. 2479: Mr. FILNER and Mr. GRIMM.
- H.R. 2502: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
- H.R. 2529: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 2554: Mrs. LOWEY.
- H.R. 2787: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2827: Mrs. NOEM, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 2866: Ms. HAHN.
- H.R. 2960: Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 2967: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 2978: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mrs. ADAMS.
- H.R. 3001: Mr. LATTI, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SHULER, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mrs. CLACK, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CALBERSON, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. REED, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LONG, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HIMES, Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MCCLEINTOCK, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. YODER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr.

- DENT, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 3032: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 3057: Mr. ALTMIRE.
- H.R. 3091: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
- H.R. 3145: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KEATING.
- H.R. 3173: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H.R. 3179: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 3187: Mr. HECK and Mr. MCNERNEY.
- H.R. 3225: Ms. FUDGE.
- H.R. 3269: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 3288: Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 3341: Mr. HULTGREN.
- H.R. 3364: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. BENISHEK.
- H.R. 3381: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 3502: Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. HAHN.
- H.R. 3506: Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
- H.R. 3526: Mr. ACKERMAN.
- H.R. 3585: Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 3591: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. SIRE.
- H.R. 3596: Mr. PALLONE.
- H.R. 3612: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. REED.
- H.R. 3635: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 3653: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 3670: Mr. BRALY of Iowa.
- H.R. 3705: Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 3769: Mr. MARINO.
- H.R. 3770: Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 3798: Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 3826: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 3828: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. FLEMING.
- H.R. 3839: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. WEBSTER, and Mr. BARTLETT.
- H.R. 3855: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 3877: Mr. MCKEON.
- H.R. 3884: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 3993: Mr. JONES, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 4032: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 4045: Mrs. BACHMANN.
- H.R. 4087: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 4095: Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 4103: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. MORAN.
- H.R. 4112: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 4114: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COLE, Mr. REYES, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. BORDALLO.
- H.R. 4115: Mr. PETERS and Ms. HAYWORTH.
- H.R. 4134: Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 4136: Mr. REHBERG.
- H.R. 4142: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 4156: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. FLEMING.
- H.R. 4157: Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LUCAS.
- H.R. 4169: Mr. TURNER of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
- H.R. 4171: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. GOHMERT.
- H.R. 4173: Mr. DINGELL.
- H.R. 4178: Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 4199: Ms. BORDALLO.
- H.R. 4209: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 4228: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 4229: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. HAHN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PITTS, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 4232: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 4237: Mr. GOHMERT and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4240: Mr. RIVERA, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 4251: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 4255: Mr. JONES, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 4259: Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 4268: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 4271: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. REYES, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 103: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. COLE and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BILIRAKIS,

Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H. Con. Res. 113: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. POMPEO, and Mrs. BLACK.

H. Res. 111: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 137: Ms. BONAMICI.

H. Res. 351: Mr. BACA.

H. Res. 526: Mr. AKIN, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. SPEIER.

H. Res. 583: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.