United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2011 No. 56

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, May 2, 2011, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2011

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 15, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACK KINGSTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

A personal ''Te Deum'':
You are God; we praise You.
You are the Lord; we acclaim You.
You are the eternal Father;
All creation worships You.
Save Your people, Lord, and bless Your inheritance.
Govern and uphold these now and always.
Day by day we bless You.
We praise Your name forever.
Keep us today, Lord, from all sin.
Have mercy on us, Lord have mercy.
Lord, show us Your love and mercy;
For we put our trust in You.
In You, Lord, is our hope;
And we shall never hope in vain. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. POE of Texas. 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 pro tempore. 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The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OUR CHAPLAIN, DANIEL COUGHLIN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our House Chaplain, Father Daniel Coughlin, is retiring from his duties after 11 years of serving the United States House of Representatives.

Since our forefathers established this tradition in Congress in 1789, the House Chaplain has provided spiritual guidance, hope, and heavenly blessings through prayer every day.

Each new day, Father Coughlin enters the House Chamber with his happy Irish spirit and a twinkle in his eyes, and prays to the Almighty so that Members will walk humbly and wise in the Lord's sight. Father Coughlin has been here during the troubling days of 9/11, during good times, and times that aren't so good.

Father Coughlin, from Chicago, has been ordained for 50 years, and has found time to be an angel to the poor in Calcutta, India, where he lived with members of Mother Teresa's community. Over the years, this House has needed Father Coughlin's guidance, for, after all, you have to be in good with the Lord to pray for politicians every day.

Printed on recycled paper.

My prayer for Father Coughlin is that he continues to be a blessing to our Nation and to the people he encounters who need spiritual help—and as he often says when ending his prayers—''both now and forever.''

And that's just the way it is.

THE REPUBLICAN MISINFORMATION MISSION

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

Mr. LEVIN. We've heard your last prayer, Father Dan. We wish you the best. You have served us very well.

Mr. Speaker, I was on the floor last night, and I heard the debate. Clearly, there is a massive misinformation mission on the part of the Republicans.

I heard repeatedly that they want to save Medicare. No. They want to end it with a voucher, costing seniors in the future at least $6,000 a year. They say they want to preserve the safety net. No. They want to shred it.

According to nonpartisan analysis, their proposal calls for spending on items other than Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid—but including defense—to fall from 12 percent of GDP last year to 6 percent in 2022 and just 3.5 percent of GDP in the long run. We are not going to shred defense. What their proposal means in shredding the safety net is that they have become radicals instead of conservatives.

THE PRESIDENT STILL STANDS FOR THE TAX MAN

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Father Dan Coughlin, for your service.

Mr. Speaker, as Americans know, today is the annual Tax Day, April 15. I bring this up because, finally, the President has joined in the discussion of our country's dangerous deficits. On Wednesday, he announced his scheme to reduce the out-of-control deficits his administration promoted—raising taxes—proving yet again that liberals still look to the tax man to solve their inability to manage a budget.

Americans do not want this. The tea party is correct: taxed enough already, T-E-A. Raising taxes on small businesses does nothing but kill jobs while keeping unemployment levels above 9 percent.

Liberals miss the point: The Federal Government does not have a revenue problem; it has a spending problem. Cutting spending and borrowing needs to be the topic of discussion. Raising taxes does not.

House Republicans continue to lead the way to limit spending. Courageous Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN has presented a commonsense plan which brings current reckless spending under control.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF NATIONAL GUARDSMAN SPECIALIST DENNIS POULIN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor National Guardsman Specialist Dennis Poulin, a recently fallen hero of our country.

Dennis ''Danny'' Poulin, a 26-year-old native of Cumberland, Rhode Island, gave his life for our Nation, on Thursday, March 31, 2011, while serving in Afghanistan.

He, like so many of our brave men and women in uniform, executed the mission in Afghanistan with dedication and extraordinary competence. Specialist Poulin certainly did all we asked of him. This brave young man served our country with honor and made the ultimate sacrifice. He served as a mortarman in the Guard's Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 181st Infantry Regiment.

I want to take a moment to recognize Specialist Poulin's parents and family and to thank them for his service to our country. Besides his parents, Doris Poulin and Richard Renau, Specialist Poulin leaves his son, Nikolous Cullen Poulin; fiancee, Ashley Shylene Simmon; two sisters, Jennifer Poulin and Angelique Renau; and extended family, all who mourn his loss.

Let us honor his life, service and sacrifice, and let us help those who mourn by joining together in thanks for Specialist Poulin's valor and courage on behalf of our great Nation. All who knew him, and those who didn't but who know the sacrifice he has made, will miss him and will remain grateful for his service to our country.

BANKRUPTCY OR PROSPERITY

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. I too would like to join in the chorus we've heard today to thank Father Coughlin for bearing the cross that is Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as we hear the debates that will continue on into today on the budget, we will hear much hue and cry; but when we look at the reality, the Ryan House Republican proposal is really a very modest attempt to sustain the welfare state, and I believe it is an important one.

When history looks back after the momentous changes in which we find ourselves, it will view the Ryan House Republican budget as but a baby step in escaping Big Government's implosion. It is a responsible course; it is a responsible choice because it is between bankruptcy or prosperity; and I and the American people will choose prosperity.

□ 0910

NATIONAL DAY OF SILENCE

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I join the chorus of those thanking Father Coughlin for his service and dedication and wishing him well.

I also rise today in observance of the National Day of Silence.

Today is the 14th year we have commemorated the National Day of Silence, a time when students across the country remain silent for the whole day to draw attention to discrimination toward their LGBT peers.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and questioning youth and their allies face verbal and physical bullying on a daily basis just for being who they are, for expressing their sexuality, or for demonstrating a non-normative gender identity. I am proud that my constituents are calling for a stop to this harassment, and I encourage all Americans to join them.

Our Nation is at her best when we are celebrating our differences, not punishing individuals for being different. I am proud to say that in my district Queer Youth and allies work together to make life better for queer youth. Middle schools and high schools in my district host student-run Gay-Straight Alliances, which create a supportive space so that queer youth do not feel isolated. My district also hosts Queer Youth conferences and award events that celebrate our queer youth.

Though many lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender advocates and straight allies are silent today, we in Congress must never be silent.

CONSUMER PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, JIM MATHESON and I introduced H.R. 1528, the Consumer Privacy Protection Act. Our legislation attempts to strike the proper balance between consumer privacy and innovation by requiring entities to provide consumers, in clear and easy to understand language, what information is being collected and how the information is being used. By giving the consumer more notice and choice, we can encourage strong Internet commerce while protecting consumer privacy.

Overreaching privacy regulations could have a significant, negative economic impact at a time when many small businesses are struggling today. Only the consumer knows how he or she feels about the information being collected, the parties doing the collecting, and the purpose for which the information is collected. Congress cannot and should not make that decision for them. We need to place the control

over consumer information with the actual consumer, and our legislation does this.

STANDING IN SOLIDARITY WITH WORKERS AT EAST MILLINOCKET PAPER MILL

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the people of the Katahdin region in my home State of Maine.

The paper mill in East Millinocket is shutting down and taking with it hundreds of jobs and much of the tax base. Like so many other mills and factories across this country, it couldn't keep its doors open.

In the last decade, our Nation has lost nearly 6 million manufacturing jobs and seen 50,000 factories closed. It's because we haven't prioritized our manufacturing sector and haven't made an effort to keep good-paying, blue collar jobs in the United States.

I worked at this mill for over 29 years alongside the hardworking people of the Katahdin region. In solidarity, I stand with them today, confident that if we are pulling together, we can find a way to put this mill back online.

I urge my colleagues in Congress to help me and workers in Maine and all across this country by supporting a national manufacturing strategy and a new trade policy.

PUTTING OUR COUNTRY ON THE PATH TO PROSPERITY

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by recognizing Father Coughlin and his service and sacrifice to our Nation.

As we look at this Nation today, we are at a tipping point, and we have two paths that we can choose. We can choose to talk in a meaningful and thoughtful way about the deficits we have before us in this national debt, or we can continue to demagogue issues and ideas that will get us to long-term prosperity for this country. I know the American people prefer us to have that thoughtful, meaningful conversation about how we get this Nation on the right path, how we rein in spending, and how we control the growth of government.

Folks, today the issues are about growing our economy, not about growing government. We have seen that past efforts to grow government have not resulted in prosperity for this Nation. The time is now for us to have a meaningful, thoughtful discussion about all aspects of the budget. Let's not demagogue the issue. Let's prove to the American people that we can make the tough decisions to move this Nation in the right direction, to get this spending under control, to reduce our debt, and make sure the long-term care of this country is put first and foremost, that we are on the path to prosperity.

ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I too rise to thank Father Coughlin, Father Dan, for his spiritual sustenance and guidance that he has given all the Members of the House during his service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to commemorate the 96th anniversary of the start of the Armenian genocide, which was the first genocide in the 20th century and, sadly, the template for a cycle of genocide that continues to this day around the world.

Next week, in Fresno and around the country, there will be thousands of Armenian Americans, many who are sons and daughters and grandchildren of the survivors of the Armenian genocide. As a young man, I grew up listening to my friends the Kezirians, the Kolligians, the Bakers, the Abrahams, the Karabians and the Kashians, and many others who told the story of their parents and grandparents.

We are quickly approaching the 100th anniversary of the start of the Armenian genocide. I am hopeful we don't have to wait until then to bring justice to the Armenian nation and our friends and neighbors who sadly recognize that event.

There is never a right time to recognize genocide. More than 90 years have passed since the start of these events, and we cannot wait for a convenient moment to recognize this truly catastrophic historical event. I will continue to stand for us to properly recognize this tragic event.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to House Resolution 223 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. 34.

□ 0917

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. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021, with Mr. KINGSTON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, April 14, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 112–62 by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on that amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

The Acting CHAIR. 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 103, noes 303, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 273]

AYES—103

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeLauro
Deutch
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kildee
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Luján
Lynch
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sires
Slaughter
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOES—303

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)

Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
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
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
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
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Quigley
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Wu
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—26

Benishek
Berkley
Bishop (GA)
Bono Mack
Clay
Culberson
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Giffords
Graves (MO)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Johnson (GA)
Langevin
LaTourette
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Meeks
Myrick
Olver
Rahall
Reichert
Rogers (AL)
Stark
Young (AK)

□ 0941

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. LEVIN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. NEAL changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 273, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 273, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 273, I was unavoidably detained, but had I voted I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 273, I was at a doctors appointment across town. Had I been present, I would have voted, "no."

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chair, I missed rollcall vote No. 273. If I were here, I would have voted "no."

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 2011, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall No. 273. Had I voted I would have voted "no" on the Cleaver/Scott (VA) Amendment in the nature of a Substitute, rollcall 273.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY) assumed the chair.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

H.R. 1473. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and the other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KINGSTON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 112–62.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012.

The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2012 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2021:

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

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

Fiscal year 2012: $2,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $4,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $4,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $4,607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $5,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $5,309,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $358,000,000.

(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 2012: $3,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $4,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $4,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $4,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $4,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $4,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $5,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $5,305,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $3,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $4,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $4,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $4,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $4,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $4,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $5,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $5,263,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $39,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $46,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $12,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$46,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $16,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $16,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,078,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $19,531,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: $19,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $20,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $20,632,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2012: $11,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $11,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $12,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $13,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $13,658,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2012 through 2021 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $672,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $683,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $539,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $531,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $535,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $542,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $547,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $547,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $556,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $550,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $566,902,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $553,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $579,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $569,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $588,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $579,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $599,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $590,067,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $110,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $102,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $92,324,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $76,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $73,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $72,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $74,735,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $68,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $66,214,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $63,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,660,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $31,863__,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $32,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $34,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $35,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $36,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $36,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $37,595,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,995,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $45,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $38,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $20,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $17,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $15,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $15,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $10,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $8,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,714,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $57,242,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $55,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $53,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $49,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $49,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $49,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $50,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $49,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $49,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $49,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,348,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $23,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $23,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $24,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $24,680__,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,002,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $24,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $14,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,578,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $12,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $13,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $14,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $17,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $21,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $22,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,304,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $146,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $111,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $117,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $110,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $124,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $131,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $138,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $135,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, $137,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $139,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $141,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,422,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $33,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $28,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $23,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,002,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $20,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $18,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,871,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $162,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $156,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $157,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $150,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $136,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $138,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $138,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $140,926,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $133,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $130,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $127,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,047,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $391,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $403,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $481,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $464,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $535,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $580,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $588,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $624,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $629,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $666,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $663,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $706,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $706,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $759,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $747,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $800,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $798,972,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $484,164,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $483,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $526,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $555,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $555,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $578,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $624,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $648,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $647,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $672,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $672,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $734,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $735,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $787,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $787,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $840,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $840,674,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $604,346,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $576,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $584,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $576,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $538,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,493,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $519,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $522,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $520,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $525,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $515,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $519,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $513,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $525,122,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $531,706,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $531,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $539,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $539,155,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $54,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $36,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $44,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $48,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $55,275__,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $60,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $65,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,979,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $162,813,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $156,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $158,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $157,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $157,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $151,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $157,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $157,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $153,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $147,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $157,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $156,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $160,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $164,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,950,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $79,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $71,187,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $69,823,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $66,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $68,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $67,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $69,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $68,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $71,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $72,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,477,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $25,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $25,562,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $26,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $26,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $26,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $27,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $28,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $29,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $29,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,453,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $30,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $31,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,922,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $371,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $371,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $426,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $490,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $490,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $546,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $546,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $599,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $642,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $642,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $675,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $675,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $696,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $696,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $714,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $714,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $718,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $718,317,000,000.
(19) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$77,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$77,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$80,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$81,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$81,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$84,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$84,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$85,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$85,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$91,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$91,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$97,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$97,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$101,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$101,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$105,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$105,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$110,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$110,174,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment, the budget substitute that we have before you, the people's budget, is an honest document consistent with our country's values and our country's desires.

The people's budget does not tell the American people what they want to hear; it gives the American people what they want: Fairness, protection of our social net for Americans in retirement and at the beginning of their lives, jobs, an immediate infusion of job creation to put people back to work, investments in education. And this budget is balanced by 2021, the deficit is eliminated. It is the only budget that accomplishes that that is before you today.

It does not balance the budget on the backs of the middle class, those who aspire to be in the middle class, and those that are vulnerable in our society.

It reverses a practice and it taxes those corporations and the very, very 2 percent rich in this country so they pay their just sacrifice to keeping this country healthy and turning our country around.

We end the wars that are draining our national Treasury and our people. The Progressive Caucus listened to the American people, and the people's budget is what they want.

I urge approval of this budget. It is a document that represents the very best of what the people need, and it represents a departure from a practice that has brought us to the brink of a deep recession, to a practice that has brought us to joblessness across this country and to a practice that has given the privileged all they want and transferred that responsibility to working Americans in this country.

Our budget is a document that is honest, it is straightforward and merits your support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROKITA. The ''people's budget''? This budget, if enacted, would end this country as we know it. This budget increases spending, Mr. Chairman, by $13 trillion over 10 years. It takes $16 trillion more from the American people over 10 years through the biggest tax increase this country has ever seen. It increases our debt $3.5 trillion over 10 years.

This isn't the people's budget. This country was founded on equal opportunity for everyone, not equal outcome. History is littered with countries and nations that have failed because they tried for equal outcome.

This country remains the greatest Nation the world has ever seen because we pride ourselves and enforce equal opportunity.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. I am honored to get a chance to comment. I am very grateful we have an honest dialogue back and forth on different options.

This is a unique moment for us as a Nation to be able to look at the direction of our country and at the way we are going to do budgeting, and I have great respect for those that will come and say let's look at other ideas, and I think that's how we should come to the table. Both the President, the Senate, and the House should be coming and saying, here are the options, here are the voices, because there are different voices in America that have different perspectives, and I think that's a good, healthy debate.

Now, there are several areas that we will disagree on with this budget. We do agree that we should be working on deficit reduction. We do agree that debt is a serious problem in our Nation and we need to be able to work it down. It's how to do that.

The budget that's being presented here, the amendment in the nature of a substitute, does tax heavily those that are wealthy, but it also has a burden that's on those most vulnerable as well. And let me give you an example of that: It increases the transportation tax, that gas tax.

It not only adds an excise tax on gas companies, energy companies, so that the tax goes up, but it also adds 25 cents per gallon to the actual gas tax, and then at this time removes any other tax subsidies that are being piled on to any energy company. All those together are going to add a significant amount per gallon at the pump, beginning with just the basic option that's there of adding 25 cents. In addition, their recommendation is 43.4 cents for the gas tax itself.

That is clearly a tax that's going to hit very hard on those that are most vulnerable in our society, the people that are driving to work, that are moms commuting back and forth. I think that's the wrong direction to go. That's such a large tax on a group of people that are vulnerable.

So we do want to deal with the nature of our great deficits and of our great debt, but I don't think we need to be able to add that additional tax burden on the people that are very vulnerable.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I encourage the gentlemen at their next opportunity, the gentlemen across the aisle, to explain to the American taxpayer why they have to pay thousands of dollars on Tax Day when GE didn't have to pay a single cent and, in fact, got money back on Tax Day. Our budget is about shared sacrifice.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

□ 0950

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, there is one proposed budget that ends the war in Afghanistan, cuts Cold War-era weapons systems, completely eliminates the deficit within 10 years and aligns the Tax Code with the values of working families. And that's the people's budget submitted by the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Instead of taking away health care from seniors by gutting Medicare, the people's budget provides more affordable health care with a robust public option that would save this Nation's taxpayers $68 billion over 7 years.

The majority's budget will cost Americans 1.7 million jobs over the next 3 years. Our budget puts America back to work with badly needed investments in transportation, infrastructure, and a 21st-century education system.

We have a choice. The majority budget which demands more sacrifice from struggling families and gives the wealthy a free ride; or the progressive budget which invests in people, creates a budget surplus, and brings our troops home.

I urge my colleagues, make a smart, fiscally responsible choice. Vote for the people's budget.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I appreciate the chairman for yielding to me, and I appreciate the opportunity to stand and speak against the Progressive Caucus budget because it is a budget that, once again, will spend too much money.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we have heard from the American people is this: they are tired of the Federal Government spending taxpayer money for programs they don't want and spending money that they don't have. And it is time for us to put this fiscal house in order.

Now, quite frankly, I think that today is a really great day. When we get to the end of this legislative day and the end of this legislative week, we will have passed the Ryan budget, which turns an enormous corner for our Nation. Over the next 10 years, it will reduce spending not by millions and billions, but by trillions—$6.2 trillion over the next 10 years.

Those are the kinds of first steps that the American people are wanting to see. That's the kind of fiscal responsibility that the American people are holding us accountable for: controlling spending, limiting spending, and making certain that there is a stable and secure environment in which economic growth and job creation can take place.

They have spoken loudly and clearly. And they have said reduce what you are spending, get your fiscal house in order, begin to focus not on the next 6 weeks or 6 months but the next 60 years, and focus on our children and our grandchildren, making certain that we are not tapping their futures and trading it to the nations that hold our debt. I think that it's so important that we begin to arrest this and get it under control and to pass the Ryan budget today.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 15 seconds to the distinguished cochair of the Progressive Caucus, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, the point was made earlier that the Progressive Caucus' budget, which addresses a gas tax, is somehow not a good thing to deal with our Nation. But the infrastructure needs of our country, over $3 trillion—according to the Society of Engineers, says that we need $3 trillion in infrastructure spending.

Let's do something and put America back to work by rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank our cochairs, Congressmen ELLISON and GRIJALVA, for their tremendous leadership.

Budgets are not just dollars and cents. They are moral documents that reflect who we are and what we believe in. The Republican budget is an assault on women, seniors, the underserved poor and low-income families. It's a shameless attempt to finance tax breaks for millionaires on the backs of the most vulnerable. The people's budget, however, offers a commonsense fiscally responsible plan that protects critical programs and services that millions of Americans depends on.

Our plan would eliminate the deficit in the next decade, put people back to work, and restore our economic competitiveness. In these difficult times, it includes additional funding for unemployment insurance to help those who've maxed out at 99 weeks to get additional benefits, recognizing there are five people to one job.

Our proposal eliminates the true drivers of our deficit, the unpaid-for Bush tax cuts and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it restates the law that no permanent bases will be built in Iraq. And we protect and preserve Medicare and Social Security for the future, and it includes a public option which saves money. The people's budget invests in our people, in our communities, and in our Nation.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

There has been a lot of talk about budgets being moral instruments. The budget that we've proposed through the Budget Committee, the Ryan budget, is a responsible budget. And let me say, Mr. Chairman, what is immoral is balancing these choices on the backs of our children and grandchildren, Americans who haven't even been born yet. That's what's immoral.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank Mr. ROKITA for the time.

I want to applaud my colleagues in the Progressive Caucus for doing something which I think is intellectually honest. In fact, I think if you look at a couple of budgets that we're going to be looking at over the next 2 days, the budget that the Budget Committee has offered, I think is a fair and honest representation of where the Republican Party is. The Republican Study Committee budget that we'll see in just a few minutes is a fair and honest representation of where the Republican Study Committee stands. And this budget, I think, is offered as a true and honest position, a policy statement, of where the progressives in this body and in this country stand. And for that I thank them.

That being said, it's hard to imagine a document that is more different from our document. There are $16 trillion worth of tax increases in this document. To the extent that the progressives do stand and are honest in their belief that taxing and spending is the way to fix the Nation, this document certainly does contain that.

All of the 2001, 2003 tax cuts, which we affectionately refer to around here as the Bush tax cuts, are gone, not just the ones on the highest income earners, everybody. This is a tax increase on almost everybody. In fact, it is a tax increase on everybody in the entire Nation. The top marginal rates under this proposal go from 45 percent up to 49 percent. The capital gains rate goes up to as high as 49 percent.

We introduced a new concept in this budget, apparently, the progressives do, that takes the estate tax to a progressive model, where you get estate tax rates that range from 45 percent up to 65 percent. We heard a few minutes ago, my colleague, Mr. LANKFORD, talk about the fact that there's a 25-cent gas tax increase in this particular document.

This is an avalanche of new taxes. At every single turn, the motivation behind the progressives seems to be that the government needs more money, that the government needs more money and it is our obligation to give it to the government. And we simply, wholeheartedly, dismiss that idea.

But, again, I think it is nice for a change to have honest and open debate on an intellectual basis in this Chamber. I thank the progressives for at least laying out where they stand. And I think it's a good process to go through. I think we'll have a chance later on today in just a few minutes to see where we stand as a Nation, at least as a body, here on these types of changes.

I very much hope that this amendment is defeated. I think that the Republican Budget Committee alternative is a better course of action. And I would like to see this amendment defeated.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I again yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I have a question for the gentleman: When does the Ryan budget create a surplus?

Mr. ROKITA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLISON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROKITA. The budget proposed and voted on by the committee—

Mr. ELLISON. I reclaim my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Do you want me to answer the question or not?

Mr. ELLISON. I will yield for an answer to the question, not for a filibuster.

□ 1000

Mr. ROKITA. With responsible, gradual reforms to the drivers of our debt, like Medicare and Social Security, the Ryan budget will balance.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. I asked the gentleman when the Ryan budget created a surplus. He could have given me a year; he didn't. That's because he's probably embarrassed about when that is.

Let me tell you when the Progressive Caucus budget comes to surplus: 2021. That is known as a responsible budget. We are making a surplus by 2021. And by the way, that is Heritage Foundation mathematics. It's not $16 trillion; it is $3.9 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I see where the gentleman from Minnesota is going with his question, and I yield myself 10 seconds just to answer it.

He claims responsibility in this budget. The only way they can possibly balance, and I don't agree that they will balance in that time, is by drastically raising taxes on every American. That's not responsibility because it doesn't pose a choice. That is the definition of irresponsibility, Mr. Chairman.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have a chart before me, and I hope everyone will look at it. It is based on Congressional Budget Office numbers. If you go to fiscal year 2001, you'll see that we enjoyed a $128 billion surplus. At that time we had a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Democrat President. Then if you'll notice, looking at the bottom, that we had a Republican Congress and a Republican President, and we had the beginning of a series of deficits, $158 billion in FY 2002, which was immediately after the 9/11 and the ramp-up as a result of our efforts to protect Americans from terrorism.

Then we go to FY '03, '04, '05, '06 and '07, you can see how the deficits have increased to a peak of $413 billion, but then the Republicans start getting things back under control. $161 billion is the deficit that America suffered in FY 2007, and that's not good. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons I was dissatisfied with the George Bush administration is because of these deficits.

But let's look at what happened after the elections in November of 2006 in which NANCY PELOSI became House Speaker and HARRY REID became majority leader of the United States Senate. These deficits, which we were getting under control, in FY '08, $459 billion; in FY '09, we almost go off the chart, $1.4 trillion. Then we lose the White House. The Democrats are in total control. In FY '10, a deficit of $1.3 trillion. In FY '11, a projected deficit of 1.6 or $1.5 trillion, depending upon who you pay attention to.

Folks, we are here today forcing this issue because America is at risk. We are at risk of insolvency and bankruptcy because the * * * Members of this body choose to spend money that we do not have. They believe in wealth transfer programs.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama will suspend.

The gentleman from Minnesota will state his point of order.

Mr. ELLISON. I would like the gentleman's words taken down for the reference to certain Members of this body as socialists.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman from Alabama will please take his seat.

The Clerk will report the words.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the particular use of one word that the folks on the other side of the aisle have objected to.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Without objection, the word is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen of America, we all know what we're talking about here, and we all know what the definitional terms are, and I am more than happy to resume this discussion off the House floor. But for whatever reason, I'm not permitted to use one word.

Having said that, you can look at this chart and you can see the kind of deficits that we have sustained over the last 4 years, and the threat that this poses to the United States of America.

Now, this Progressive people's budget, I submit to you, is nothing more than a Trojan horse. There is an old saying: Those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it. Why should anyone believe that the folks who have racked of these massive deficits that put America at risk are now going to change their stripes?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for withdrawing the word ''socialist'' from his commentary.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentlemen.

Mr. Chairman and Members, the gentleman from Alabama evidently has amnesia. Clinton administration eliminated the deficit and left a balanced budget. It was the Bush administration that created the deficit.

I rise in strong support for this, the Progressive Caucus alternative balanced people's budget. During the last administration, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle maxed out our Nation's credit card for wars and tax cuts for the rich, all the while saying deficits don't matter. Now they are using our deficit crisis as a rationale to undermine programs that they have never supported and push a divisive social agenda that is a sideshow to our budget debate.

Mr. Chairman, this country is not broke. We have spent our money on wars and tax credits for the very rich, and now it is time to entertain the people's budget, a balanced budget.

The Ryan budget breaks our promise to these American families by expecting them to bear the entire burden of deficit reduction, neglecting the fact that just 4 months ago my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle insisted on $80 billion in tax cuts for the richest 2 percent of individuals in this country.

This is a balanced budget. I ask my colleagues to support this very responsible, balanced budget.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

□ 1010

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have never been one to stand silent in the face of injustice. Today, I see before us one of the greatest betrayals in American history—the betrayal of our seniors and the disabled who rely on Medicare for their health care. We have made a social compact with our seniors, and the Republican budget breaks that compact. It is a disgrace and a shame.

Where is our sense of fairness? Where is our outrage? We can and we must do better.

Republicans head down a very dangerous path. We cannot, we must not, and we will not balance our budget on the backs of people who can least afford it. Our seniors, the disabled, the poor, the hungry—they have done nothing wrong. They do not deserve to bear the burden of these budget cuts.

Support and vote for the people's budget. It is the right budget, it is fair, and it is just.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. My heart pains me for this day and this

budget for America. Some of us might feel as the President does, that it's a question of whether or not we are saying to the American people that they are not understanding, or that we who are fighting simply are stupid.

It's a time when you want to reflect on how great a country we live in, and it hurts my heart when I see individuals putting on the floor of the House a budget that unfairly targets low-income communities and senior citizens while protecting the wealthiest Americans, Americans who I care about, and simply eliminating any sense of responsibility for working and middle class Americans.

The people's budget saves Medicare. Those are working Americans. Those are Americans that are middle class. And then, of course, what about our disabled persons? Do you think that they are only classified as low-income? These are individuals who become seniors or disabled who need to have the kind of sacrifice. Look what happens. The people's budget protects those who cannot protect themselves.

Finally, I ask the individuals, is there any shared sacrifice that you can see in the Republican budget. The Republican budget fails to help all those who are in need? This is a good budget. Support the people's budget.

Recommendation from CPC:

Every Member mentions the first talking point below re: deficits. Then Members can address the remaining TPs below, as they feel comfortable.

Deficit: Our Budget Eliminates the Deficit by 2021.

We eliminate the deficit by 2021. Instead of eroding America's hard-earned retirement plan and social safety net, our budget targets the true drivers of deficits in the next decade: the Bush Tax Cuts, the wars overseas, and the causes and effects of the recent recession.

Jobs: Our Budget Puts America Back to Work & Restores America's Competitiveness.

We rebuild America and make it competitive again. We make smart investments. We put America back to work. You can't grow the economy by slashing programs. Our plan will spark new job growth, improve education, accelerate clean energy development and modernize the nation's infrastructure.

Taxes: Our Budget Implements a Fair Tax System.

We ask the richest and most fortunate Americans to contribute more. We stop giving handouts and huge tax giveaways to corporate special interests. The ''People's Budget'' implements a fair tax system, based on the notion that fairness and equality are integral to our society. Our budget restores fairness to a system that unfairly benefits a few while hurting the majority of Americans.

Defense: Our Budget Brings Our Troops Home.

We bring the troops back home. We ensure that our country's defense spending does not continue to contribute significantly to our current fiscal burden. It's time to stop bankrupting the country fighting unwinnable wars. We end these wars not simply to save massive amounts of money or because the majority of Americans favors it, but because these wars are making America less safe, reduce our standing in the world, and do nothing to reduce America's burgeoning energy security crisis.

Health: Our Budget Keeps Americans Healthy.

We allow real competition in health care. We will never see health care costs decrease until the government can compete and use its bargaining power to strike a better deal for Americans.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 3¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Arizona has 6¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We have been greeted with a Republican budget that is a profoundly negative view of the future, and you've heard some of the reasons. I want to focus on just one. It doesn't just ignore the infrastructure deficit of an America that is falling apart—over $2 trillion of unmet needs as referenced by my friend from Minnesota. It makes it worse. A 31 percent cut in already inadequate funding for national infrastructure. The Progressive Budget hears the needs of the American public and actually agrees with the truckers, the U.S. Chamber, local governments, AAA of America, indeed, the deficit commission, all suggested that, for the first time since 1993, we raise the gas tax.

My Republican friends have lost track of their Republican roots, for Republicans used to believe in infrastructure. Lincoln. Eisenhower. Eisenhower raised the gas tax. Even Reagan raised the gas tax. This progressive budget is a profound investment in infrastructure. It will put millions to work renewing and rebuilding America.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, the people's budget contains a provision for infrastructure development and the National Infrastructure Bank. I want to agree wholeheartedly with Congressman BLUMENAUER. We can not only put America back to work but we can strengthen the infrastructure that will make it safe to go across a bridge. We cannot neglect the bridges and the roads, the high-speed optical fiber cables and all these things that our country needs for a 21st century infrastructure. It's a jobs program. The people's budget is talking about jobs.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the people's budget.

I heard mention that our country was based on the goal of equal opportunity. Yes. But what about ''and justice for all''? That is in our Pledge of Allegiance. We pledge that on the floor of this House every single day. This budget is not justice for all.

I was visited by advocates from Hawaii, eighth graders, who support funding for the disabled, for the blind, for our seniors. They were astounded by the anti-people priorities in the Ryan budget.

A budget has to be fair. That means the multi-millionaires in our country have to pay their fair share. That means the oil industry that's making money hand over fist, getting billions of dollars, has to pay their fair share. That means the companies that ship our jobs overseas have to pay their fair share.

Then we can invest in the future. That means education, energy self-sufficiency, infrastructure. I urge my colleagues to vote for this people's budget.

Aloha.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. I rise to support the people's budget. It will create millions of jobs and turn the deficit into a surplus in 10 years. Republicans have unveiled their 2012 Road to Ruin budget, but instead of focusing on creating jobs, Republicans are ripping the bandage off our economy before the scar has even healed.

The people's budget focuses on real solutions. Instead of billion-dollar handouts to Big Oil, we're investing in job creation and loans for higher education. Instead of ending Medicare as we know it, we keep our promise of secure health care for seniors. Instead of giving more tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires, we're committed to tax relief for the middle class.

We must eliminate the deficit, but we must do it responsibly, and that means taking the Republican target off the backs of working families.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Congressional Progressive Caucus substitute budget. One of the concerns I have as an American citizen and a small business owner for 30 years is this document right here. This is the Internal Revenue Code. It is 9,959 pages long. This plan that is offered up today will add hundreds if not thousands of pages of additional complexity.

Recently, we all heard about a large U.S. corporation that had billions of dollars in profits and paid zero taxes. Mr. Chairman, the reason they were able to do that is because their attorneys knew what was buried in this document. Do we really need to make it more complicated and more complex? I think not.

I also oppose this because they talk about the benefits to lower income Americans. Yet by removing the 2001 and 2000 tax credits and tax rates and returning them to their previous levels, you will increase on the poorest Americans from 10 percent to 15 percent, a full 50 percent increase in their tax rates. On top of it, small business

owners will see their tax rates go to 45 percent.

Think of the small business owner in northeast Wisconsin, who will also pay an 8 percent State income tax, will pay a 5 or 6 percent sales tax, will pay 50 cents a gallon gasoline tax, will pay property tax, will pay FICA tax, will pay Social Security tax. I'm beginning to wonder if all they will do in their life is pay taxes.

I urge my colleagues to reject this proposal.

□ 1020

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself 10 seconds.

If I may, I have a simple inquiry for the gentleman from Wisconsin.

As part of the fairness in our Tax Code, I would like to ask, is it fair that, let's say, Warren Buffett should pay a lower income tax rate than his receptionist? Is that fairness in our Tax Code?

Mr. RIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RIBBLE. I would concur that it's not fair.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York, Congressman RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

This substitute budget is listed as the ''Progressive budget.'' For reasons that clearly anyone can take a deep breath and see, as opposed to what Mr. RYAN is presenting to us as Republican, this is really what our country is all about: building on the great things that we've done and making certain that the young people who follow us will be able to say that we have improved their opportunities.

Make no mistake about it: Borrowing trillions of dollars and paying interest on that money puts us in a very bad economic position, not only in our country, but throughout the world. I assume that none of us here wants to spend a lot of time pointing fingers at each other about how we got to be where we are.

One thing is abundantly clear: If America is going to be progressive, it has to find a progressive solution in order to get out of that.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has the right to close.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Progressive budget substitute.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, in closing, budgets are more than collections of numbers; they are a statement of our values. The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget is a reflection of the values and priorities of working families in this country. Our budget charts a path that keeps America exceptional while addressing the most pressing problems facing the Nation today.

Our budget eliminates the deficit and stabilizes the debt by 2021. It does this in a manner consistent with the aspirations of the American people. It does this by restoring our economic competitiveness so that we can all experience the fullest definition of the American Dream: that each of our children will do better than we did.

We did not set these goals arbitrarily. Our budget was crafted by listening to the American people. In poll after poll, they are telling us that they want us to preserve Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid; to make higher education more affordable; to expand job training programs; to invest in roads, research and, above all, in great schools for our children.

We can do all of these things and eliminate our deficit. We have a moral imperative to do so. The people's budget is fair; it is just; it is a step towards moving this debate back to the true center.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Progressive budget. It is the people's budget. Please vote for our amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROKITA. In closing, I would like to recall the words of the gentleman from South Carolina, who spoke about the honesty of this proposed amendment.

I think it was an appropriate thing to say. This is an honest proposal. I believe that the proponents of this amendment believe everything that's in the amendment as a possible solution—but honesty, Mr. Chairman, does not equal responsibility.

This isn't the people's budget that is being proposed. It is the ''blank check'' budget. You see, it doesn't force any choices. It spends $13 trillion over 10 years. It taxes the American people. It has the Federal Government confiscate from the American people an additional $16 trillion over 10 years. That's not forcing choices. That's not being responsible. Every family in this Nation understands, when they prepare their budgets, they have to make choices. There are different priorities. This just opens up by fiat the right of the Federal Government to dip into the wallets of every American.

I heard a lot about tax cuts for the rich, Mr. Chairman. I want to be clear that the budget that came out of the Budget Committee calls for revenue-neutral tax reform. We are motivated by the same reform principles that are in the President's fiscal commission: to broaden the tax base and to lower tax rates for everybody.

I was looking at some statistics. The bottom 50 percent of taxpayers pays less than 3 percent of the income taxes. In fact, 47 percent of individuals pay no Federal income tax whatsoever.

Our idea is tax neutral. It's revenue neutral. It lowers the tax rates for everybody. It makes all of us pay something, and it doesn't give tax cuts to the rich. We are planning to take away the loopholes so that those who are better off than we are can't take advantage of high-priced lobbyists.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this proposed amendment.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget proposal pulls a bait and switch on seniors, people with disabilities, the poor, and anyone who hopes to grow old with dignity in this country. It dismantles bedrock American programs—Medicare and Medicaid—and opens Social Security to future attack.

The Republican plan takes Medicare's promise of guaranteed health benefits and swaps it out for a voucher for private insurance—one that's intentionally structured to diminish in value. Seniors will be at the mercy of big insurance companies and left to pay bigger bills out-of-pocket.

The Republican plan changes Medicaid to a block grant program. States' funding will fall far short. They'll be forced to slash programs that now cover much-needed health care for kids, the poor, and the disabled.

The Republican plan is morally bankrupt and takes the most cynical view of our country's future. It says we should reward the wealthiest Americans and corporations with trillions in tax breaks and pay for them by slashing essential programs that work.

I applaud the President for attacking the Republican budget proposal and calling it what it is: a plan to reduce the deficit on the backs of our most vulnerable populations and middle class families.

We know there is a better, fairer way.

The People's Budget—put forth by the Congressional Progressive Caucus—works for all Americans and puts people back to work.

In contrast to the House Republican budget, it balances our budget in 10 years—while preserving Medicare, improving health reform, maintaining our commitment to education, and making the investments in our infrastructure that will create jobs.

It does so by ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and bringing sanity to our bloated defense budget.

Rather than destroying our safety net like the Republican budget does, the People's Budget ensures that the wealthiest Americans and Wall Street pay their fair share of taxes.

The People's Budget would end tax breaks for oil companies and corporations that ship jobs offshore, and it would require Wall Street to pay for the damage it did to our economy.

I recently sent a survey to my constituents asking how we should cut the deficit. The results show that 85 percent want to close loopholes benefiting Wall Street and corporations;

78 percent want the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy to end; and 64 percent want defense spending cut. In contrast, only 13 percent think we should cut domestic spending for education and children, and only 12 percent want cuts to Medicare or Social Security.

The People's Budget represents the priorities of my constituents and is the real path to prosperity. I'm proud to support it and urge all of my colleges to do the same while voting no on the reckless Republican budget.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1308. An act to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act to extend the termination date for the Commission, and for other purposes.

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 216. An act to increase criminal penalties for certain knowing and intentional violations relating to food that is misbranded or adulterated.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106–286, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, and after consultation with the Majority Leader, appoints the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS).

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101–509, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the reappointment of Steve Zink of Nevada to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106–554, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) to the Board of Directors of the Vietnam Education Foundation, vice the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100–696, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) as a member of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission, vice the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KINGSTON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 112–62.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, 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 2012.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2011 and for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 are set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION SUBMISSIONS

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.
Sec. 202. Submission of reports on mandatory savings.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Restrictions on advance appropriations.
Sec. 302. Emergency spending.
Sec. 303. Changes in allocations and aggregates resulting from realistic scoring of measures affecting revenues.
Sec. 304. Prohibition on using revenue increases to comply with budget allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 305. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 306. Budget Protection Mandatory Account.
Sec. 307. Budget discretionary accounts.
Sec. 308. Treatment of rescission bills in the House.
Sec. 309. Sense of the House regarding baseline revenue projections.
Sec. 310. Sense of the House regarding long-term budget projections.

TITLE IV—EARMARK MORATORIUM

Sec. 401. Earmark moratorium.
Sec. 402. Limitation of authority of the House Committee on Rules.

TITLE V—POLICY

Sec. 501. Policy statement on health care law repeal.
Sec. 502. Policy statement on bailouts of State and local governments.
Sec. 503. Policy statement on means tested welfare programs.
Sec. 504. Policy statement on reforming the Federal budget process.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2021:

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

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

Fiscal year 2011: $1,664,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $1,866,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,128,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,325,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,426,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,523,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,694,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,809,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,959,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,120,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,287,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2011: −$0.
Fiscal year 2012: −$25,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: −$227,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: −$346,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$406,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$448,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$482,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$527,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$544,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −$561,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$597,000,000,000.

(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 2011: $2,961,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,617,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,502,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,540,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,624,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,744,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,808,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,975,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,067,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,154,000,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2011: $3,117,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,740,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,673,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,650,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,706,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,818,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,872,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,919,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,038,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,131,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,219,000,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2011: $1,453,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: $874,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $545,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $325,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $280,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $295,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $179,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $111,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $78,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $11,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$68,000,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 2011: $14,969,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $15,992,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $16,722,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $17,243,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $17,750,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,287,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $18,727,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $19,127,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,485,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $19,792,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $20,053,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2011: $10,348,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,208,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $11,768,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,100,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $12,385,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $12,678,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $12,857,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $12,976,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $13,066,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,106,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $13,078,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2011 through 2021 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $733,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $696,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $646,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $662,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $674,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $687,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $699,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $711,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $723,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $735,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $747,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $213,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $213,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $254,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $310,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $310,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $372,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $426,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $477,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $477,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $518,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $518,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $549,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $549,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $570,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $586,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $586,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $591,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $591,000,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $2,015,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,904,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $1,667,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,486,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $1,546,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,363,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, 1,506,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,278,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,524,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,280,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,580,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,341,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,591,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,354,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,602,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,370,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,682,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,468,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $1,746,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $2,545,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $1,816,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,628,000,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(21) Global War on Terrorism and related activities (970):
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION SUBMISSIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS TO SLOW THE GROWTH IN MANDATORY SPENDING AND TO ACHIEVE DEFICIT REDUCTION.—(1) Not later than September 15, 2011, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $436,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $103,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $3,007,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $49,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(E) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $18,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(F) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $28,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(G) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by $320,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(H) SPECIAL RULE.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may take into account legislation enacted after the adoption of this resolution that is determined to reduce the deficit and may make applicable adjustments in reconciliation instructions, allocations, and budget aggregates and may also make adjustments in reconciliation instructions to protect earned benefit programs.

(b) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN REVENUE.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill not later than September 15, 2011, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $4,163,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

(c) REVISION OF ALLOCATIONS.—(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

SEC. 202. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS ON MANDATORY SAVINGS.

In the House, not later than September 15, 2011, all House committees shall identify savings amounting to one percent of total mandatory spending under its jurisdiction from activities that are determined to be wasteful, unnecessary, or lower-priority. For purposes of this section, the reports by each committee shall be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget not later than September 15, 2011.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2013 and fiscal years 2014 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,565,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2012.

SEC. 302. EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In the House, if a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in paragraph (2). If such legislation is to be considered by the House without being reported, then the committee shall cause the explanation to be published in the Congressional Record in advance of floor consideration.

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any such provision is an emergency requirement if the underlying situation poses a threat to life, property, or national security and is—

(i) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(ii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iii) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(iv) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report that contains an emergency designation unless that designation meets the criteria set out in subsection (a)(2).

(c) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (b).

(d) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.—As disposition of a point of order under subsection (b) or subsection (c), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the point of order. A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent of the 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.

SEC. 303. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, including measures filed in compliance with section 201(b), that propose to change Federal revenues, the impact of such measure on Federal revenues shall be calculated by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account—

(1) the impact of the proposed revenue changes on—

(A) Gross Domestic Product, including the growth rate for the Gross Domestic Product;

(B) total domestic employment;

(C) gross private domestic investment;

(D) general price index;

(E) interest rates; and

(F) other economic variables; and

(2) the impact on Federal Revenue of the changes in economic variables analyzed under paragraph (1).

(b) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make any necessary changes to allocations and aggregates in order to conform this concurrent resolution with the determinations made by the Joint Committee on Taxation pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 304. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution in the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not take into account the provisions of any piece of legislation which propose to increase revenue or offsetting collections if the net effect of the bill is to increase the level of revenue or offsetting collections beyond the level assumed in this concurrent resolution.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any provision of a piece of legislation that proposes a new or increased fee for the receipt of a defined benefit or service (including insurance coverage) by the person or entity paying the fee.

SEC. 305. 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 contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the appropriate Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 306. BUDGET PROTECTION MANDATORY ACCOUNT.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the ''Budget Protection Mandatory Account''. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, except that it shall not include the Committee on Appropriations.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution (other than an appropriation bill), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Mandatory Account by the amounts specified in paragraph (2); and

(B) reduce the applicable section 302(a) allocations by the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in paragraph (1)(A) shall be the net reduction in mandatory budget authority (either under current law or proposed by the bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment that was adopted in the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House bill or joint resolution or a House amendment to a Senate bill or joint resolution, other than an appropriation bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in mandatory authority (either under current law or proposed by a bill or joint resolution under consideration) provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in paragraph (1) is as follows: ''The amount of mandatory budget authority reduced by this amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.''

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term—

(1) ''appropriation bill'' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2008 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(2) ''mandatory budget authority'' means any entitlement authority as defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 307. BUDGET DISCRETIONARY ACCOUNTS.

(a)(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain an account to be known as the ''Budget Protection Discretionary Account''. The Account shall be divided into entries corresponding to the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and the committee's suballocations, under section 302(a) and 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) Each entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (b). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

(b)(1) Upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall—

(A) credit the applicable entries of the Budget Protection Discretionary Account by the amounts specified in paragraph (2).

(B) reduce the applicable 302(a) and (b) allocations by the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) Each amount specified in subparagraph (A) shall be the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution.

(c)(1) If an amendment includes a provision described in paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of a House appropriations bill, reduce the level of total revenues set forth in the applicable concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years in an amount equal to the net reduction in discretionary budget authority provided by each amendment that was adopted by the House to the bill or joint resolution. Such adjustment shall be in addition to the adjustments described in subsection (b).

(2)(A) The provision specified in paragraph (1) is as follows: ''The amount of discretionary budget authority reduced by this

amendment may be used to offset a decrease in revenues.''

(B) All points of order are waived against an amendment including the text specified in subparagraph (A) provided the amendment is otherwise in order.

(d) As used in this rule, the term ''appropriation bill'' means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent fiscal year, as the case may be.

(e) During the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall maintain a running tally, which shall be available to all Members, of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 308. TREATMENT OF RESCISSION BILLS IN THE HOUSE.

(a)(1) By February 1, May 1, July 30, and November 11 of each session, the majority leader shall introduce a rescission bill. If such bill is not introduced by that date, then whenever a rescission bill is introduced during a session on or after that date, a motion to discharge the committee from its consideration shall be privileged after the 10-legislative day period beginning on that date for the first 5 such bills.

(2) It shall not be in order to offer any amendment to a rescission bill except an amendment that increases the amount of budget authority that such bill rescinds.

(b) Whenever a rescission bill passes the House, the Committee on the Budget shall immediately reduce the applicable allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 by the total amount of reductions in budget authority and in outlays resulting from such rescission bill.

(c)(1) It shall not be in order to consider any rescission bill, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, unless—

(A) in the case of such bill or conference report thereon, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet for at least 48 hours before its consideration; or

(B)(i) in the case of an amendment to such rescission bill made in order by a rule, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet within one hour after the rule is filed; or

(ii) in the case of an amendment under an open rule, it is made available to Members and the general public on the Internet immediately after being offered; in a format that is searchable and sortable.

(2) No amendment to an amendment to a rescission bill shall be in order unless germane to the amendment to which it is offered.

(d) As used in this section, the term ''rescission bill'' means a bill or joint resolution which only rescinds, in whole or in part, budget authority and which includes only titles corresponding to the most recently enacted appropriation bills that continue to include unobligated balances.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING BASELINE REVENUE PROJECTIONS.

For purposes of constructing its baseline revenue projections, the Congressional Budget Office should assume that any tax provision which is scheduled to expire under current law will be extended through the duration of any budget forecast by Congressional Budget Office so as to ensure that expiring tax provisions and expiring spending programs (other than direct appropriations) are treated in like fashion.

SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING LONG-TERM BUDGET PROJECTIONS.

For purposes of constructing its ten-year and long-term budget projection reports, the Congressional Budget Office should include an alternative scenario that assumes that mandatory spending programs grow at the same rate as average, projected nominal gross domestic product (GDP).

TITLE IV—EARMARK MORATORIUM

SEC. 401. EARMARK MORATORIUM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order to consider—

(1) a bill or joint resolution reported by any committee, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit; or

(2) a bill or joint resolution not reported by any committee, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this resolution, the terms ''congressional earmark'', ''limited tax benefit'', and ''limited tariff benefit'' have the meaning given those terms in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—The point of order under subsection (a) shall only apply to legislation providing or authorizing discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority, providing a Federal tax deduction, credit, or exclusion, or modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule in fiscal year 2011 or fiscal year 2012.

(d) INAPPLICABILITY.—This resolution shall not apply to any authorization of appropriations to a Federal entity if such authorization is not specifically targeted to a State, locality, or congressional district.

SEC. 402. LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The House Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order that would waive the point of order set forth in the first section of this resolution.

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE LAW REPEAL.

It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152) should be repealed; and

(2) in its place, health care reform that empowers patients should be enacted.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON BAILOUTS OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Federal Government should not bailout State and local governments, including State and local government employee pension plans and other post-employment benefit plans.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:

(1) In 1996, President Bill Clinton and congressional Republicans enacted reforms that have moved families off of Federal programs and enabled them to provide for themselves.

(2) According to the most recent projections, over the next 10 years we will spend approximately $10 trillion on means-tested welfare programs.

(3) Today, there are currently 77 Federal programs that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

(4) Taxpayers deserve clear and transparent information on how well these programs are working, and how much the Federal Government is spending on means-tested welfare.

(b) POLICY ON MEANS TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING THE FEDERAL BUDGET PROCESS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Federal budget process should be reformed so that it is easier to reduce Federal spending than it is to increase it by enacting reforms included in the Spending, Deficit, and Debt Control Act of 2009 (H.R. 3964, 111th Congress).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1030

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican Study Committee's substitute that is now on the floor. This substitute amends and builds upon the great work of Chairman RYAN and the entire House Budget Committee.

And while I do come to the floor and support Chairman RYAN's proposal, the RSC wanted to put forth a proposal on the floor today that went even a step further. We named our budget today the Honest Solutions budget because we know that what we are proposing will not be easy. Why? Because real solutions are not necessarily easy solutions. But given the dangerous conditions of our Nation's fiscal situation, we must recognize that tough choices must be made and must be made now.

The RSC believes that we can do better than any of the budgets on the floor today. So we have a budget that will, first of all, ensure that our Nation spends responsibly by freezing total discretionary spending at 2008 levels. The RSC budget further ensures that our Nation's security will be met by meeting Defense Secretary Gates's defense request. The RSC budget puts nondefense discretionary spending on a sustainable path.

In addition, the RSC budget strengthens Medicare's long-term finances. And most importantly, our budget, unlike any other budget on the floor today, will balance within our lifetime.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I want to thank all the members of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. Chairman, for their work on this budget. I also want to thank Chairman

RYAN for the work on his budget and the committee's work there too, and in particular, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for their work in putting this together.

The RSC budget, as the gentleman from New Jersey has mentioned, keeps tax rates low because we believe in economic growth; starts the process of saving Medicare and Social Security; protects national defense, which, after all, is that area we are supposed to constitutionally spend taxpayer dollars on.

But most importantly, what the Republican Study Committee budget does is it balances. It does what every single family, ever single small business owner, every single State government and local government has to do: it actually puts forth a budget that balances, lives within your means, doesn't spend more than you take in, gets to balance within a definable period of time. That is why we think this is appropriate, particularly when you think about the fiscal situation our Nation is in.

So I stand here in support of the budget and commend the gentleman from New Jersey for the great work that he has done.

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

If the Republican budget is a doubling down on the policies that brought us to the brink, which is contained in this budget, my brother from New Jersey presents a budget which I think quadruples down on the economic policies and lack of optimism in the American people.

The budget believes we cannot, as President Kennedy said a little over 50 years ago, ''bear any burden and meet any hardship'' in order to better our Nation. That's what America is all about, regardless of your party persuasion.

This budget gives trillions in income tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans, we both agree on that—you think it's a good policy, we think it's a horrible policy—and at the same time cuts $18 billion. Let me just take one example, the SCHIP program: $18 billion cut to our children—our own children, our grandchildren. You must be kidding me. This budget gives trillions in estate breaks to the wealthiest Americans. Many people having estates pay no taxes, yet this slashes funding for Pell Grants for our kids, our grandchildren to go to college.

This budget gives trillions in tax breaks to corporations that have been shipping jobs overseas, but ask our constituents, in your district and my district and everybody's district, to take a 20 percent cut in the scheduled benefits to Social Security. It's easy to sit here as a Congressman waiting until you turn 70—why are you smiling?—to retire with benefits you've earned, but you're asking this of our asphalt layers, our secretaries, and our teachers.

It comes down to a clear set of priorities, Mr. Chairman. If your priorities are to cut taxes for the wealthy on the backs of the retirees, then I think this second budget is the budget for you. But if you believe in an America that protects our seniors, our children, the disabled, our veterans, levels the playing field and invests in future generations, then I urge you to stand with us.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), who recognizes the fact that we must live within our means now and, unlike the gentleman from New Jersey, does not want to put additional burdens on future generations.

Mr. MULVANEY. To the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Chairman, I would say that it's not easy to do.

Why are we here? We're here for a single purpose: we take what the Republican Committee has done and simply lay out for the American people how hard it is to balance the budget within 10 years. It is not easy to do. But to sit and hear these onslaughts about how we're giving tax breaks—from a group of people that promised they would not raise taxes on folks who make less than $250,000 and then repeatedly violated that promise over the course of the last 2 years—is simply hard to take.

This is the only budget that we will get a chance to vote on this week that both balances the budget within 10 years and does not raise taxes. We take what the Republican Committee has done, we build on it to show exactly how deep the hole is that we have dug for ourselves and how hard it is to get out. But to suggest that we do it on the backs of the poor is simply disingenuous.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who is absolutely on target on most of these issues dealing with the budget as we move forward.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate my colleague's courtesy.

The words ringing in my ears for a moment about the Democrats having increased taxes, there is this collective amnesia on the side of our Republican friends who forget that a critical part of President Obama's Recovery Act that was passed by the last Congress—42 percent of which was tax cuts or relief—included a tax cut for every working American. The kind of forgot about that.

As a practical matter, Mr. Chairman, what we have done is to move forward under our initiative with something that will enable us to rebuild and renew America. What we have been given from our friends here with this alternative budget from my good friend from New Jersey which I do appreciate, this is where the Republican Party wants to go.

The Ryan budget is bad enough. It will be dead on arrival in the Senate, and will be resoundingly rejected as Americans see what is happening, taking away the retirement, health care security of Americans—230 million Americans will be returned to the tender mercies of the private insurance market. Remember, the private insurance market didn't want to insure senior citizens in an affordable fashion with comprehensive coverage; that's why we had to have Medicaid in the first place. And now the trick is to provide a voucher to insurance companies, hoping that they will step up and fill the gap. When you look at how private insurance premiums have more than doubled in the last 10 years, you see what a hollow promise this is and what a serious problem it is going to be for American families trying to plan for their future.

This is the vision that we have from our Republican friends, not only take the Republican Budget Committee, go beyond it in terms of more benefits for those who need it the least.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who has no amnesia but recognizes the fact that we do no favor for this generation by putting the burden for future constraints on our children and our grandchildren.

□ 1040

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. This Nation is on a collision course with a sovereign debt crisis the magnitude of which has never been known to this country. This is not some moonless night on the Atlantic. We are barreling full speed toward that iceberg of debt in the full light of day, and we can all see it dead ahead.

The Ryan budget turns the ship around just enough to avoid hitting that iceberg. The RSC budget does it with an added safety margin by incorporating more of the debt commission's recommendations and implementing them faster.

Mr. Chairman, we know the challenge. We see the American dream at risk, and we know that we have but a fleeting moment in history to avoid the hardest times our Nation has ever known. We can act now, place our retirement systems on sound financial footings, arrest the debilitating spiral of debt that threatens the very survival of our Nation, and return our economy to the prosperity that it has known when it enjoyed what Jefferson called a wise and frugal government. Or we can continue on our present course until we crash into the ice cold and hard reality that we can all see dead ahead.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 3 minutes to the vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, budgets are a reflection of our values and our priorities: jobs, economic growth, fiscal discipline, fairness, shared sacrifice. Most Americans talk about this all the time when they're at their kitchen table. It's not that difficult.

So quite honestly the question before us is not whether to reduce the deficit, but how. Budgets involve tradeoffs. The Republican budget that is presented to us today along with this Republican Study Committee alternative would say that we must continue the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans in this country. We must continue to give a millionaire about $130,000 in tax cuts in this budget even though we are facing the largest deficits our country has experienced.

At the same time, the choice that this Republican budget makes is to say to seniors, We must end Medicare as we know it; we must eliminate the guarantee that you, as a senior, have had for more than 35 years under Medicare to choose your doctor and your hospital; and we must impose upon you an additional $6,000 in health care costs because these deficits are so big.

So as the President said a couple of days ago, under the Republican budget, you would need to take 22 seniors paying 6,000 additional dollars to cover the costs of giving one millionaire in this country the $130,000 tax cut. We must do that under the Republican budget.

Democrats have said we must not do that. We must do this differently. And we must invest again in our people.

On health care, we don't believe that Americans who are seniors should be given a coupon instead of a guarantee. But that's what the Republican budget does. It says, You're going to get a voucher, a coupon, essentially. Once you've used it, the extent of the value of that coupon, the rest of the money to pay for your health care, comes out of your pocket. That's why the President said 6,000 additional dollars for each senior under Medicare under the Republican plan. Coupon care instead of Medicare. That's what you must have under the Republican budget.

Democrats say we must invest in Medicare and find the cuts to get rid of the waste in Medicaid that we know exists. The duplication of services that seniors don't need. We can do this without denying seniors guaranteed benefits.

And finally, we must create jobs, but the Republican budget, most of the leading economists tell us, will cost us 1.7 million jobs. Not create. Cost us 1.7 million jobs. Under the Bush recession, 8 million Americans lost their job. The month that George Bush handed the keys to Barack Obama, we hemorrhaged nearly 800,000 jobs.

We must do this right. Reject the Republicans' budget proposal.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), who, just like the gentleman from California, understands that we must not sink the ship of state, as the other side of the aisle would do, by excessive tax burdens and debt.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. You know what's great about being here today and talking about the Ryan plan is it's a blueprint. And blueprints you can do a couple things to. You can add to, and you can take away from.

And what we've heard from the progressives a minute ago is, plunder the people's plan rips the pages out of the future of this Nation for our children and our grandchildren. But the Republican Study Committee, it adds to it. It actually takes it a step further. It saves the taxpayers more money by providing savings starting with 2006 levels and going to 2008 levels.

But what we have to recognize is the debt and the deficit problems we have here today are not because we are taxed too little; it's because we have spent too much. And it is a result of 2 failed years of more government, more taxes, and more spending that we've seen. It's time to put that in history. Let's put it in the drawer.

Let's move on, and let's pass the Republican Study Committee plan because I can assure you this: It doesn't go where the President and the liberals of this House want to go, and that's into the wallets of the taxpayers of this Nation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the bipartisan fiscal commission—no fringe group—said that the Republican plan was unbalanced because it doesn't ask for shared sacrifice. It's a lopsided approach. This budget takes us farther off the deep end.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS.)

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

Mr. ANDREWS. There is no question that the country has to reduce the deficit by restraining spending. That's why we favor having Medicare get the same deal on prescription drugs the VA does—which would save $24 billion a year.

But there is a question about the future of Medicare. And today we're going to take a vote. Will Medicare prosper or perish? Will Medicare survive or die? That's the issue before the House today.

The fact is the Republican plan puts an insurance company between our seniors and their doctors—and that is wrong. The fact is that the Republican plan does not reduce health care costs. Hospitals will not charge less. Doctors will not charge less. The government will pay less, and seniors will pay more—$6,000 per senior per year.

The fact is that this is all being done not to reduce the deficit, but to reduce taxes of the wealthiest people in America. The fact is we should not have this.

And the fact is this: We can have an America that doesn't have red ink in its budget but does have Medicare for its seniors.

Let's make the choice that our constituents sent us here to make. Yes, let's sensibly reduce spending—as we did yesterday on a bipartisan basis. But this is the wrong time to end Medicare. We will fight this effort, and we will prevail.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the RSC budget because we cannot wait, as the other side seems to indicate, to get our fiscal house in order. And the RSC budget will put us on that path even faster.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are tired of their tax dollars going to Washington, D.C., with nothing in return but empty promises and Federal strings. They are tired of adding to the National debt with none of the promised jobs.

People across my State of Kansas, indeed all across the country, want their power back from Washington. Our Founding Fathers got this concept of federalism right, and it's time we return government power from Washington bureaucrats and politicians back to the American people.

Block grants of Federal Medicaid dollars to the States will do just that by allowing States and those closest to the people to use their ingenuity and creativity to make Medicaid dollars work more effectively.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. If we really care about the people, Mr. Chairman, there are currently 455 Medicaid waivers, and I ask that we allow the flexibility in the Medicaid system through a block grant system that returns the powers of federalism back to the States. And the RSC budget will do just that, Mr. Chairman. It's the right thing to do. It's the right time now to balance our budget in this way.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

□ 1050

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you for this opportunity.

Unlike so many of my colleagues, I don't have any charts or anything to point out the direction in which I would want my great country to go, but I do have 40 young minds that come from the Frederick Douglass Academy, come from my alma mater on Lenox Avenue, come from Harlem. And in these minds are the dreams and the aspirations of all the young people that want to be a part of the progress that this Nation has made.

Most of them, their parents have never had an opportunity to go to college, but have been the recipients of

Pell Grants and other kinds of educational benefits. Most of their parents and grandparents have depended on Medicaid and Medicare. Most of these kids have dreams that most of your kids have today. It just seems to me that when they go home they should not be able to say that they witnessed the protection of the wealthiest people in the United States; but they should go home to say their dreams can be acquired, our Nation can be stronger, and they want to be partners in making certain that America can be all that she can be.

So as we welcome them, they are only symbolic, they are only representative of the young people of our great country, and I hope we can see clear to support them. Thank you for the opportunity.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), who realizes that the young people would do best if we not put additional tax burdens of over $40,000 or $50,000 on their birth coming into this country by the actions of not living responsibly.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the RSC budget. With a deficit of $1.6 trillion, a debt of $14 trillion, it's no surprise that we've got to do something. We have to do something dramatic. This budget actually balances over a 9-year period, and it reforms the programs that are important to many Americans, to make them solvent and sustainable over time.

The proposals from the other side of the aisle simply don't do that. They ignore the time bomb that we have in these programs. So I commend the RSC staff and Members for putting this together. This is a good budget. We ought to support it to put our Nation on a path of financial stability and security.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the time bomb that's ticking is the time bomb on the Medicare guarantee.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I can't express my concern with greater alarm about this budget. It is a budget that's going to inflict terrible harm on Americans from all walks of life, while protecting the wealthiest taxpayers in America, both individuals and Republicans.

Now, if I give the benefit of the doubt to the Republican sponsors of their budget proposal that they're sincere, they are speaking from an ideological point of view, they want to try a social experiment in this country. But if they fail to live up to what they say they're going to accomplish, there is going to be tremendous harm.

We have a social contract with seniors to provide affordable, accessible, comprehensive health care under Medicare. And they want to take Medicare and end it, and tell those people to go to private insurance companies. We have estimates that the average senior will face cost increases of $6,000 when the program begins, and it could be over $11,000 per beneficiary in later years. But right away, to add insult to injury, they would reopen the doughnut hole under the part D prescription drug benefit, meaning people still have to pay all of the cost of their drugs, reversing what the Affordable Care Act provided.

But most of their cuts are coming from the Medicaid program. They want to take Medicaid and turn it into a block grant. Medicaid accounts for 43 percent of total long-term care spending in the U.S. Most of it goes to seniors and disabled people who are in nursing homes. If the States don't have enough money in their block grants, are they going to dump these people? These are human beings, and you are playing with their lives. This means real harm will be inflicted where Medicaid spending is the greatest.

By cutting reimbursement rates, Medicaid will lose providers. Nursing home quality and staffing levels will decline.

Reject this budget. Don't experiment on the most vulnerable of our population.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose the Republican Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2012. Their budget inflicts terrible harm on Americans from all walks of life—while protecting the wealthiest taxpayers in America, both individuals and corporations.

I am particularly disturbed by what the Republican budget does to Medicare and Medicaid.

There is no other way to put it: the Republican budget is the end of Medicare as we know it, and it is devastating for Medicare beneficiaries.

Medicare is a social contract with our seniors to provide affordable, accessible, comprehensive health care. The Republicans want to turn Medicare over to the private insurance industry, with payments to seniors that will fall far short of what they need to get the health care they deserve.

The Congressional Budget Office analysis of the Republican budget shows that, over the next decade, it will more than double beneficiary cost for new enrollees.

The average senior will face increased costs of over $6,000 annually when the program begins. And all of that extra spending by seniors and people with disabilities will go to private health insurance plans.

The transfer of seniors into private plans will raise costs by over $11,000 per beneficiary by 2030.

To add insult to injury, the Republican budget reopens the donut hole under the Part D prescription drug benefit, increasing the burden on seniors starting today.

For Medicaid, the Republican budget is even worse. Medicaid covers 60 million of the country's most vulnerable people, one in 3 low income children, 5 million seniors, and 10 million disabled individuals.

It accounts for 43 percent of total long term care spending in the U.S.

But the Republican budget cuts Medicaid in half by 2022, and turns it into a block grant for the states right away.

And since the Medicaid block grant would grow by only 1 percent per year, while inflation is over 2 percent and health inflation and enrollment growth is even higher.

This means real harm will be inflicted where Medicaid spending is the greatest: on seniors and individuals with disabilities in nursing homes and those receiving benefits to live independently in their home.

By cutting reimbursement rates, Medicaid will lose health providers.

Nursing home quality and staffing levels will inevitably decline.

Medicaid cuts will mean job losses in the health professions.

The Republican budget utterly fails the basic test of humane government. It is extreme, it is mean, and it must be defeated.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), who does not believe it's a social experiment to do what all families have to do: live within our means.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, folks, no prepared remarks, no fancy speeches. I brought with me a financial calculator. And regardless of how you calculate the numbers, America is spending too much money.

You know, for 3 years in a row we spent over a trillion dollars more than we were bringing in as a Nation. We are over $14 trillion in debt. This budget puts us on a very clear path to paying back the national debt, to reducing and ending deficits in a very timely manner, to protecting the future for our children and our grandchildren, our most precious resource as Americans.

I urge my colleagues to get behind this budget, vote for it, and let's put the American spending in priority. Let's stop the spending insanity here in Washington, D.C., and let's do what we tell the folks back home we are going to do, and let's get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We can get our fiscal house in order and do this in a balanced way without ending the Medicare guarantee.

With that, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my friend from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, every budget is about the bottom line, and here is the Ryan budget bottom line: If you are making over a million dollars, you get a $100,000 tax cut. If you are a senior on Medicare, you get an extra $12,000 medical bill. If you make over a million dollars, you win the lottery. If you are a senior citizen, you lose your Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, they say this is about balancing the budget, but they are trying to balance the budget by giving tax cuts to people earning over a million dollars and taking Medicare away from our seniors. That is no way to balance the budget.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the Chair how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who recognizes the fact that the solutions to all the problems in the world, as the other side may think, is not raising taxes on anyone and certainly not raising the taxes on those who produce the jobs in this country.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee budget alternative.

The fact of the matter is we're broke. The Federal budget deficit is projected to exceed $1 trillion for the next 2 fiscal years and exceed $800 billion annually for at least the next decade. We cannot sustain this path without bankrupting our country.

Congressman RYAN's budget proposal is a great start and sets us on a path to bringing the budget into balance. However, that proposal takes 28 years to do so. I support and will vote for his budget, but I am concerned about what will happen to it if future Congresses are not as willing to make the tough choices that are necessary to see this budget path to completion. That's why I strongly support the RSC budget, which balances the Federal budget within 9 years.

Ultimately, we need a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget to force all future Congresses to make these tough decisions, but the RSC budget does the best job of getting our fiscal house in order as quickly as possible. And now I urge all Members to support it.

The RSC Budget Proposal:

Puts forward commonsense reforms to improve Medicare and Medicaid by offering increased choices and improved services, and takes steps to save Social Security.

Repeals ObamaCare to eliminate $677 billion in additional spending over 10 years.

Freezes total discretionary spending at 2008 levels ($933 billion) beginning in 2013.

Prevents any new tax increases, repeals the unaffordable $813 billion tax increase included in ObamaCare, and proposes a smarter tax code that would lower rates while broadening the tax base.

Reduces unnecessary mandatory spending—other than Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security—by $1.9 trillion between 2012 and 2021.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

□ 1100

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee budget alternative. Today I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his courageous leadership on this issue.

You know, they say that the first step in dealing with addiction is recognize that you have got a problem. After 10 years of fighting runaway Federal spending by both political parties here in Washington, DC, I am convinced Washington, DC is addicted to spending, and it's time that we got serious.

I am a strong supporter of the Republican budget authored by PAUL RYAN, and I am a strong supporter of the Republican Study Committee alternative offered by Mr. GARRETT.

The legislation before us today would actually put us on a pathway to achieve a balanced Federal budget by the year 2020. There are hard choices in this budget, but it's time the American people broke this addiction. It's a time that people in both political parties came together and played it straight with the American people and said there are tough choices ahead, we can do them in a way that's humane, we can do them in a way that represents fiscal discipline and reform.

But we have to act; we have to act now. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this budget amendment.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I also support the Ryan budget. Both these budget proposals are steps in the right direction. They make reforms that are needed. They are honest proposals. They are not trying to demagog, they are not trying to fear-monger, they are not trying to fib to the American people.

We have got to address, Mr. Chairman, the drivers of our debt. We could have no Defense Department. I could work for free; our staffs can work for free. We can get rid of 167 agencies, and we still wouldn't get rid of this debt.

Our debt is driven by these programs of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. And the reason is because reckless politicians who came before this new Member made promises that can't possibly be kept. We are here to tell the truth, Mr. Chairman.

These budgets do this job gradually, they do it humanely, and they allow people to prepare so that these programs can be saved for my kids and our grandkids.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND), who recognizes we must keep our promises, especially to the youth of tomorrow.

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for the time this morning.

I rise today in support of the RSC budget, as well as the Ryan budget.

You know, my friends on the other side of the aisle make quick talk about the very most wealthy. Well, unfortunately, most of those file as individuals because they own LLCs and they own S corporations, as my family does. So you file those on your individual tax return. I think the American people deserve the truth regarding that number.

The second thing, I will tell you something, as a new freshman to this body, it's amazing that we want to talk about how the Republicans want to harm Medicare on the heels of a health care bill that cut $500 billion out of Medicare. I have little patience, little patience with such talk.

I will tell you the American people deserve the truth. They need this body, rather than to propose and push forth debt, doubt and despair, they must, they require us to give them certainty, safety, and security.

I rise in support of the Ryan budget as well as RSC budget.

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

I would remind the body that the $500 million in Medicare reform savings, which we got from ending some of the big breaks to the insurance industry, are kept in the Republican budget. You keep those savings.

What you do not do is what we did: use some of those savings to close the prescription drug doughnut hole. So you took the savings, but you left the seniors with the doughnut hole.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I strongly oppose this budget proposal. The choices the majority is making are ill considered and wrong.

Instead of working to reduce the deficit in a commonsense way, this budget ends Medicare—it ends Medicare—throws seniors to the wolves. Instead of working to control health care costs, this budget shifts them on to seniors and families.

The proposal repeals health care reform, dismantles Medicaid, throwing seniors out of nursing homes while providing giveaways to the insurance industry. It gives tax breaks to corporations that shift jobs overseas, cuts critical investments in education, research, job training and infrastructure. It provides subsidies to big oil companies, while cutting services to the most vulnerable Americans, including $350 billion in food stamps.

Programs such as Medicaid, Pell Grants, WIC would be gutted. It cuts taxes for the wealthiest while raising taxes on the middle class. Millionaires, billionaires get a lower top tax rate and extended estate tax giveaway.

Everyone else sees deductions and credits, like the child tax credit, eliminated. This budget is Robin Hood in reverse. It takes from seniors, the middle class, working families and gives all

that money to the rich and to corporate special interests.

I urge my colleagues, stand up for the middle class today and for America's seniors and oppose this budget.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS), who actually read this amendment and understands that it makes absolutely no changes whatsoever for seniors 60 years of age and over and actually strengthens health care for seniors in generations to come.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, by way of background, for the listeners and the people in this House, I graduated from Duke University with highest honors with distinction in economics. I say that to give you an idea, to have a little bit of insight as to what I am talking about when I talk about the two principal economic theories of our day.

One is free enterprise and the other is socialism. Let's talk about socialism for a moment. It's greater and greater government micromanaging our lives. It's higher taxes to pay for it.

Let's talk about free enterprise. Free enterprise is belief in the individual, in freedom and opportunity. It's what has helped make America one of the greatest nations this world has ever seen.

This Republican budget, the two of them—you can go with the RSC or you can go with the Ryan one—they are premised on free enterprise solutions. They will create real jobs and wealth for all Americans.

I urge this body to go with what our Founding Fathers went with, free enterprise. That's the ticket to success.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

So we stand before you, as I said before, with clear distinctions on the course that this country will lead in the future. Shall we continue to make the same bad policy that we have made in the past which sets us on a fiscal crisis, which not only this side of the aisle but the President of the United States recently stated as well?

Or should we change the direction of the ship of State? Should we direct ourselves on a path towards fiscal sanity? Should we go in the direction that every single family in this country has to go in, that is to say, that we will live within our means, that we will not put an additional burden on our children and our grandchildren?

Shall we go in a direction that we can say to the seniors 60 years of age or older that we will not change your entitlements, we will not change your health care but, rather, that we will put in place today's programs that will make sure that they are here for you and for your children and future generations as well?

Shall we go on a path that says to our children of today and of tomorrow that we will not put additional burdens onto you today or in the future by putting in programs that we cannot afford?

□ 1110

The Republican Study Committee chooses the latter. The Republican Study Committee decides that we should live within our means. The Republican Study Committee ensures that our Nation spend responsibly by freezing the total discretionary spending at 2008 levels, ensures our national security by meeting Defense Secretary Gates' defense request. Our budget puts non-defense discretionary spending on a sustainable path for the future.

We reduce unnecessary mandatory spending other than Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security as opposed to what my friends on the other side of the aisle say. We strengthen Medicare's long-term finances. This budget would slowly phase in increases to Medicare eligibility and make it stronger for the future.

And most of all, unlike any other budget that will come to the floor today, this budget will actually balance, we will actually come with a balanced budget within the lifetimes of all the Members here sitting today.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the solutions outlined in our budget proposal will put our Nation on a greater, surer footing, address the fiscal crisis and set the course for dynamic innovation, job creation, and economic growth for the future.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we do need to make tough choices. The question is what choices do we make? You choose to give another round of tax cuts to millionaires at the same time you're cutting investments in our kids' education. You choose not to get rid of the subsidies, taxpayer subsidies for oil companies while you end the Medicare guarantee, while you immediately eliminate the effort to close the doughnut hole, and while you cut funding for seniors in nursing homes by slashing Medicaid. Those are the choices you have made.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will remind Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. 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 New Jersey 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 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 77, noes 347, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—77

Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kucinich
Lee (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Markey
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Miller, George
Moore
Nadler
Napolitano
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Rangel
Richardson
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Serrano
Slaughter
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—347

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
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
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes

Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
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
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holden
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schiff
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Garamendi
Giffords
Keating
Lowey
Meeks
Olver
Reichert
Sewell

□ 1135

Mr. PETRI changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. WATT changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHNER was allowed to speak out of order.)

ON THE RETIREMENT OF THE CHAPLAIN

Mr. BOEHNER. I think all of the Members should be aware that today is Father Coughlin's last day as our Chaplain after 11 years of service.

I think all of us, not just the Members but the officers and the staff, owe a giant debt of gratitude to Father Dan. He has been an invaluable part of our community, not just with the opening prayer but his counsel and his guidance that he's offered to all of us. In the House's darkest hours, he's been there to gently lead us back to safe haven. In between, when things get really noisy around here, he tries to encourage us to stop, find some quiet time, and reflect.

He was appointed by Speaker Hastert 11 years ago. He comes from Chicago, where he will return. I am sure that there's one person that's real happy he's returning, and that's his mother, who's 96 years young.

So, Father Dan, on behalf of the whole House, I want to thank you for your service. I know we haven't always been the most cooperative congregation. I hope that you will keep this House and the people who serve here in your prayers. We will keep you in ours.

With that, I am happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

As is very evident by the response to your remarks in praise of Father Coughlin, if there's one thing that Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives agree on, it is that God has truly blessed us with the service of Father Coughlin as our Chaplain for the past 11 years.

When we talk about him being our Chaplain, it's not that he's just the Chaplain of the Members, he's the Chaplain for the staff, for the carpenter that we see in the hall, for the service employees who are here. He ministers to the needs of all of us here, sometimes in a very macro way.

□ 1140

When 9/11 struck, or in Tucson most recently, or with the anthrax threat, those kinds of things had an impact on all of us. Father was there for us as a group, and he was there for us individually. We never know what joys or pain our colleagues or our workers here are undergoing or suffering. Father Dan knows more than most of us, and his discretion is something that we all value and respect.

Father Dan has ministered to the needs of the poor with the Missionaries of Charity in Calcutta, India. He has meditated with the Trappist monks in the monastery, and I think he's going back to do some of that again. He has been a scholar-in-residence at the North American College in Rome, exchanging ideas there. He has ministered to the needs of his parishioners in LaGrange, Illinois, and that probably serves him best for ministering to the diverse needs of the flock that he shepherds here. We are very, very, very honored.

Last year, many of us in a bipartisan way stood up and sang the praises. It seems so recent, but it was a year ago. Then after that, Father was honored in Illinois for serving as a priest for 50 years. For some of us, it was really a special source of pride. Although we respect all of our Chaplains, it was a source of personal pride that he was the first Roman Catholic Chaplain in the House of Representatives, and he showed that he could minister to the needs of all of the Members of all faiths here.

So, yes, we are very blessed by his service in the Congress. We are going to miss him a great deal. We wish him well as he goes forth. The legacy that he left us is one that was not only of opening prayer each day to inspire us and lift us to a higher place in our deliberations, but he set an example of civility in the Congress of confidentiality of relationships. He was a great Chaplain. We will miss him greatly, and we are enormously grateful to him.

Thank you, Father Coughlin.

Mr. BOEHNER. Father Dan, may God be with you.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) 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 is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 119, noes 136, answered ''present'' 172, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—119

Akin
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Guinta
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador

Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lummis
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Pence
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Ribble
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross (FL)
Royce
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Walberg
Walsh (IL)
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Woodall

NOES—136

Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Barletta
Barrow
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Black
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Heller
Herrera Beutler
Hultgren
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Kildee
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lungren, Daniel E.
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Miller (MI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Paulsen
Pearce
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Rivera
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Schilling
Schock
Schrader
Scott (SC)
Sensenbrenner
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walden
Watt
Webster
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—172

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

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Keating
Meeks
Olver
Reichert

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). Less than 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1158

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. BONO MACK and Mr. DREIER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. GALLEGLY changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Messrs. ELLISON, TIERNEY, GUTIERREZ, DINGELL, SARBANES, BECERRA, RICHMOND, GRIJALVA, DEFAZIO, FRANK of Massachusetts, GEORGE MILLER of California, MCDERMOTT, PAYNE, HONDA, LYNCH, MCNERNEY, WAXMAN, CLYBURN, ROTHMAN of New Jersey, PASCRELL, MICHAUD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Messrs. LIPINSKI and RUSH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''present.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 112–62.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to put in order the Democratic substitute budget.

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 2012.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for the fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Reserve fund for job creation through investments and incentives.
Sec. 202. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence.
Sec. 203. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and servicemembers.
Sec. 204. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicare improvement.
Sec. 205. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Transitional Medical Assistance.
Sec. 206. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for initiatives that benefit children.
Sec. 207. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the reauthorization of Trade Adjustment Assistance.
Sec. 208. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
Sec. 209. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for college affordability.
Sec. 210. Reserve fund for additional tax relief for individuals and families.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 302. Adjustments to discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 303. Costs of overseas contingency operations and emergency needs.
Sec. 304. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 305. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 306. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—POLICY

Sec. 401. Policy of the House on Social Security reform that protects workers and retirees.
Sec. 402. Policy of the House on protecting the Medicare guarantee for seniors.
Sec. 403. Policy of the House on affordable health care coverage for working families.
Sec. 404. Policy of the House on Medicaid.
Sec. 405. Policy of the House on health care for military servicemembers and their families and veterans.
Sec. 406. Policy of the House on overseas contingency operations.
Sec. 407. Policy of the House on national security.
Sec. 408. Policy of the House on tax reform and deficit reduction.
Sec. 409. Policy of the House on agriculture spending.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2021:

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

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

Fiscal year 2012: $1,874,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,160,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,427,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,617,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,766,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,912,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,088,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,265,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,440,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,621,001,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: −$16,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: −$194,259,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014: −$242,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$213,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$204,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$262,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$245,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$237,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −$240,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$262,582,000,000.

(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 2012: $3,019,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,020,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,211,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,343,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,558,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,724,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,883,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,098,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,314,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,497,789,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $3,056,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,077,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,199,401,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,342,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,549,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,691,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,828,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,056,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,258,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,452,330,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $1,181,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $916,327,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $771,492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $724,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $783,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $778,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $739,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $791,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $818,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $831,329,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $16,316,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $17,417,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,385,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $19,336,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $20,362,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $21,403,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $22,433,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $23,505,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $24,622,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $25,784,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $11,533,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $12,463,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $13,241,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,972,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,753,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $15,533,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $16,282,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $17,087,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $17,936,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $18,810,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2012 through 2021 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $585,002,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $598,671,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $602,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $598,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $618,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $606,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $631,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $644,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $633,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $656,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $642,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $668,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $650,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $680,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $667,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $692,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $679,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $705,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $692,242,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $57,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $57,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $55,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $55,252,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,081,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $55,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $58,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,049,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $60,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $61,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $62,327,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $63,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,299,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $32,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $31,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $31,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $32,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,049,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $33,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $33,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $34,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $35,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $36,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,875,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $12,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $7,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $6,188,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $6,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $6,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $6,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $6,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,974,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $37,368,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $35,981,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $36,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $36,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $37,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $38,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $39,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $40,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $41,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,309,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,035,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $20,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $20,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $19,463,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $20,052,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $19,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $20,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,889,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $24,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $13,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $12,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $13,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$4,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $17,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $20,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $28,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $21,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,194,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $92,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $93,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $93,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $94,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $95,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $96,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $97,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $98,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $99,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $100,797,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,951,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $15,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $15,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $16,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $16,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $17,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $17,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $17,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $18,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,802,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $111,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $103,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $106,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $111,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $110,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $118,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $122,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $124,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $126,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $128,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $130,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,515,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $356,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $358,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $371,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $368,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $452,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $435,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $518,204,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $565,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $612,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $615,828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $654,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $652,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $700,813,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $697,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $755,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $742,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $799,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $795,946,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $483,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $483,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $520,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $521,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $548,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $548,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $571,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $571,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $618,727,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $640,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $640,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $663,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $662,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $722,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $723,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $775,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $774,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $829,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $828,970,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $536,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $531,078,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $523,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $522,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $520,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $519,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $518,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $525,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $526,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $530,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $546,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $557,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $554,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $570,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,314,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $54,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $36,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $44,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $48,721,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $53,514,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $58,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $64,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,053,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $128,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $130,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,024,000,000.

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $134,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $134,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $138,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $147,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $146,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $145,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $144,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $155,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $159,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $164,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,622,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $55,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $61,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $55,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $56,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $59,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $59,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $60,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $62,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $66,045,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $68,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,039,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $27,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $26,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,510,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $28,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,173,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $29,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $30,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $31,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $31,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $32,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,931,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $373,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $373,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $439,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $519,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $519,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $598,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $598,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $678,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $678,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $756,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $756,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $827,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $827,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $890,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $890,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $953,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $953,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $1,006,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,006,915,000,000.
(19) Non-Security Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$20,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$13,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$16,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$10,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$22,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$18,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$22,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$19,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$25,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$23,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$28,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$26,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$29,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$31,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$33,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,708,000,000.
(20) Security Allowances (930)
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$15,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$8,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$20,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$15,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$21,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$30,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$26,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$31,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$33,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$36,409,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$36,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,728,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$77,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$77,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$80,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$81,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$81,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$84,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$84,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$85,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$85,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$91,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$91,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$97,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$97,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$101,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$101,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$105,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$105,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$110,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$110,174,000,000.
(22) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $126,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,301,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR JOB CREATION THROUGH INVESTMENTS AND INCENTIVES.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for a robust Federal investment in America's infrastructure, incentives for businesses, and support for communities that creates jobs for Americans and boosts the economy. The revisions may include measures that:

(1) Provide for additional investments to improve energy efficiency, develop renewable energy sources, and provide the training for workers in these industries (''clean energy

jobs'') by the amounts in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

(2) Reauthorize Federal highway and transit programs by providing new contract authority by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure establishes or maintains a solvent Highway Trust Fund over the period of fiscal years 2012 through 2017. ''Solvency'' is defined as a positive cash balance. Such measure may include a transfer into the Highway Trust Fund from other Federal funds, as long as the transfer of Federal funds is fully offset.

(3) Create a National Infrastructure Bank to pool Federal, State, local, tribal, and private-sector resources for a wide range of investments of national or regional significance by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

(4) Provide for additional investments in rail, aviation, harbors, seaports, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other infrastructure by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

(5) Provide additional incentives, including tax incentives, to small businesses, nonprofits, States, and communities to expand investment and to train, hire, and retain private-sector workers and public service employees by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides tax incentives for or otherwise encourages the production of renewable energy or increased energy efficiency;

(2) encourages investment in emerging energy or vehicle technologies or carbon capture and sequestration;

(3) limits and provides for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;

(4) assists businesses, industries, States, communities, the environment, workers, or households as the United States moves toward reducing and offsetting the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions; or

(5) facilitates the training of workers for these industries (''clean energy jobs'');

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) enhances health care for military personnel, military retirees, or veterans;

(2) maintains the affordability of health care for military personnel, military retirees, or veterans;

(3) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(4) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay (concurrent receipt); or

(5) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016, or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that make improvements to Medicare, including making reforms to the Medicare payment system for physicians that build on delivery reforms underway, such as advancement of new care models, and—

(1) change incentives to encourage efficiency and higher quality care in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability;

(2) improve payment accuracy to encourage efficient use of resources and ensure that patient-centered primary care receives appropriate compensation;

(3) support innovative programs to improve coordination of care among all providers serving a patient in all appropriate settings; and

(4) hold providers accountable for their utilization patterns and quality of care;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends the Transitional Medical Assistance program in title XIX of the Social Security Act through fiscal year 2012, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INITIATIVES THAT BENEFIT CHILDREN.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of children by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021. Improvements may include:

(1) Extension and expansion of child care assistance.

(2) Changes to foster care to prevent child abuse and neglect and keep more children safely in their homes.

(3) Changes to child support enforcement to encourage increased parental support for children, particularly from non-custodial parents, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child or encourages States to provide access and visitation services to improve fathers' relationships with their children. Such changes could reflect efforts 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. 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.

SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REAUTHORIZATION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends Trade Adjustment Assistance and the 2009 reforms to Trade Adjustment Assistance, which expired earlier this year, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that capitalizes the existing Affordable Housing Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 209. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable, including efforts to maintain the maximum Pell grant award, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

SEC. 210. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF FOR INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides additional tax relief to individuals and families, such as expanding tax relief provided by the refundable child credit, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2016 or fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2021.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2013 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2014, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) 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 2012 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2012.

SEC. 302. 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, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 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 $623,000,000, and that amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that appropriates $7,233,000,000 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 $1,257,000,000, to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(3) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that appropriates up to $581,000,000, 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 House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that appropriates $10,000,000 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 $60,000,000, 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 House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget 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. 303. COSTS OF OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND EMERGENCY NEEDS.

(a) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2011 or fiscal year 2012 for overseas contingency operations and other activities and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to the amounts of budget authority specified in section 102(22) for fiscal year 2011 or fiscal year 2012 and the new outlays resulting therefrom.

(b) EMERGENCY NEEDS.—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority and outlays resulting therefrom shall not count for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or this resolution.

SEC. 304. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, 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 House Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying section 302(f) 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.

SEC. 305. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—In the House, 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) APPLICABILITY.—Clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall not apply to measures for which the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has made an adjustment contemplated under title II of this resolution.

(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for legislation which has received final congressional approval in the same form by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but has yet to be presented to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

SEC. 306. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

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, 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.

TITLE IV—POLICY

SEC. 401. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND RETIREES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Social Security is America's most important retirement resource, especially for seniors, because it provides an income floor to keep them, their spouses and their survivors out of poverty during retirement—benefits earned based on their past payroll contributions;

(2) in 2010, 53 million people relied on Social Security;

(3) Social Security benefits are modest, with an average annual benefit for retirees of about $14,000, while the average total retirement income is only about $25,000 per year;

(4) diverting workers' payroll contributions toward private accounts undermines retirement security and the social safety net by subjecting the workers' retirement decisions and income to the whims of the stock market;

(5) diverting trust fund payroll contributions toward private accounts jeopardizes Social Security because the program will not have the resources to pay full benefits to current retirees; and

(6) privatization increases Federal debt because the Treasury will have to borrow additional funds from the public to pay full benefits to current retirees.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Social Security should be strengthened for its own sake and not to achieve deficit reduction. Because privatization proposals are fiscally irresponsible and would put the retirement security of seniors at risk, any Social Security reform legislation shall reject partial or complete privatization of the program.

SEC. 402. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) senior citizens and persons with disabilities highly value the Medicare program and rely on Medicare to guarantee their health and financial security;

(2) in 2010, more than 40 million people relied on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services;

(3) the Medicare program has lower administrative and program costs than private insurance for a given level of benefits;

(4) excess health care cost growth is not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, it is endemic to the entire health care system;

(5) destroying the Medicare program and replacing it with a voucher or premium support for the purchase of private insurance that fails to keep pace with growth in health costs will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks; and

(6) shifting excess health care cost growth onto Medicare beneficiaries would not reduce

overall health care costs, instead it would mean beneficiaries would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the Medicare guarantee for seniors and persons with disabilities should be preserved and strengthened, and that any legislation to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance should be rejected.

SEC. 403. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) making health care coverage affordable and accessible for all American families will improve families' health and economic security, which will make the economy stronger;

(2) the Affordable Care Act signed into law in 2010 will expand coverage to more than 30,000,000 Americans and bring costs down for families and small businesses;

(3) consumers are already benefiting from the Affordable Care Act's provisions to hold insurance companies accountable for their actions and to end long-standing practices such as denying coverage to children based on pre-existing conditions, imposing lifetime limits on coverage that put families at risk of bankruptcy in the event of serious illness, and dropping an enrollee's coverage once the enrollee becomes ill based on a simple mistake in the enrollee's application;

(4) the Affordable Care Act reforms Federal health entitlements by using nearly every health cost-containment provision experts recommend, including new incentives to reward quality and coordination of care rather than simply quantity of services provided, new tools to crack down on fraud, and the elimination of excessive taxpayer subsidies to private insurance plans, and as a result will slow the projected annual growth rate of national health expenditures by 0.3 percentage points after 2016, the essence of ''bending the cost curve''; and

(5) the Affordable Care Act will reduce the Federal deficit by more than $1,000,000,000,000 over the next 20 years.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the law of the land should support making affordable health care coverage available to every American family, and therefore the Affordable Care Act should not be repealed.

SEC. 404. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICAID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Medicaid is a central component of the Nation's health care safety net, providing health coverage to 28 million low-income children, 5 million seniors, and 10 million disabled individuals who would otherwise be unable to obtain health insurance;

(2) senior citizens and persons with disabilities account for two-thirds of Medicaid program spending and consequently would be at particular risk of losing access to important health care assistance under any policy to sever the link between Medicaid funding and the actual costs of providing services to the currently eligible Medicaid population;

(3) Medicaid pays for 43 percent of long-term care services in the United States, providing a critical health care safety net for senior citizens and disabled individuals facing significant costs for long-term care; and

(4) at least 70 percent of persons over age 65 will likely need long-term care services at some point in their lives.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the important health care safety net for senior citizens, persons with disabilities, and other vulnerable populations provided by Medicaid should be preserved and should not be dismantled by converting Medicaid into a block grant that is incapable of responding to increased need that may result from trends in health care costs or economic conditions.

SEC. 405. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON HEALTH CARE FOR MILITARY SERVICEMEMBERS AND THEIR FAMILIES AND VETERANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that active duty military servicemembers and their families value the high-quality health care they receive through Tricare and other programs run by the Defense Department, and veterans rely on the health service network run by the Department of Veterans Affairs to address their unique health needs.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the Congress should reject legislation that would damage the excellent care provided to the men and women who are serving and who have served the country in uniform; and that any future health care legislation that eliminates quality Federal health care programs for military servicemembers and veterans and replaces them with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance should be rejected.

SEC. 406. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) it is the stated position of the Administration that all troops will be redeployed from Iraq by the end of 2011; and

(2) it is the stated position of the Administration that Afghan troops will take the full lead for security operations in Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) consistent with the Administration's stated position, no funding shall be provided for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through the Overseas Contingency Operations budget beyond 2014; and

(2) any future operations should be funded through the base budget.

SEC. 407. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the country's national security depends upon a well-coordinated strategy that involves the Department of Defense, the National Nuclear Security Administration, the Department of Homeland Security, and international affairs programs—including those at the Department of State and the Agency for International Development;

(2) a growing economy is the foundation of our security and enables the country to provide the resources for a strong military, sound homeland security agencies, and effective diplomacy and international development;

(3) because it puts our economy at risk, the Nation's debt is an immense security threat to our country, just as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen has stated, and we must have a deficit reduction plan that is serious and realistic;

(4) the bipartisan National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and the bipartisan Rivlin-Domenici Debt Reduction Task Force concluded that a serious and balanced deficit reduction plan must put national security programs on the table;

(5) the House Budget Committee voted and passed on a bipartisan vote of 33–5 an amendment to the 2012 budget resolution recognizing that national security programs should be considered as part of a serious deficit reduction plan;

(6) the national security recommendations of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform contained a number of suggestions for savings that could be made without jeopardizing our troops, military families, veterans, or the country's security and global standing;

(7) more can be done to rein in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies, including the Department of Defense—an agency that has been unable to pass a clean audit—and the Department of Homeland Security, such as the elimination of programs the Government Accountability Office recently reported as duplicative, which could save billions of dollars;

(8) effective implementation of weapons acquisition reforms at the Department of Defense can help control excessive cost growth in the development of new weapons systems and help ensure that weapons systems are delivered on time and in adequate quantities to equip our servicemen and servicewomen;

(9) the Department of Defense should continue to review defense plans to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant and are applicable to 21st century threats;

(10) the State Department, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and other U.S. international affairs agencies can save money and improve cost-effectiveness by ensuring that their workforces have the appropriate mix of direct-hire personnel and contractors, as identified by the Administration's 2010 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review;

(11) the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security should perform a comprehensive review of the role that contractors play in their operations, including the degree to which contractors are performing inherently governmental functions, to ensure they have the most effective mix of government and contracted personnel;

(12) ballistic missile defense technologies that are not proven to work through adequate testing and that are not operationally viable should not be deployed, and that no funding should be provided for the research or development of space-based interceptors;

(13) cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing ''loose nukes'' and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat; and

(14) the Department of Defense should make every effort to investigate the national security benefits of energy independence, including those that may be associated with alternative energy sources and energy efficiency conversions.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that after thorough review, the Committee on Appropriations shall determine savings within the Nation's security programs as identified in subsection (a)(1) below the levels in the President's 2012 budget equal to the amounts in section 102(20).

SEC. 408. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the House must pursue deficit reduction through reform of the tax code, which contains numerous tax breaks for special interests;

(2) these special tax breaks can greatly complicate the effort to administer the code and the taxpayer's ability to fully comply with its terms, while also undermining our basic sense of fairness;

(3) the corporate income tax does include a number of incentives that help spur economic growth and innovation, such as extending the research and development credit and clean energy incentives;

(4) but tax breaks for special interests can also distort economic incentives for businesses and consumers and encourage businesses to ship American jobs and capital overseas;

(5) the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform observed that the corporate income tax is riddled with special interest tax breaks and subsidies, is

badly in need of reform and proposed to streamline the code, capturing some of the savings in the process, to achieve deficit reduction in a more balanced way.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This resolution's revenue policies achieve the same net savings as the revenue policies in the President's budget. It does not endorse any of the President's specific proposals unless expressly stated in this resolution.

(2) POLICY ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.—

(A) The President and this resolution extend the middle class tax cuts, provide long-term relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax for tens of millions of middle class American families, and provide estate tax relief at the 2009 levels.

(B) The President and this resolution apply President Clinton's top two tax rates to persons with adjusted gross incomes above $200,000 ($250,000 for married couples). The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform plan also assumes revenue from returning to those top two tax rates for top earners.

(C) The President and this resolution extend policies that support saving and capital formation.

(D) This resolution encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the various proposals made by the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform to limit tax expenditures and raise revenue for deficit reduction; and expressly rejects the approach in the Republican resolution that provides millionaires with even larger tax cuts at the expense of middle-income taxpayers. This resolution protects middle-income taxpayers and encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider tax expenditure reform proposals that would apply to households with over $1 million in adjusted gross income, consistent with the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform's proposals to limit tax expenditures.

(3) POLICY ON CORPORATE INCOME TAXES.—

(A) The President and this resolution assume elimination of subsidies for the major integrated oil and gas companies, and pernicious tax breaks that reward U.S. corporations that ship American jobs—rather than products—overseas.

(B) This resolution adopts those and other pro-growth corporate tax incentives in the President's budget, such as extending the research and development credit and clean energy incentives.

(C) This resolution therefore urges the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the full range of different corporate tax reform proposals to determine which one can most effectively optimize economic growth and provide for necessary revenues.

SEC. 409. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AGRICULTURE SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the current looming Federal deficit threatens our Nation's economic security and continued growth;

(2) the Committee on Agriculture reduced spending in programs under its jurisdiction when writing the 2008 farm bill;

(3) as directed by the 2008 Farm Bill, the Department of Agriculture realized an additional $6 billion in crop insurance savings by renegotiating the Standard Reinsurance Agreement;

(4) soaring crop prices and a booming farm sector make agriculture subsidies—particularly those originally designed to be temporary—difficult to defend in a time of fiscal constraint; and

(5) farm policy is vital to rural communities and protects food and energy security around the country.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that the Committee on Agriculture should reduce spending in farm programs that provide direct payments to producers even in robust markets and in times of bumper yields. The Committee should also find ways to focus assistance away from wealthy agribusinesses and toward struggling family farmers in a manner that protects jobs and economic growth while preserving the farm and nutrition safety net.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, our top priority in this Congress should be to support a robust economic recovery and put America back to work. That is what the Democratic plan does. It reduces the deficit in a steady, predictable way without slashing important investments in our kids' education and strategic national investments, without ending the Medicare guarantee, and without putting seniors, disabled individuals and kids at risk who rely on Medicare, and it reduces the deficit in a balanced way by $1.2 trillion more than the President's budget and achieves primary balance in the year 2018.

The Republican plan we've been discussing is a narrow vision of America—a place with no shared sacrifice, a place where those who have benefited the most from what our country has to offer give little in return.

The Democrats have a different vision for our country. We believe our strength springs not only from the undisputed benefits of a free people pursuing their ambitions and their dreams but also from sometimes harnessing those talents for important national purposes.

We believe America's greatness is rooted not only in a collection of individuals acting alone but from our capacity to work together for the common good. We believe that is a patriotic vision of America. We do not see the government as an enemy but as the imperfect instrument by which we can accomplish together as a people what no individual or single corporation can do alone.

Small business owners recognize that they must make certain investments to build a successful enterprise. Similarly, our Nation must make the strategic national investments necessary to keep our country strong in an increasingly global economic marketplace. Our plan does that.

We also believe we can do that while making cuts, and we make sensible, targeted cuts. But we do it in a smart way, not with a meat ax that threatens the fragile recovery.

We also agree with the fiscal commission that security spending should be part of this debate. Admiral Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has stated, and I quote, that the most significant threat to our national security is our national debt. There is growing bipartisan consensus that those security agencies must themselves be part of our effort to reduce our debt and strengthen our country.

Our approach is a balanced one. We take cuts in the discretionary and bring down that part of the budget to the lowest point as a percentage of the economy since the Eisenhower administration. We take cuts in other areas. We take cuts in mandatory programs, including agriculture subsidies.

But we make different choices than the Republican budget. We end the subsidies to Big Oil rather than keeping those as we cut education for our kids. We ask the folks at the very top to pay the same tax rate they paid during the Clinton administration rather than end the Medicare guarantee and slash funding for seniors in nursing homes and others who rely on that support.

We make very different choices in this budget, but we accomplish the goal in a fiscally responsible way.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, I want to start off by commending Mr. VAN HOLLEN. It's not always that the minority offers an alternative budget. In fact, I know there are a lot of pressures not to do that. So I think Mr. VAN HOLLEN is to be commended, and his very capable staff, for actually proposing an alternative. That's important. It's important that we bring ideas to the table so we can have a real debate about ideas. I want to start with saying that.

Number two, we just have a different definition of ''fiscal responsibility,'' I suppose. This budget, relative to the mark, to the base budget we're talking about, increases spending by $4.5 trillion, raises taxes by $2 trillion, and it adds $2.4 trillion to the deficit compared to the base bill we're talking about here.

It does exceed the President's budget in debt reduction, in deficit reduction, and so the gentleman is to be commended for that, but I personally think the President's budget is a pretty low water mark. It exceeds it by raising taxes another $210 billion and also cutting defense by $614 billion above the cuts that are in the base, our budget, and in the President's budget.

Secretary Gates has warned us that such cuts would leave the military unable to meet its current missions. And using his words: ''Setting indiscriminate targets to scrimp on defense is math, not strategy.''

I think it's very important that we recognize our priorities. Number one, national defense is the primary responsibility of the Federal Government. When our war fighters tell us this doesn't allow them to have the tools to keep them safe, the equipment they

need to prosecute their jobs, I think that's not responsible.

When our economy is struggling to get out of a very deep recession, over $2 trillion in tax increases I just don't think is responsible.

□ 1210

On the alternative, I think what we are offering is responsible. Our budget does four basic things. It gets the economy growing. It keeps taxes where they are and prevents massive tax increases. It saves our Medicare and Medicaid programs. It fulfills the mission of health and retirement security for all Americans by guaranteeing that people who have retired and are about to retire keep what they have, what they have organized their lives around, and then reforms these programs so that they're solvent and sustainable for the next generation. Number three, it repairs our social safety net so that it works. And it, number four, pays off our debt. That's what we do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal commission said of the Republican plan it was an unbalanced approach. Our approach is a balanced approach. Secretary Gates' comments were directed to the fiscal commission's recommendations. Our proposals are in line with what the President outlined just the other day. I would point out that Governor Haley Barbour said, ''If we Republicans don't propose some savings of money on defense, we will have no credibility on anything else.'' Of course the Pentagon has never passed a GAO budget, and I think everybody who does budgets recognizes there is some savings to be found there.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished assistant leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend from Maryland for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard from our Republican friends that they're transforming Medicare. They call it a move to premium support. They also say they're just fixing the flaws in Medicaid. They say they're being brave, and finally tackling entitlement reform. But earlier today, on one of the morning shows, I heard my friend from Texas, JEB HENSARLING, being finally candid about the Republicans' view of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. He called them cruel Ponzi schemes. So there we have it.

This isn't about being brave, or transformative, or making a few changes to save the economy. Republicans are pushing the same agenda they have always had, ending the safety net programs that they view as fraudulent. And the Republican budget does exactly that. It ends Medicare, results in a huge cost shift, and forces seniors to pay $6,000 per year out of pocket.

It block grants Medicaid, slashes nursing home aid, and would lead to 50 different benefit programs across the country. That takes us back to my childhood, when benefits in our country were determined by what State you may have been fortunate or unfortunate to have been born in.

But the greatest fraud being committed is that these drastic and unfair changes don't even bring the Republican budget to balance. In fact, the Republican budget adds $8 trillion to the deficit over the next decade. Then where is all that money going, one might ask. While Republicans are gutting Medicare and Medicaid with one hand, they're giving tax breaks to big oil companies and making tax cuts for the wealthy with the other hand. That's what I call a Ponzi scheme.

Now, if you're wealthy or a special interest group, this is surely a pathway to prosperity. But if you're in your golden years, it's the Road to Ruin. Democrats have a plan to reduce the deficit in a steady, responsible way as we build a foundation for shared prosperity and long-term economic growth. In fact, the Democratic budget achieves primary balance by fiscal year 2018, and cuts the deficit by $1.2 trillion more than the President's budget. I proudly support the Democratic alternative budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

We have heard from the minority party that their budget seeks to harness the American people. Why? They have already saddled the American people with record spending deficits and debt. Just say ''neigh.''

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words about Medicare if I can. First and foremost, I want to make it very clear that if you are 55 and over, there are no changes to you whatsoever. We hear a lot about Medicare as we know it. Unfortunately, Medicare as we know it is going bankrupt. If you are for the status quo with regard to Medicare, you're on the side of the elimination of Medicare as we know it.

Another point I want to make is, we hear a lot about cuts. These are Washington cuts. This is Washington cutspeak. Where I'm from, if you get $5 on a Monday and the next day you get $10, that's an increase, not a cut. Most Americans would be appalled to know, Mr. Chairman, that the increases we are seeing are being called cuts. And I'm going to explain it to my folks when I get back to Arkansas. Medicare has not one penny of cuts in this budget. It continues to grow.

With regard to the language about vouchers, there is no voucher here. We're trying to give the folks that are 55 and under health care like Members of Congress have. Have you ever, Mr. Chairman, heard anyone in Congress describe their own health care plan as a voucher? No. Of course you haven't. Because it's not. That word has been rolled out with the other tested words, ''privatization,'' all this other nonsense, for the purposes of politics. You don't want the American people, Mr. Chairman, to have the same health care that you have.

I support this budget because it will keep our promise to seniors, it will save Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and it will preserve this country for my kids.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge Republican Members to read their own budget. It does not give seniors the same deal as Members of Congress. Members of Congress have a fair share formula. Seniors do not under their bill. Seniors get an immediate cut to the prescription drug benefit to the extent that we closed the doughnut hole, and they don't. Let's get our facts straight.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I want to thank Chairman VAN HOLLEN and I want to thank Mr. RYAN for the conduct of this debate that's taking place. They are two exemplary examples of how debate and discussion should move forward and emanate here in the House of Representatives.

Harry Truman said, ''Every segment of our population, and every individual, has a right to expect from his government a fair deal.'' I rise in strong support of the fair deal that's being proposed by the Democratic side in this debate. I rise because it helps us out with jobs and the economy, and recognizes that we must deal with the deficit, but deal with it in a manner that makes sense.

In my hometown we go to a place called Augie & Ray's. In Augie & Ray's, they want to know, whose side are you on in this? When you take Medicare and end the program as we know it, and shift the burden of the deficit at a time when we need shared sacrifice to the elderly, it is just flatly unfair. The social contract that the governed, that the people have with their government is about shared sacrifice, but it's also about the guarantee.

□ 1220

This is not about charts and statistics and flow charts; it's about people at the end of the day who are impacted by the decisions that we make; not by some economist's theory, but about a guarantee from their government, a guarantee that if they pay in, at the end of the day they are going to receive the benefits they have worked so hard for all of their lives.

That guarantee shouldn't be two-tiered. That guarantee shouldn't cut off benefits immediately to some and postpone it for others. That's a guarantee we should be working to fix, not to end. That is the fundamental difference in what's going on here today.

My distinguished colleague, the leader, Mr. CLYBURN, said let's recognize what's going on here, the extreme differences that have existed in this party since Roosevelt became President. An end of Social Security, an end of Medicare, an end to Medicaid, that has been the goal of the other side.

I stand in strong support of the Democratic alternative.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished chief deputy whip, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My colleague from Connecticut talked about a guarantee. Well, there is one guarantee that is for sure, Mr. Chairman, and that is the guarantee that Medicare as we know it is a pipe dream into perpetuity. It's going broke. The guarantee that the Democratic House has brought us in the past is a guarantee that says 47 percent of our debt obligations are to foreigners.

We are guaranteed right now to borrow 40 cents on every dollar unless we do something about it. So what do we do about it? There are famous themes in literature that fast-forward into the future. You get a glimpse of the reality of the future, and then we always love it when the hero comes back and says, Oh, here's what's going on. There's a choice. Let's make a good choice and let's move forward.

Well, we don't need fiction today. What we need is the clear-eyed reality of what these numbers present to us, and they present to us a choice:

We can either choose to do nothing, and I would say that is choosing, or we can choose to do something. We can choose to do a historic plan that brings a brightness to the economy, that creates jobs and opportunity, that doesn't mortgage our children's future to China and ultimately puts the U.S. on a global competitive basis, the likes of which the world will have never seen.

This is a time of choosing. Let's move forward and choose the House Republican plan, which makes guarantees and makes promises that we can keep with.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a time of choosing. Our budget chooses to make investments in our kids rather than choosing to provide even bigger tax breaks to the very wealthy, and we choose to get rid of subsidies for oil companies instead of cutting nursing homes funding through Medicare for seniors and disabled individuals.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget cuts the President's 2012 request for international affairs by $20 billion. That's 39 percent of the amount in diplomacy and development outside of Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. While diplomacy and development account for only about 1 percent of the overall budget, under the Republican plan this tiny portion of the budget would absorb a wildly disproportionate share of the cuts.

Here's what it means on the ground: Taking AIDS patients off lifesaving medication, withholding bed nets from children in malaria zones, and standing idly by during humanitarian emergencies.

I know the chairman of the committee, I know he doesn't want to see those things happen, but the effect of his plan would make them happen.

The Democratic alternative takes a wise and responsible approach to reducing the deficit. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let's talk about Medicare for a moment. It's not as if we don't have a problem. We know Medicare is going broke in 9 years. We want to make sure that the people who have retired and who are 10 years away from retiring can bank on the promises that have been made for them.

But to keep that promise, we have to reform it and save it for the next generation. So that's why we have a plan that says for people 54 and below, you too will have a plan of guaranteed Medicare coverage from guaranteed Medicare plans that you get to choose from. Choice and competition works.

A prescription drug benefit, a bunch of plans that compete against each other for the seniors' business, came in 41 percent below cost projections. Why? Because it's not a government-run program. It's not a bunch of bureaucrats.

What is the President proposing? What are the Democrats proposing? Here's what they have proposed for current seniors. The President just gave us a glimpse of it 2 days ago. He wants to take this board of 15 people he appoints on this rationing board, and they make the decisions. They price-control Medicare. They ration Medicare, $480 billion, almost $10,000 per senior on current seniors.

We are saying, don't do this to seniors, get rid of the rationing board and don't delegate Medicare decision-making to 15 people appointed by the President with no congressional oversight. Let the 40 million seniors in Medicare be in charge of their Medicare program. More importantly, we save Medicare, prevent its bankruptcy.

What does the other side do? They sit by and watch the program go bankrupt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues that the reason Medicare was created in the first place was because the private insurance industry wouldn't cover seniors' affordable care. That's what they want to go back to.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic resolution.

Last week on the floor of the House, the Republican leader, ERIC CANTOR, asked a very important question. He asked, How did we get here? So I took the challenge. I went back and have carefully chronicled a series of vote steps and quotes from Newt Gingrich, Dick Armey, John Kasich and others who argued against the Clinton plan for balancing the budget.

Remember when Clinton left office, the clock in Times Square had been turned off. Alan Greenspan said, you're paying down the debt too quickly.

We've had five balanced budgets since 1969; four of them came with Bill Clinton. The prescription that was offered on January 20 of the Bush inauguration was massive tax cuts and the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan.

And our Republican friends ask, How did we get here?

I am very optimistic about engaging in this conversation now and as we get to the debt ceiling. When Clinton walked out on January 19, 2001, 22 million jobs had been created. Economic growth averaged 4 percent per quarter. It was the greatest period of economic prosperity in the history of America. And our friends on the other side of the aisle want to turn the clock back on that reality.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. I do appreciate the conversation about the balanced budgets in the past.

Yes, Bill Clinton was the President there. He did sign that budget. But as this House knows, above any other place, this House is very aware that budgets originate in the House of Representatives. So Republicans were leading the House of Representatives pulling that budget together.

We are proposing a similar thing again, that a Republican House can propose a budget, send it to a Democrat President, and we work together to start balancing the budget again.

So that formula that we just discussed, I believe, is a very good formula. We should initiate that again and say, once again, a Republican House, do a great budget, send it over to a Democrat President, and be able to work their way through it.

I would disagree with the cuts in defense. I think it is a very common statement that we can look and say there are issues with defense systems. There are issues with our acquisition process in defense.

□ 1230

Where I would disagree is we should then take our defense and where we find savings, then move it over to deficit reductions. I represent an area around Tinker Air Force Base in Midwest City. It is a great base that is strategic to us. Those planes that fly out of there are 50-plus years old. There are some airmen that are flying with the same tail number that their grandfather flew 50 years ago. This is a

moment when we should not be robbing from defense and saying we are going to use that for deficit reduction that we need to be reinvesting.

Robert Gates, our Secretary of Defense, has said there's $178 billion that he can find, and $78 billion of that savings is applied to deficit reduction in the Republican plan, and $100 billion of it is reinvested back into the Defense Department. There are good ways to do this that leave America safe and that make strategic sense. We think we should do those things.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 1¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. MULVANEY.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start by thanking my own chairman, Mr. RYAN, and also the ranking member, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for the entire process. It has been my first year. I have enjoyed it. We've had some spirited debates. I know that we have disagreed more than we agree, but I have appreciated the opportunity to do this.

I'll close with this. This will be the last opportunity I'll have to speak on this year's budget. We've heard a lot about the benefits that accrued to this Nation during the Clinton administration. I for one am willing to give partial credit to the President at that time. It was a Democrat President. Yes, it was. It was a House of Representatives controlled by my party. And I think it was a formula that worked for the Nation.

We've heard a lot of things, though, about the importance of raising the tax rates back to the Clinton era in order to solve our problems. I would suggest to you it was not the tax rates during the Clinton era that drove our prosperity at the time.

Let me show you what President Clinton did to the size of the government workforce. President Clinton was elected right about here. There was a dramatic reduction in the size of the Federal workforce, a dramatic reduction in the size of Federal spending on people who work for the Federal Government. In fact, unprecedented in the last 30 years, done again under a Democrat President and a Republican House.

What happened as a result? As spending as a percentage of our economy went down, the unemployment rate went down. As the government spent less, more people went back to work. As we sit here, we all agree that the discussion is really about jobs. There's nothing more telling than what happened during the Clinton administration as a formula for how to create jobs—the government needs to spend less.

My question to my esteemed colleagues on this side of the aisle is, where is this type of leadership out of the White House these days? Where is this generation's Bill Clinton saying let's spend less on government spending so that people go back to work? If we put President Obama's proposals, his current budget, up here, it would be almost the exact opposite of what your party proposed only 20 years ago. Where is that type of leadership out of the White House?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Democrat substitute amendment. Let me just quickly here sum up. The Democrats' prescription, if you will, for our Nation's fiscal troubles basically includes what? More spending, more debt and more taxes, more taxes on hardworking families and small businesses. And so while the Democrat budget has lower deficits than, well, the President's budget, you really need to take a closer look at how they achieve this and how they achieve the deficit reduction compared to the White House's budget.

Let's take a look at it. First, well, they raise taxes again. How much? By $208 billion more than the President's budget on all Americans. Then what do they do next? They cut the defense budget. By how much? By $614 billion again relative to the President's budget over the 10-year window. Now, at the same time, you already had Secretary Gates who has said that we need to cut the Defense budget by $78 billion. They want to cut Defense by $614 billion on top of that.

What about in addition to that? Well, in their budget, if you go into it and look, there's about $400 billion in unspecified savings. Unspecified? Here at the 12th hour they still can't decide how they want to try to rein in spending? Of course not, because they really honestly don't want to do so.

I believe that budgets must be credible, and the Democrats' budget doesn't pass that test at all. The only specific savings in the budget come from how? Raising taxes again on Americans and cutting the defense budget. The Democrat budget does not tackle even the drivers behind our deficits. What are they? It does not address the pending bankruptcy—yes, bankruptcy—of Medicare and Medicaid. The Democrat budget is nothing more than punting, which is exactly what the administration and the White House have been doing as well.

Now, look, the American people want Congress to do the right thing. The American people want us to get spending, want us to get deficits, and they want us to get our debt here in Washington under control, just as American families have to get their spending, deficit and debt under control, just as small businesses across this country have to get it under control. The Democrats' budget is frankly an embarrassment and shows that the other side is not serious about taking our fiscal challenges seriously.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself 45 seconds.

What we heard just doesn't fit the facts. In fact, our budget does make cuts to domestic programs, but we do not do it in a meat ax way. We make cuts to agriculture subsidies. We do tax reform as the commission recommended, getting rid of a lot of clutter in the Tax Code for special interests. That is what we do.

With respect to defense, our numbers track what the President was saying the other day, but we do get rid of a so-called overseas contingency fund which we think our Republican friends would like to join us on which gives the executive branch a blank check to undertake any military operations whatsoever for the next 10 years and doesn't have to ask Congress. That's what we do.

What we don't do? We don't end the Medicare guarantee. What we don't do is we don't keep giving subsidies to oil companies while we cut education for kids. That's what we don't do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the very distinguished Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend him and the members of the Budget Committee for their hard work to bring legislation to the floor to enable us to have this debate yesterday and today and I think for a long time to come.

We have said it over and over again: A Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. It should reflect what is important to us as we allocate the resources of investments for the future. Much has been said about this deficit, and I want to join the distinguished ranking member before I go any further in correcting the record.

I listened with great interest as Members on the other side are taking credit for the Clinton administration balanced, or budgets in surplus. And I remind them or tell them, because many of them may not know, that those budgets were a result of the 1993 budget vote that we took on this floor of the House without one Republican vote which was the source of that fiscal discipline and job creation, again, as other speakers have said, over 20 million jobs created.

So when I hear the Republicans say it was the Clinton Presidency and the Republican Congress, no, it was the Democratic Congress, because we know that deficit reduction is essential. We had to stop the budget deficits that President Clinton inherited, and now

we have to stop the budget deficits that President Obama inherited.

Budget deficits, I've heard our colleagues say, are immoral. I quite agree. We have a responsibility and an obligation to our children and our grandchildren not to send them any bills, personal or official. And we do not intend to do so. But they were immoral during the Bush years, too, when they were giving tax cuts to the rich, two unpaid-for wars and a prescription drug benefit that gave away the store to the private sector and sent the bill to the taxpayer.

So here we are with a choice on the floor. Some of it was spoken; a vision of it was shared with the Nation by President Obama the other day. He talked about an America of greatness that cared about its people. He talked about the essential need for us to reduce the deficit. He talked about growth, investments, and job creation.

□ 1240

He talked about being fair to our seniors and keeping our promise to them. In the budgets that we have before us today, one presented by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, one presented by the Republicans, we see a sharp contrast, one that supports the vision that the President puts forth, and one that definitely does not.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the budget deficit; but we also in doing so, if we are going to do right by the American people, have to recognize that there are other deficits. We have a deficit in education. We have a deficit in innovation because innovation begins in the classroom. We have a deficit in investments in our infrastructure. All of these investments have a payoff back to us. They create growth. They bring revenue to the Treasury, and they help reduce the deficit.

It is a false economy to think that we can write a budget that cuts serious investments in education, infrastructure, innovation and the rest and think that we are going to end the deficit. You cannot cut your way out of it. You cut, you grow, and you increase revenue. That's a subject I will hold for when we talk about the Republican budget more specifically.

What is important to note, if you had one thing to know about the difference between the Democrats and the Republicans in terms of these budgets, if you had just one thing, it would be on the subject of Medicare. The Republican budget breaks the promise that this country has made to seniors that after a lifetime of work, they will be able to depend on Medicare to protect them in retirement. But the plan here ends Medicare as we know it and dramatically reduces benefits for seniors. It forces seniors to buy their insurance from the health insurance companies where the average senior would be forced to pay twice as much for half the benefit—as much for some as $20,000 a year.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to this chart, ''Senior Citizens Health Cost Skyrockets Under Republican Budget.'' Blue is the government share, red is the beneficiary share. Health care spending for a typical 65-year-old in 2022 dollars, the Republican budget would have $8,000 from the Federal Government, $12,500 from the individual, which is more than twice what the Medicare cost should be to a senior, $6,150; twice as much for less in benefit.

Now, this chart is not our chart. This information was conveyed to the Republican chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, in a letter to him describing what the cost would be to seniors under his plan. I just don't think that is fair to our seniors. This plan has the wrong priorities. It is focused on helping corporate special interests and Wall Street, not reducing the deficit or helping the country.

It raises taxes for the middle class while cutting them for the wealthiest in our country. It repeals Wall Street reforms for the big banks. It abolishes Medicare as we know it, cuts funding for education, health care, alternative energy and job training programs, and uses the money not for reducing the deficit but to help the most privileged, help the most privileged and negate what we did in our health care bill, which was to start to close the doughnut hole.

If you are a senior and you see that your prescription drug costs will come down under the health care bill and the doughnut hole will close, this budget reverses that.

There are so many reasons for seniors and people with disabilities and people who care about Medicare to be concerned. Medicare is a bedrock of stability for our seniors, for their health, for their economic security, and for those with disabilities who depend on it. We must make sure that it is solvent, but we must not charge seniors more while giving bigger tax cuts to the wealthy.

Just remember these three points. First of all, it abolishes Medicare as we know it, increasing costs to seniors, while it gives tax breaks of tens of billions of dollars to Big Oil.

Changes in Medicaid will send seniors out of nursing homes while we give tax breaks to companies that send jobs overseas. This Ryan budget, the Republican budget, will hurt education, cut the education of our children, increase the cost of higher education for young adults, 10 million young adults, while we give tax cuts to the wealthiest. That's just not the American way.

The President said in his remarks that we are about shared responsibility and shared sacrifice. We are about a sense of community in our country. And so as we want to reduce the deficit, the fiscal deficit, and we must, and we have proven, Democrats have proven that we can, this proposal does not.

But what Mr. VAN HOLLEN is proposing in the positive sense is recognizing that we need to reduce the deficit, growth is a part of that and so we have investments in education and the innovation that springs from that, and other initiatives that grow our economy, that strengthen the middle class, that creates jobs as it reduces the deficit.

I urge our colleagues to vote ''yes'' on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget and ''no'' on the Ryan budget to strengthen the middle class.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, let me start off by saying that the only way the word ''oil'' is mentioned in this budget—it is not in the Tax Code—it is that we want to drill for more of it in this country so we can lower gas prices and get ourselves off foreign oil.

Let me address Medicare briefly. I have here the Federal Employee Benefit Handbook that everybody in Congress, every Federal employee has. Nowhere in this book does it say voucher. Look at all of these plans we get to choose from: Kaiser, Aetna, Humana, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, Coventry, pages and pages of choices and options. This is what we're talking about for people 54 and below.

Guess what, the biggest threat to Medicare is the status quo. Medicare goes bankrupt in 9 years. And so, is this exactly like the Federal employee health plan? No, it is not. It is the same kind of plan because what we say is in the future, people who are wealthy don't need as much of a subsidy. People who are sick need more, people who are low-income need more, and they get complete out-of-pocket coverage. More for the sick, more for the poor, less for the wealthy, and a solvent Medicare system.

But more importantly, the people choose. Medicare beneficiaries choose. What's the President's plan? What's the Democrats' plan? Appoint 15 people to do the choosing. It is a different philosophy. Should we have 15 unelected bureaucrats run Medicare, ration Medicare, or should we allow 40 million to 50 million seniors make the decision?

Let's talk about taxes. Look at all of these budgets we've been looking at today. By the way, our budget doesn't even cut taxes. I wish I could say it does. Revenues still rise, about $12 trillion under this budget. We just don't want to go up and up and up.

The budget we have here is a $2 trillion tax increase; the plan we had before, the Progressive plan, a $16 trillion tax increase; the Congressional Black Caucus budget, a $6 trillion tax increase.

This budget cuts defense $619 billion; the Progressive budget, $1.2 trillion; the CBC budget cuts defense $469 billion.

The CBC budget increases spending on domestic spending $4.1 trillion. The Progressive Caucus increases domestic

spending $11.4 trillion. The Democratic budget increases, relative to the mark, $4.6 trillion.

So we've got it. We know where they are. More spending. More spending on everything, but cut and gut defense, and raise taxes a lot.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Democratic alternative budget for FY 2012. With this budget, Congressman VAN HOLLEN has offered a responsible alternative to the dangerous Republican approach.

The Democratic alternative offers a dramatically different vision of America's future. It takes on our deficits, but not in a reckless way. It does so responsibly, so that we can continue investing in our economy and our people. It took us years to get into this fiscal challenge, and economists agree that it would be disastrous to try to get out of it overnight. But that is exactly what Republicans want to do. Democrats believe in a balanced approach that keeps our economy growing while getting us back to living within our means.

The Democratic alternative also allows us to keep the promise of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid to our seniors, the disabled, and the poor. What our country needs is to get on a more responsible fiscal path. But we cannot afford to remake the social contract in a way that harms the least advantaged in our society. Democrats want to strengthen these programs—not destroy them.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget is a responsible alternative to a Republican plan that would fundamentally alter the kind of society that we live in. Democrats reject the false choice between fiscal responsibility and our values. We are offering an opportunity to get serious about our deficits without turning our backs on those who can least afford it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Democratic budget.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 259, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—166

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOES—259

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

NOT VOTING—7

Aderholt
Bishop (UT)
Giffords
King (IA)
Meeks
Olver
Reichert

□ 1312

Mr. COBLE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BALDWIN, Messrs. POLIS, COSTELLO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 276, I was detained by two (2) elevators which were in use by non-Members during votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider 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 gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by first thanking the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, and the entire Budget staff. I would also like to thank the Democrat members on the Budget Committee as well.

What we are taking up today is the point of where this country goes. Because this debate has gone on for quite some time, there is probably not one person in America that has not watched the news and watched the clock of our debt of $14 trillion.

I want you all to imagine for one moment, just imagine for one moment, what the future of this country would hold in the dreams if that clock was zero. What could we invest in? What could we build? And what would our

children become? But because that clock does not say zero and that clock continues to climb in the wrong direction, that's why we are here today. But it is a good day because today is the day that we turn that clock back around.

We have a plan and a Path to Prosperity that will create jobs—even those on the outside that looked at it said there will be more than 1 million jobs, a plan that will make us energy independent, but also a plan that does something the rest of America has to do as well: tighten our belts.

So today, when we come and have to put our card in the voting slot, I want you to think of one thing: Today could be the day that we create the great America comeback, or it could be the day that America goes into the long fade into history. The floor is made up of a microcosm of America, and all of America knows that we have to control the situation we are in.

So today, a ''yes'' vote is for jobs, for energy independence, and a new Path to Prosperity.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we are turning back the clock. We're turning back the clock on progress and we're turning back the clock—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, what the Republican budget does is turn back the clock on a fair deal for the American people.

Every person in this body today loves this great Nation of ours and believes it's a special place. We have to maintain the dynamism and exceptionalism of this country. We see different paths and make different choices to accomplish that goal.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois will state his point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my question is about the clarification of the rules. The rules also, for our visiting guests, allow the Sergeant at Arms to clear the Chamber, if necessary. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. It is within the authority of the Chair to clear the gallery.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the Chairman.

I would just encourage those to continue the civil conversation that we are having about a very difficult conversation in our country.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, if I——

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order, and would affirm to all Members that the Chair has the authority to clear the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we all agree we have to act now to put in place a plan to reduce our deficit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

□ 1320

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to begin my remarks from the beginning and reset the clock.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues.

As I said, nobody doubts that every person in this Chamber loves this country and wants to do the right thing.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery, which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant-at-Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I'm tempted to reserve my time and yield it back to the other——

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant-at-Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair makes this announcement for purposes of possible prosecution.

The gentleman from Maryland may proceed.

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

As I said, I was tempted to reserve my time and allow my colleague to proceed. But as I understand the Chamber is now quiet, let me begin where I left off and say that all of us agree, everybody in this Chamber agrees, we need to put in place a plan to reduce our deficit in a predictable, steady manner. The question throughout this debate has been not whether, but how we do that. And as the bipartisan fiscal commission has indicated, any responsible effort requires a balanced approach.

And the Republican plan simply fails on that score. And that's what the cochairs of the bipartisan fiscal commission said. They said it, ''falls short of the balanced, comprehensive approach needed for a responsible plan.'' And when you peel off the layers, what you find is the Republican plan is not bold. It's just the same old, tired formula we've seen before of providing big tax breaks to the very wealthy and powerful special interests at the expense of the rest of America—except this time it's dressed up with a lot of sweet-sounding talk of reform. But at the end, it's the same old ideological agenda—except this time on steroids.

To govern is to choose. Each of us is sent here to make difficult choices, and the choices that are made in the Republican plan we believe are wrong for America.

We do not believe it's courageous to protect tax giveaways to big oil companies and other special interests when we're slashing investments in our kids' education, scientific research, and critical investments in the future.

We don't think it's bold to provide another tax break to millionaires while ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors and sticking seniors with the bill for ever-rising health care costs.

We do not believe it's visionary to award corporations that ship American jobs rather than American products overseas while we're terminating affordable health care for tens of millions of Americans right here at home.

And we don't think it's brave to give Governors a blank check of Federal taxpayer dollars and then a license to cut support for seniors in nursing homes, individuals with disabilities, and poor kids.

And we don't think it's fair to raise taxes on middle-income Americans to pay for additional tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

□ 1330

Yet those are the choices that are made in the Republican budget. Where is the shared sacrifice? We have American men and women putting their lives on the line in Iraq, in Afghanistan, while others hide their income in the Cayman Islands and Switzerland and refuse to pay their fair share to support our national efforts. And that is why the bipartisan commission, among other reasons, said that the Republican plan is just not balanced. It's not.

Let's say ''no'' to the Republican plan. Let's say ''yes'' to finding a balanced way to reduce our deficits in a way that protects the values and priorities of the American people and in a way that gets our economy moving and America back to work.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, earlier this week, USA Today reported that we have the fewest participants in our workforce than at any time in 30 years. And my Democratic colleagues announced their plan to increase taxes $1.5 trillion on our economy, much of it on our small businesses.

The Congressional Budget Office has announced that Medicare is going broke in 2020. And my Democratic colleagues announced their plan to double down on the rationing of health care for our seniors.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Budget Office has announced that Social Security will go broke in 2037. And my Democratic colleagues have announced this is not a problem. We're ready to implement the 22 percent benefit cut that's already in our statute.

Survey after survey shows that our fellow citizens believe that their children will be worse off than they are, and yet my Democrat colleagues announced their plan to add $9.1 trillion to the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to quit spending money we don't have. It's time to quit borrowing 42 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese, and then send the bill to our children and grandchildren.

The Republican budget will help us create jobs with fundamental tax reform in preventing these tax increases. It will save our social safety net programs. Programs that have been of a great comfort to my parents and grandparents before our eyes are morphing into cruel Ponzi schemes for my third-grade daughter and my first-grade son. And, Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget will put us on the path to pay off the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, I heard from one of my constituents recently. He said, I never felt so embarrassed and ashamed of anything I have done in my life as I do about leaving this mess in the laps of Tyler and Caitlyn, my precious grandkids. I have written them both 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, I have got a message for Mr. Calhoun. Put that letter away. House Republicans are going to stand for Tyler and Caitlyn. We're going to put America back to work. We're going to save the social safety net and preserve the American Dream for ourselves and our posterity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it's hard to see how someone would define saving the social safety net by ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors, by slashing Medicaid by over $750 billion, a program that disproportionately helps seniors in nursing homes and disabled individuals. It's really hard to understand how that is preserving the social safety net. It reminds me of that strange statement we once heard that you have to destroy the village in order to save it.

Now, let's understand what happens under this budget to Medicare. This budget ends the Medicare guarantee for seniors. It doesn't reform Medicare; it deforms and dismantles it because it forces seniors off the Medicare program, into the private insurance market.

And it does nothing, as it dumps the seniors into the private insurance market, to control the rate of increase in health care costs. Instead, it transfers to the senior all those risks and all those costs. Seniors will pay a lot more, while the insurance companies will get all their Medicare payroll taxes. They'll get a bonanza out of this thing, but seniors will be left holding the bag.

If your voucher amount, call it whatever you want, is not sufficient to pay for the increased cost, you eat it. And we saw earlier the fact that by the year 2022 seniors will have to pay more than $6,000 above what they would have had to pay under the regular Medicare program. If your doctor's not on a private plan that you can afford, tough luck. This is rationing health care by income, nothing more.

And I want to say something just to clear the record one more time. We keep hearing that they're offering seniors exactly what Members of Congress get. It simply is not true. What Members of Congress get is what's called a fair share deal. I encourage my colleagues on all sides of the aisle just to look at the Federal Employees Benefit Plan. And you look in the Office of Personnel and it says: ''This formula is known as the fair share formula because it will maintain a consistent level of government contributions as a percentage of program costs regardless of what plan the enrollees elect.'' And it says that the government contribution equals the lesser of 72 percent of the amounts OPM determines are program-wide, or 75 percent.

The point is Members of Congress get a fair share formula. The Republican budget does not give a fair share formula to seniors on Medicare. It just doesn't. In fact, the way it saves money is to give them an unfair deal. It unconnects the support we give to seniors from rising health care costs. That's why seniors will end up paying so much more and more and more, because you make the savings—health care costs are going up like this, and the support, if you want to call it support, it's really not coming from the Medicare program or the Federal Government, is going like this. That's why the seniors are having to eat those additional costs. That is what the Republican budget does. At the same time they do provide additional tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

If you want to get rid of some of the junk in the Tax Code, you can support the Democratic plan, because we got rid of subsidies for the oil companies. We got rid of those perverse tax incentives to reward corporations that are shipping American jobs instead of American products overseas.

So if you want to start with tax reform, vote for the Democratic plan. Those are the choices we made, not ending the Medicare guarantee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) for his outstanding leadership and all the hard work he has shown in leading this effort to put together a budget for this House. I also want to commend the hard work of his members in the committee for bringing this forward.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government is broke. We borrow nearly 40 cents of every dollar we spend. Our debt is more than $14 trillion and is averaging yearly trillion-dollar deficits. We simply cannot afford to keep spending money we don't have, and we must bring down the debt.

Now, for years this House, including legislators on both sides of the aisle, has kicked the can down the road. Americans were led to believe that we could spend hundreds of billions of dollars that we don't have and that there would be no consequences. And when it came to fostering an environment where American business could compete in a global economy, we became complacent. This must stop.

□ 1340

It's time to be honest with the American people.

Mr. Chairman, we stand at a crossroads. Before us lie two divergent paths: one defined by crushing debt, slow growth and diminished opportunity; and one defined by achievement, innovation and American leadership.

By demonstrating courage and directly confronting our challenge at this critical moment, we can fulfill the promise of America and pass on to our children a Nation that offers everyone a fair shot at earning their success.

The House Republican budget is an honest, fact-based proposal that details our vision for managing down our debt and growing our way back to prosperity.

First, we will stop spending money that we don't have. This budget cuts non-security discretionary spending to below 2008 levels and freezes it for 5 years. Overall, we reach $6.2 trillion in savings against the President's budget.

Second, we will lead where the President has failed by finally addressing our insolvent entitlement programs. We know that these programs are the biggest drivers of our debt, and the Congressional Budget Office acknowledges that if we don't take action, these important safety net programs will go broke.

We cannot afford to ignore this oncoming fiscal train wreck any longer. While it may be seen by some as politically risky, we Republicans are willing to lead, because, to be frank, complacency is not an option.

To be clear, our plan will not touch benefits for today's seniors and those nearing retirement. For those of us 54 and below, it calls for reforms that will restructure Medicare and Medicaid to ensure that these safety nets will still be there for those who need it, not for those who don't.

Unlike the lofty outline the President gave in his speech this week, our budget is not a political document. We do not dream up imaginary savings and dodge specifics in an effort to lull people into the belief that they can actually get things for nothing. Our budget is a concrete plan for getting our fiscal house in order, and we do not resort to tax increases on the very small businesses and job creators we need to put America back to work.

Bringing down the debt sends a message to American families. It sends a message to businessmen and -women, to entrepreneurs and to investors. It gives them the confidence that they won't face a future plagued by inflation, higher taxes and higher interest rates.

We understand that cutting spending alone is not enough. That's why our budget calls for pro-growth policies to get our economy growing and get people back to work.

Families and small business people are struggling, and today, Tax Day, millions of them will send their hard-earned money to Uncle Sam. The last thing we should be asking them to do is to send yet again more. Instead, our budget calls for a more competitive tax system that will encourage the economy to grow, create jobs and spur investment in the private sector.

We call for the end of crony capitalism that allows privileged industries to gain competitive advantage in our Tax Code, and we call for a more simple system that lowers rates for all but makes sure everyone pays their fair share.

Mr. Chairman, with this budget, House Republicans are changing the culture in Washington from one of spending to one of savings.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, America will see that it can get its fiscal house in order after years of mismanagement. We are finally doing what families and small business people have been doing for years: tightening the belt and learning how to do more with less.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman RYAN and his committee for their outstanding leadership.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, the American people understand that we can't continue to spend money that we don't have. Our national debt has now surpassed $14.2 trillion, and it's on a track to eclipse the entire size of our economy.

This massive debt that we are incurring hurts private sector job creation, eroding confidence, spreading uncertainty amongst employers big and small, and discouraging private investment in our economy that is sorely needed in order for us to create jobs.

This debt is also a moral threat to our country. In my opinion, it is immoral to rob our children's and grandchildren's future and leave them beholden to countries around the world who buy our debt. We have a moral obligation to speak the truth and to do something about it.

Yesterday, we took the first step in beginning to address this massive debt by passing legislation that will reduce our deficit by $315 billion over the next 10 years. It was an imperfect bill, but it was a positive step that has cleared the decks and allowed us to focus on cutting trillions of dollars, not just billions.

Chairman RYAN and the members of the Budget Committee have done an excellent job of putting together a budget that's worthy of the American people. This budget will help job creation today, lift the crushing burden of debt that threatens our children's future, and preserve and protect programs like Medicare and Medicaid. Most importantly, the budget shows families and small businesses that we're serious about dealing with America's spending illness so we can put our country on a path to prosperity.

The Ryan budget sets the bar for the debate going forward. President Obama had an opportunity to match it. Unfortunately, he gave a partisan speech about the need for more spending, more taxing, and more borrowing. He said he wants to target our debt problem through a so-called ''debt fail-safe,'' but exempts the major entitlement programs that account for most of the long-term debt problems. And he proposed yet another commission, though he ignored the recommendations of this last one.

Instead of offering serious solutions, the President asked Congress to raise the debt limit without addressing Washington's spending problem. The President wants a clean bill, and the American people will not tolerate it.

Now, let me be clear: There will be no debt limit increase unless it's accompanied by serious spending cuts and real budget reforms.

We delivered this message on Wednesday morning to the President. We cannot continue to borrow recklessly and dig ourselves a deeper hole and mortgage the future of our children and grandchildren. The American people are looking for leadership to address this debt crisis. Unfortunately, the President has failed to put a serious proposal on the table. If the President won't lead, we will.

□ 1350

No more kicking the can down the road. No more whistling past the graveyard. Now is the time to address the serious challenges that face the American people. And we will.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that even if we adopt the Republican budget, we're going to have to lift the debt ceiling for years and years to come. So let's not play Russian roulette with the economy and the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

Now, on the question of jobs—the question of jobs—during the Clinton administration, we asked the very wealthiest for a little bit more sacrifice than they have today. And do you know what happened to jobs? Twenty million jobs were created during the Clinton administration. Under the current tax rates, after 8 years of George Bush, the private sector lost 630,000 jobs.

So you see the pattern here. During the Clinton administration, economic growth was booming, and 20 million jobs were created. During the 8 years of the Bush administration, there was a net loss of 653,000 jobs. We need to continue to invest in this country and make sure that the entrepreneurs of this country can continue to thrive. We need to do this in a balanced way.

I would point out that the folks who said that this Republican plan we are debating would increase jobs are the same people who predicted that the Bush tax cuts would create jobs. That's the blue line. That's the prediction of the Heritage Foundation about what

would happen. The red is the reality. If we want to create jobs and reduce the deficit, we need to do it in a balanced way. That's what the fiscal commission said. That's what the Democratic plan does.

We urge everyone, respectfully, to vote ''no'' on the Republican plan. It's the wrong choice for America.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for bringing a budget proposal to the floor today that is a statement of our national values and about what we care about: investing in our children, honoring our seniors, creating jobs, growing the economy and strengthening the middle class. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for your great leadership in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, today we will be taking a vote that is very, very important for the health and security of American seniors. A great deal is at stake. I'm just going to focus on one part of this Republican budget. I want to say to my Republican colleagues, Do you realize that your leadership is asking you to cast a vote today to abolish Medicare as we know it? Because that is the vote that we have. This is not about an issue; this is about a value. This is about an ethic. Medicare is a core value of our social compact with the American people. Yet this budget shreds that contract which is part of the strength of our country. The Republican proposal breaks the promise that our country has made to our seniors that after a lifetime of work, they will be able to depend on Medicare to protect them in retirement.

This plan, the Republican plan, ends Medicare as we know it and dramatically reduces benefits for seniors. It forces them to pay more to buy their insurance from health insurance companies, where the average senior will be forced to pay twice as much for half the benefit. I want to repeat that: the Republican plan forces seniors to buy their insurance from health insurance companies where the average senior will be forced to pay twice as much for half the benefits, as much as $20,000 per year more for some seniors.

This plan has the wrong priority for our seniors and for all Americans. Just remember these three things about the Republican budget: It ends Medicare as we know it as it gives big tax breaks and subsidies—tens of billions of dollars—to Big Oil. This budget reduces Medicaid for our seniors in nursing homes, sending them away from nursing homes, while it gives tax breaks to companies that send jobs overseas. This budget hurts our children's education. In fact, it increases the cost of higher education for nearly 10 million of our young adults, while it gives tax breaks to America's wealthiest families. That's just not fair. It is just not the American way.

Here we are. Yesterday, we observed the 100th day of the Republican majority in Congress. In those 100 days, not one job has been created. Not one job agenda is in the works. And what are we doing? We are here to abolish Medicare instead.

I have heard our colleagues say that the budget deficit is immoral. It's been immoral for the 8 years of the Bush administration, and I didn't hear anybody say ''boo'' while we were giving tax cuts to the rich, having two wars unpaid for, and giving prescription drug bills to the private sector.

Democrats are committed to reducing the deficit. We have demonstrated that we can during the Clinton administration, and we will. We are committed to strengthening the middle class, to growing our economy as we reduce the deficit, and to creating jobs. The Republican budget fails to do that, and the Republican budget will not have Democratic support.

We are here, and as one of the previous speakers said, now is the time. Now is the time to preserve Medicare. And Democrats will. I urge a ''no'' vote on the Republican plan.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself the remainder of my time.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our staffs, the Democratic staff and the Republican staff, for all of their hard work in getting us to this moment.

I want to ask my colleagues a question. I want to ask the American people a question. I remember one of the worst moments I had in Congress was the financial crisis of 2008. It seems like it was yesterday. We had the Treasury Secretary and we had the Federal Reserve chairman coming here talking about crisis and talking about bank collapses. And what came out of that was really ugly legislation that we passed on a bipartisan basis but no one enjoyed. That crisis caught us by surprise. It was unpredictable. We didn't see it coming.

Let me ask you this. What if your President and your Member of Congress saw it coming? What if they knew why it was happening, when it was going to happen, and more importantly, they knew what to do to stop it and they had time to stop it, but they didn't? Because of politics? What would you think of that person?

Mr. Chairman, that is where we are right now.

This is the most predictable economic crisis we've ever had in the history of this country. Yet we have a President who is unwilling to lead. We have too many politicians worried about the next election and not worried about the next generation. Every politician in this town knows we have a debt crisis. They know that we are in danger.

We cannot avoid this choice. To govern is to choose. We are making a choice even if we don't act. And that's the wrong choice. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. Will we be remembered as the Congress that did nothing as the Nation sped toward a preventable debt crisis and irreversible decline? Or will we instead be remembered as a Congress that did the hard work of preventing that crisis, the one that chose this Path to Prosperity? This Path to Prosperity charts a different course. It gets us off this wrong track.

It achieves four objectives:

Number one, grow the economy and get people back to work.

Number two, fulfill the mission of health and retirement security. We don't want to ration Medicare. We don't want to see Medicare go bankrupt. We want to save Medicare.

Number three, repair the social safety net. Get it ready for the 21st century. We don't want a welfare system that encourages people to stay on welfare. We want them to get back on their feet and into flourishing, self-sufficient lives. So let's reform welfare for people who need it, and let's end corporate welfare for people who don't need it.

□ 1400

Number four, let's do the work of lifting this crushing burden of debt from our children.

This is what we achieve. We have a choice of two futures, but we have to make the right choice. We must not leave this Nation in decline. We must not be the first generation of this country to leave the next generation worse off. Decline is antithetical to the American idea. America is a Nation conceived in liberty, dedicated to equality and defined by limitless opportunity. Equal opportunity, upward mobility, prosperity; this is what America is all about.

In all the chapters of human history, there has never been anything quite like America. This budget keeps America exceptional. It preserves its promise for the next generation. Colleagues, this is our defining moment. We must choose this Path to Prosperity.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, 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. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013

through 2021, and, pursuant to House Resolution 223, reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 193, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—235

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

NAYS—193

Ackerman
Altmire
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
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
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
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
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Meeks
Olver
Reichert

□ 1423

Mr. LAMBORN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, 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.

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

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION OF MEMBERS OF STAFF

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to thank all of our hardworking staff in our office and on the House Budget Committee, who put in long hours, dedicated years of expertise to making this budget possible, to making this budget passable—to making this moment happen.

I want to thank Budjon Burks, Eric Davis, Vanessa Day, Marsha Douglas, Tim Flynn, Nicole Foltz, Jose Guillen, Jim Herz, Matt Hoffmann, Charlotte Ivancic, Pat Knudsen, Jane Lee, Dick Magee, Ted McCann, Andy Morton, Courtney Reinhard, Paul Restuccia, Jon Romito, Austin Smythe—our staff director—Jenna Spealman, Stephen Spruiell, Conor Sweeney, Dennis Teti, Dana Wade. I call him ''John Z,'' but it's John Zakrajsek. That's an inside joke. Brad Butler, Jonathan Golster, Spencer Pepper, Alex Stoddard.

I also want to thank from our personal office:

Smythe Anderson, Laurie Krmpotich, Joyce Meyer, Sarah Peer, Mark Positano, Kevin Seifert, Martin Skold, Andy Speth—my chief of staff—Allison Steil; our interns: Brad Kirschbaum, Jane McEarney, David Pelsue, Greg Spevacek, and John Watts.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank all of the hardworking staff for making this possible.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 1213, H.R. 1214, H.R. 1215, AND H.R. 1216

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be permitted to file its reports to accompany H.R. 1213, H.R. 1214, H.R. 1215, and H.R. 1216 at any time through Wednesday, April 27, 2011.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42–43), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. BECERRA, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2302, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. GRIMM, New York
Ms. HAYWORTH, New York
Mr. MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
Mr. WAXMAN, California
Ms. GIFFORDS, Arizona

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 431 note, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission:

Mr. THORNBERRY, Texas
Mr. SIMPSON, Idaho
Mr. BOSWELL, Iowa

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mr. SCHOCK, Illinois, Chairman
Mr. PRICE, Georgia
Mr. LATTA, Ohio
Mrs. DAVIS, California
Mr. SHERMAN, California
Mr. RICHMOND, Louisiana

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715a), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission:

Mr. WITTMAN, Virginia
Mr. DINGELL, Michigan

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. DREIER, California, Chairman
Mr. MCCAUL, Texas

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

Mr. KING, New York
Mrs. MCCARTHY, New York

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois, Chairman

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

Mr. COBLE, North Carolina
Mr. COURTNEY, Connecticut

CONGRATULATING THE BAYLOR UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Baylor University women's basketball team on an outstanding 2011 season. I don't believe that there are many Members of this body who have the honor to represent two great schools that made it to the NCAA Elite Eight in this year's NCAA Women's Tournament. This trip to the Elite Eight is part of their winning tradition that includes a national championship in 2005.

Coach Kim Mulkey and the Lady Bears deserve high praise on winning this year's Big 12 Championship and advancing to the Elite Eight for the second straight year. Sophomore post Brittany Griner was also named as a first-team All American.

Congratulations to the Baylor Lady Bears on a great season, and Sic'em Bears.

□ 1430

HONORING JUDGE WILLIAM HART RUFE III

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Judge William Hart Rufe III for 36 years of outstanding service to the Heritage Conservancy based in my home of Bucks County.

Headquartered in the county seat of Doylestown, the Heritage Conservancy is an organization that specializes in open space preservation, planning for sustainable communities and natural resource protection. As a vocal advocate for the preservation of farmland, parkland and critical natural areas during my time as county commissioner, I have a personal appreciation for the mission of the conservancy.

Judge Rufe has been an important partner in working to stop suburban sprawl from transforming the beauty of the Bucks County landscape. His decades of leadership in this organization have been invaluable, and he will be missed as the Heritage Conservancy continues its important work.

AMERICAN FILM COMPANY

(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, recent studies have shown that there is an epidemic of historical and political ignorance in our country and that an alarming 83 percent of Americans fail a basic test on knowledge of the American Revolution and the principles that have united all Americans. It is for this reason that I rise today to acknowledge the exciting work of the American Film Company, founded in 2008 by entrepreneur Joe Ricketts.

Mr. Ricketts founded the company on the belief that real life is often more compelling than fiction, and so he set out to produce films about the incredible true stories from America's past. Central to the company's filmmaking are prominent historians, assuring that each production remains true and historically accurate.

As a resident of the great State of Illinois, I was pleased that the first film produced by the American Film Company was ''The Conspirator,'' which tells the true story of Mary Surratt, the lone woman accused of participating in the conspiracy to assassinate President Abraham Lincoln. Fittingly, the film premiered last Sunday at Ford's Theater.

I commend the American Film Company for finding an entertaining way to encourage and educate Americans about our country's important history, and I congratulate Mr. Ricketts as well.

BUDGET

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the last 48 hours, this House engaged in its constitutional right of creating a pathway for revenue for the United States of America. Sadly, we ended just a few minutes ago on a Republican budget that cannot claim that it will, in essence, reduce the deficit or create a surplus in any given year.

I am delighted to have supported the Democratic budget that reduces the deficit and reaches a primary balance by 2018. But more importantly, I think I am very delighted that the American people will see a heart in this budget: that we will not destroy Medicare; that we will not burden on seniors the extra $12,000 that seniors will have to pay—that is right, $12,000—in the Medicare program under the Republican plan; and that young people will not be prevented at the doors of colleges from going to school, and that Head Start will end and Medicaid for the disabled and seniors will end.

I do have faith in this country, and I believe we will get a budget that is both merciful and balanced the right way for the American people, not the wrong way. Today, unfortunately, we made a wrong step, but I believe together we will make it right.

BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STIVERS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently I have given several Special Order speeches about my view of the Constitution, making the argument for why I think it should be amended to include certain basic rights for the American people that they currently lack. These include: the right to a high-quality education, the right to health care, and equal rights for women.

Equal rights for women, alone, Mr. Speaker, would be responsible for providing an extraordinary amount of income for 51 percent of households headed by women if women in our society were simply paid at the same rate that their counterparts in the workforce are paid. Equal rights. Equal rights for women, alone, as a fundamental right, would strengthen our economy.

This afternoon, my Special Order time will be used to discuss the continuing resolution for fiscal year 2011, the Republican proposed fiscal year 2012 budget, which we just voted on, and the balanced budget amendment, or what I've taken to call the ''imbalanced budget'' amendment. All three of them have something in common.

In an ideal world, my colleague PAUL RYAN would support the idea of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, but such an amendment would have extraordinary implications for our country, extraordinary implications for our Federal Government, and it would be fundamentally in the wrong direction.

And while the Republican proposed budget of fiscal year 2012 does not have the strength of the Constitution of the United States, it is clear to me that Republicans and conservatives in the Republican Party—and some conservatives within the Democratic Party—are forcing the Nation's politics into a consideration of a balanced budget amendment for the Constitution. And I want to talk about that in the context of the 2011 debate, the context of the 2012 debate, and such an amendment.

Before I begin, I want to set the framework for my Special Order.

President Harry Truman, in 1946, said, ''All of the policies of the Federal Government must be geared to the objective of sustained full production and full employment.''

Today, our country has unemployment that is nearing 9 percent; unemployment nearing 9 percent. Nearly 13 to 14 million Americans are presently unemployed—many of whom are chronically unemployed—and yet, in 1946, President Harry Truman said that the objective of the Federal Government must be ''sustained full production and full employment to raise consumer purchasing power and to encourage business investment.'' There has not been a single bill in this Congress since the 112th Congress has begun to address the issue of full employment.

Secondly, I want to remind the American people, Mr. Speaker, of what William Jennings Bryan said in 1896. He said: I am in favor of an income tax. When I find a man or a woman who is not willing to bear his share of the burdens of the government which protects him or her, I find a man or a woman who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours.

Not long ago, Mr. Speaker, the House passed H.R. 1, a continuing resolution that would have forced middle class and working class Americans to carry the burden of spending cuts. My colleagues across the aisle simplified the impacts of this measure by describing it as ''tightening our belts.'' They seem to be oblivious to the fact that these cuts went deep for those Americans who could least afford them.

H.R. 1—tightening our belts—slashed programs like community health centers specifically designed to provide access to basic health and dental services to underserved communities that may not be otherwise able to care for them.

H.R. 1 tightened our belts through cuts to the National Institutes of Health, setting back development of cancer treatments and cures for other diseases, the impact of which we will feel for years to come as medical professionals are forced to shut down promising research projects.

H.R. 1 tightened our belts by hacking away at training of health professions, reducing this funding by more than 23 percent. Cuts to title VII and title VIII programs that help to train primary health professionals for underserved areas would limit the access of low-income individuals to quality doctors, nurses and physician assistants in their areas.

H.R. 1 tightened our belts by severing title X family planning programs. In doing so, we stepped back in time, preventing lifesaving care from being offered to our Nation's women, specifically women who wouldn't otherwise have access to this kind of care.

The programs I've listed so far provide health services to our Nation, and especially to our most underprivileged populations.

□ 1440

H.R. 1 also tightened our belts with cuts to job-training programs, Head Start, and after-school programs, Pell Grants, Hope VI housing programs, and high-speed rail. These programs were systematically sent to the guillotine.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1081

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1081.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. The people that they serve are not millionaires to whom we generously extended tax cuts. They are not the corporations that eagerly navigate tax loopholes, navigate the walls and the Halls of this Congress every year, costing our Nation billions in revenue. They are everyday, hard-working, middle class, public school educated, checkbook balancing, minimum wage earning mothers and fathers and grandparents who elected each of us, hoping we'd find a way to decrease unemployment and bring America back from the brink.

Mr. Speaker, thankfully our colleagues across the Capitol thought we went a few notches too tight in our belt with H.R. 1, as the Senate refused to take up these cuts. Much of our future long-term budget decisions and discussions to reduce our deficit and get America back on track remain in limbo.

Recently, this discussion had reached a fevered pitch. After multiple short-term extensions of the fiscal year 2011 appropriations legislation, the negotiations between Speaker BOEHNER, Leader REID, and the President had broken down many times throughout the week. We were faced with the threat of the first government shutdown since 1996. Agencies were planning which workers to furlough, national parks and museums were prepared to shut their doors for the weekend, and the

brave men and women in active duty and service to our Nation were prepared to continue their work without pay.

Then at the 11th hour, there was a breakthrough. The 5½-month continuing resolution agreed to by the leadership of the House and the Senate and the President included a total of $39 billion worth of cuts.

But these cuts that were agreed to late into Friday have real consequences. There are significant cuts to programs like WIC, Women, Infants and Children, the special supplemental nutrition program for Women, Infants and Children; Community Health Centers; Low-income Heating and Energy Assistance Programs, LIHEAP; international disaster assistance; and Head Start.

And after the President and congressional leadership agreed to giving $800 billion in tax cuts to America's top wage earners last December, we turned around and cut programs that working families and seniors depend on. It just doesn't make sense to me, Mr. Speaker.

Again, while I was relieved that the Federal Government did not shut down, I am deeply disappointed in the process that has brought us this so-called ''compromise,'' if you can even call it that. Like the negotiations that held up tax cuts for the middle class at the end of last year to hold out for tax cuts for the wealthy, our leadership has again demonstrated that they're willing to hold up programs that provide for the most vulnerable Americans. And this Congress is only just beginning.

As for next fiscal year's budget, there are a variety of solutions that have been presented—some with potential to succeed, others destined to fail.

Among the proposals lie Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN's recent offering. Look at the facts. His proposal will reduce our Nation's deficit, but leaves us asking the question, At what cost?

First and foremost, Mr. RYAN intends to place the burden of ending our Nation's debt on the citizens least capable of caring for themselves, the most reliant on the help of others—our seniors. The Budget Committee's proposal will end the Medicare our senior citizens have come to know and rely on, replacing it with what can only be described as a coupon, a voucher, that, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, would leave our eldest Americans shouldering 68 percent of their health care costs in the next 20 years.

Who else pays the cost of balancing our budget within the Ryan proposal? The burden falls next to working American families. The Ryan proposal will lower tax rates for individuals with the highest income as well as corporations, relying on raising taxes for the average Americans to pay for it.

If it sounds familiar, it's because it's the same standby trickle-down failure that we placed our faith in in the past decade. Despite what Majority Leader CANTOR says, during an economic downturn, decreasing the deficit does not create jobs. Also, cutting taxes does not create jobs. Both Presidents Bush and Obama have cut taxes so much that if Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR's theory were correct, we would have zero unemployment, which we do not have. This is what the Ryan plan aims to do.

For 10 years our economy has stagnated. The gap between the median wage and average wage is growing because the highest earners are the only ones receiving wage increases. Unfortunately, balancing our Nation's budget on the backs of the middle class does not end there.

Where else would the burden of balancing the budget fall under the Ryan plan? Education. Cuts to K–12 education are just the starting point in disadvantaging the future of America. The proposal also makes significant cuts to Pell Grants. These cuts will prevent the educated generation of young Americans our country needs to compete in a global economy. The proposed cuts to Pell Grants would return the maximum award allowable to prestimulus levels, impacting millions of young Americans depending on financial assistance to attend college. This will stretch the time it will take for them to earn their degrees and enter the workforce.

Finally, RYAN's budget continues to provide tax loopholes to big oil companies and cuts all Federal support for clean energy, shortsighting our economic investments in the future of energy.

Mr. Speaker, I am not promoting constant Federal debt. I am not advocating against hoping or trying for a balanced budget. But when you look through history and the history of our Nation, we see that when Americans were in most need during war or recession, during the Great Depression, we focused on solving these problems, not just on reducing our debt.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently engaged in two wars and fighting our way out of the worst recession of the modern era. The Ryan budget is a new attempt at an age-old ploy to mandate a balanced budget for the Federal Government. Ending our Nation's deficit and returning our country to prosperity should, of course, be the goal. But we must also ask the question, At what cost? Where do our priorities lie?

The Ryan proposal, like the myriad of constitutional amendments before it, attempts to balance our budget on the backs of those Americans who can least bear the burden.

Here's the history of the balanced budget amendment. The current budget situation is most poignant when looking at the origins of the balanced budget amendment and its history. Mr. Speaker, after listening to my colleagues across the aisle present the Republican Study Committee's budget this morning, I'm apt to wonder what it is that they're actually studying over there. Hopefully, we will be able to set the record straight.

As a reaction to FDR's New Deal, Republican Congressman Harold Knutson of Minnesota introduced the first version of the amendment in 1936. Like many constitutional amendments, this resolution did not receive a hearing or a vote.

During President Dwight D. Eisenhower's first term, the Judiciary Committee of a barely Democratic Senate held its first hearing on this amendment. It again did 2not receive a vote.

After these partial defeats, the balanced budget amendment supporters shifted their focus to the States. From 1975 to 1980, 30 State legislatures passed resolutions calling for a constitutional convention to propose this amendment directly to the States; that is, they sought to bypass Congress and the congressional amendment process.

The election of President Reagan and a Republican Senate in 1980 renewed hopes for a balanced budget amendment and passage by Congress. While the Senate did adopt the amendment in 1982, it failed to garner the necessary three-fifths majority in the House. This failure energized conservative groups such as the National Taxpayers Union and the National Tax Limitation Committee to refocus on State action.

In 1982 and 1983, the Alaska and Missouri legislatures passed a resolution supporting the BBA, bringing the total number of these resolutions to 32, two short of the 34 needed for a convention.

However, a growing concern about the scope of a constitutional convention led some States to withdraw their resolutions, reshifting focus to congressional action.

□ 1450

From 1990 to 1994, Congress would make three additional attempts to codify this amendment. All failed to garner the necessary three-fifths majority. However, the BBA made a comeback when it was included in Newt Gingrich's Contract with America. Twenty-six days after taking office, the newly empowered Republican majority adopted the balanced budget amendment, giving conservatives their first congressional win in a decade. Disappointment awaited in the Senate, however, where two separate votes fell just short of adoption. This failure, along with the balanced budget and the budget surplus at the end of the decade, sapped any remaining congressional support for a balanced budget amendment.

There was renewed energy from Republican support for the amendment in 2000 as it was included in their party's platform. The Bush tax cuts, wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the massive deficit spending created by them eventually led Republicans to sweep the idea of a balanced budget amendment back under the rug. By 2004, the Republican Party left any mention of a balanced budget out of their political platform.

Again in recent years, with the advent of the tea party and the return of

extreme fiscal conservatism in the Republican Party, there are currently 12 balanced budget amendments in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate there are three. I had my staff double-check that for me. Twelve balanced budget amendments in the House. They are all basically the same. Some have even been offered by Members of my own party. I understand these Members' frustrations. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to pass my nine amendments to the Constitution for 10 years now, and my amendments are based on FDR's second bill of rights, which he proposed back in 1944. Today, 67 years later, here we are.

Mr. Speaker, I fundamentally believe that conservatives in Congress are pushing for this amendment, not to force a vote in Congress, but to rally States to act. Mr. Speaker, we have a troubling national debt and deficit, but the balanced budget amendment is not the solution.

The argument proponents of a balanced budget amendment make is as follows: Like families, businesses, and States, the Federal Government should balance its budget. But since it does not, we need a constitutional amendment to guarantee that it will do so.

Nearly every State in this Union has some form of a balanced budget requirement, but those States are not out of debt. Their amendments have restricted the ability of those States to care for their citizens in time of austerity or emergency, but their budgets are not balanced.

According to a Forbes analysis of the global debt crisis in January of 2010, every single State in the country is carrying some form of debt. These debts range from as little as $17 per capita in Nebraska to $4,490 in Connecticut. How can this be, Mr. Speaker? It's because the infrastructure of these States allows them to hide debt in capital funds. The Federal Government cannot, and I would argue the Federal Government should not follow this path. Congress should never seek to hide the fiscal realities from the public that bears the burden of the costs nor should we sell the public magic beans that a balanced budget amendment will somehow make the national debt and other problems go away.

Debt will exist just as new problems will arise. Just as there are new threats to America, unforeseen threats, just as there are future economic calamities that we cannot see, the Federal Government must play some role in addressing a national crisis. A balanced budget amendment would simply prohibit the Federal Government from exercising precisely the authority that it needs to exercise on behalf of the American people.

In fiscal year 2012, approximately 44 States will face revenue shortfalls. Many are desperately looking for ways to declare their State bankrupt. Bankrupt. I say it again, Mr. Speaker, because this proposed amendment would place the Federal Government in a similar predicament. The effect on many States is calamitous. For instance, in Rhode Island, judges and court workers have cut pay and left 53 positions unfilled. This is still not enough to balance their budgets. As a desperate last resort, the chief justice has begun to dispose of cases on backlog, literally tossing them out. Florida is in the same predicament.

Mr. Speaker, a balanced budget amendment would force the Federal Government to deny Americans the right to seek redress and justice in Federal courts for the sake of balancing their budgets. In my home State of Illinois, mental health services have been cut by $91 million. Human service directors are fearful that these cuts will cause a real public health and public safety crisis. Iowa, Idaho, Alabama, and Ohio are considering drastic cuts to education.

My colleagues across the aisle are so concerned about handing our children and grandchildren any amount of national debt that they fail to realize we are setting future generations up for failure. States are already cutting too many services that the American people and the American workforce need in order to remain strong and competitive. Should the Federal Government do the same, our legacy will be an America that is uneducated, ill-equipped to compete on a global level.

Mr. Speaker, as exemplified by its effects on the States, this amendment may sound good on its face, but it falls flat when examined more critically. Like an optical illusion, the image of which carries and changes as you draw closer, the balanced budget amendment masquerades as the savior of our budget; yet in reality it threatens to permanently destroy it.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Citizens for Tax Justice, and others, a Federal balanced budget amendment would do five very damaging things. It would damage our economy by making recessions deeper and more frequent. It would heighten the risk of default and jeopardize the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. It would lead to reductions in needed investments for the future. It would favor wealthy Americans over middle- and low-income Americans by making it far more difficult to raise revenues on people who can afford to pay, and easier to cut programs for people who need them most. And lastly, Mr. Speaker, it would weaken the principle of majority rule. Therefore, passing a balanced budget amendment is not prudent. It's not the right path for our Nation to follow.

So let's return for a few moments to the five faults outlined by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and Citizens for Tax Justice. These arguments will bring to light the dangers with which a balanced budget amendment would threaten our Nation.

The first fault. A balanced budget amendment would damage the economy and make recessions deeper and more frequent. Under a balanced budget amendment, Congress would be forced to adopt a rigid fiscal policy, not just under the amendment, but also under the Ryan budget, requiring the budget to be balanced or in surplus every year, regardless of the current economic situation or threat to our Nation's security.

A sluggish economy, with less revenue and more outgoing expenditures, creates a deficit, as we've seen from recent events. A deficit necessitates economic stimulation to reverse negative growth. That is why in the last session of Congress the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act invested in roads, bridges, mass transit, and other infrastructure, provided 95 percent of working Americans with an immediate tax cut, and extended unemployment insurance and COBRA for Americans hurt by the economic downturn through no fault of their own.

If Congress were forced to function under a balanced budget amendment, deficit reduction would be mandated, even more so during periods of slow or stalled economic growth, which is the opposite of what is needed in such a situation. This consistently proposed constitutional amendment risks making recessions more common and more catastrophic for middle class families, seniors, veterans, and the poor. Under such an amendment, Congress is stripped of any power to adequately respond.

The second fault. A balanced budget amendment would risk default and jeopardize the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government while simultaneously challenging the separation of powers. A balanced budget amendment would bar the government from borrowing funds unless a three-fifths vote in both Houses of Congress permitted a raise in the debt limit. Under such a scenario, a budget crisis in which a default becomes a threat is more likely because of the limits placed on the fluidity of the debt ceiling. We are about to enter into a national conversation about what to do about the debt ceiling. That default under such a scenario becomes more likely to occur.

After a default of only a few days, the long-term impacts would quickly appear. Confidence in the ability of the U.S. to meet binding financial obligations would erode almost immediately. The government pays relatively low interest rates on its loans because it pays its debts back in full and on time. A default would mimic an earthquake, shaking confidence in the United States on a global scale, resulting in exploding interest rates and aftershocks felt in our national economy.

□ 1500

The international economy would also succumb to the rumblings of this potential disaster, and our deep connection to it would cause even further chaos here at home.

Other balanced budget proponents argue that since States have to balance

their budgets, so should the Federal Government. Indeed, many States are required to balance their operating budgets but not their total budgets. No such distinction is made by a balanced budget amendment.

Rainy day, or reserve funds, which States can draw on to balance their budgets, are prohibited by a BBA. Many States operating under a BBA require the Governors to submit a balanced budget, but do not require the actual achievement of it. Some States allow Governors to act unilaterally to cut spending in the middle of the fiscal year. This condition of the BBA would violate the Federal Constitution's separation of powers.

The Founding Fathers were deliberate in their construction of our government, and the separation of powers serves as a cornerstone in our democracy. Each branch has certain powers and limitations. Congress, the courts, and the President worked together but in distinct ways to move America forward. The threat of judicial involvement in matters of the budget is a real problem under the balanced budget amendment. The BBA would weaken the balance of power. It diminishes the authority of Congress, as the elected representatives of the people, to have the final say on taxes and spending.

Mr. Speaker, what purpose does this body serve if this amendment passes? Should we broaden the scope of judicial review granted to our Federal courts? By subverting the balance of power between the branches, this body steps onto a slippery slope of reassigning authority and moving away from the values inherent in our Constitution.

The third fault. A balanced budget amendment would lead to reductions in needed investments for the future.

Since the 1930s, our Nation has consistently made public investments that improve long-term productivity growth in education, in infrastructure, in research and development. All of the Federal highways in this country are paid for by this Congress. They have helped build a more perfect union between the States, within States.

When we take off from O'Hare airport in Chicago or from Reagan airport, all of the airports are Federal facilities run by the Federal Aviation Administration. When you visit your Nation's Capital and you take off from an airport, because airports function under the rigid guidelines of the FAA, there is a reasonable assurance, when your plane takes off from one airport and lands at another airport, that the length of the runway that you take off from and land on are reasonably the same. States don't determine the lengths of runways.

If we are going to build a national government, if we are going to build one country, if we are going to form a more perfect union, only the Federal Government has the power to do that. It simply cannot be done one State at a time. In a global economy and in a global economic environment, we must move as one Nation to challenge Europe, to challenge the Japanese, to challenge the Chinese, to challenge cheap labor and cheap labor markets abroad.

We must have one national standard, not 50 individual State sovereign standards to move our Nation—our education system, our infrastructure and our research and development—forward. These efforts encourage increased private sector investment, leading to a surplus and a thriving economy.

A balanced budget amendment, which requires a balanced budget each and every year, would limit the government's ability to make public investments, thereby hindering our future growth and thereby hindering our ability as a Nation to be competitive nationally and internationally—a very important point, Mr. Speaker, for which I want to deviate from my prepared remarks.

You see, it is just simply impossible to go one State at a time or to assume that the private sector, acting on its own, has the capacity to address the question of sustained full production and full employment on their own. President Truman made it perfectly clear: All of the policies of the Federal Government must be geared to the objective of sustained, full production and full employment, to raise consumer purchasing power and to encourage business investment. In the 112th Congress, unemployment is at 9 percent, and not a single piece of legislation considered by the 112th Congress has done anything to address 13 million unemployed Americans.

A few short weeks ago, I came to the House floor after having purchased an iPad, and I said that I happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, that at some point in time this new device, which is now probably responsible for eliminating thousands of American jobs—now Borders is closing stores, because why do you need to go to Borders anymore? Why do you need to go to Barnes & Noble? Buy an iPad and download your book, download your newspaper, download your magazine.

At Chicago State University in my congressional district, in the freshman class, they are not being given textbooks any longer. They are all being given iPads as they enter school. President Wayne Watson hopes to have a textbook-less campus within 4 years where at this State university they no longer have textbooks.

Well, what becomes of publishing companies and publishing company jobs? What becomes of bookstores and librarians and all of the jobs associated with paper?

Well, in the not-too-distant future, such jobs simply will not exist. Steve Jobs is doing pretty well. He created the iPad. Certainly it has made life more efficient for Americans, but the iPad is produced in China. It's not produced here in the United States. So the Chinese get to take advantage of our First Amendment value, that is, to provide freedom of speech through the iPad to the American people, but there is no protection for jobs here in America to ensure that the American people are being put to work.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress and the direction of this Congress, in its obsession with debts and deficits, is heading in the opposite direction of sustained full production. Again, iPads are made in China, and full employment. There are 13 million unemployed Americans counting on this Congress to do something.

They certainly can't count on the State of Illinois; it's broke. They can't count on the State of Idaho; it's broke. They can't count on the State of Alabama; the State of Alabama is broke. They can't count on Mississippi; Mississippi is broke. Louisiana is broke. The States are broke.

So the Federal Government is under an obligation to sustain full production and full employment to raise consumer purchasing power and to encourage business investment in the United States, not in China.

The third fault of the BBA would lead to reductions in needed investments for the future. Since the 1930s, our Nation has consistently made public investments that have improved long-term productivity growth in education, in infrastructure, and in research and development.

These efforts encourage increased private sector investment, leading to a budget surplus and a thriving economy. A balanced budget amendment, which requires a balanced budget each and every year, would limit the government's ability to make public investments, thereby hindering future growth.

For years, conservatives have abused the debt and the deficit as a springboard from which to argue for smaller government and cuts to programs that serve as social safety nets for American families. Although we must consider the debt and the deficit, the larger and more significant issue is the nature of the debt that we create.

If you invest $50,000 in a business, in a house or in your education, you can expect future returns on your investment. If you ''invest'' the same $50,000 in a gun collection or ammunition, what are the future investment returns? Both investments result in $50,000 of debt, but only one results in returns that can transform that debt into long-term gain. Social investments provide the potential for greater returns in the long run in the same fashion as personal investments. Even small expenditures on social programs lay a foundation for great wealth in the long term.

If the Nation chooses to invest $1.5 trillion over a 5-year period in the building of bridges and roads and airports and railroads and mass transit and schools and housing and health care, we could create some debt.

□ 1510

But the increased ability of companies to interact and to ship their goods over well-paved and planned roads, the new businesses that would sprout around the freshly built or newly expanded airport, the higher wages of a student who is well-educated and able to attend college, resulting in more tax revenue, and the improved productivity of employees at their healthiest would eventually result in greater returns for our country.

The extension of the Bush-era tax cuts for corporations and the rich brought about some short-term stimulus of consumer spending. But similar to Reagan's tax cuts, which resulted in record government deficits, the long-term damage outweighs the immediate effects. Reagan's tax cuts for the rich came at the expense of investing in our Nation's need for long-term balanced economic growth. The Reagan administration neglected and cut back on our Nation's investment in infrastructure, education, health care, housing, job training, transportation, energy conservation, and much more.

The inclination of most conservatives in both parties is to cut the debt by cutting programs for the most vulnerable among us—our poor, our children, our elderly, and our minorities. This approach, however, has been proven false too many times. A balanced budget amendment would take us back to this archaic and ineffective system permanently.

The fourth fault. A balanced budget amendment favors wealthy Americans over middle- and low-income Americans by making it harder to raise revenues and easier to cut programs.

Again, a BBA ultimately favors wealthier Americans over middle- and lower-income Americans. Under current law, legislation can pass by a majority of those present and voting by a recorded vote. The BBA requires, however, that legislation that raises taxes be approved on a rollcall vote by a majority of the full membership of both Houses. Thus, the BBA would make it harder to cut the deficit by curbing special interest tax breaks of the oil and gas industries, and it would make it easier to reduce programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, veterans' benefits, education, environmental programs, and assistance for poor children. Wealthy individuals and corporations receive most of their government benefits in the form of tax entitlements while low-income and middle-income Americans receive most of their government benefits through programs.

As evidenced by the cuts that both parties agreed upon recently, it is far easier to cut social welfare programs than to cut spending for our military or to increase taxes. As long as spending is a political issue, cuts to those programs that assist those with the smallest voice in our government will always happen first.

Raising taxes, the only option to address a budget deficit aside from cutting programs, is already a burdensome political issue. The additional requirements of a BBA further complicate the process of raising taxes. This means that the richest Americans will likely keep the benefits they receive from our government via tax cuts. Meanwhile, the poor lose the programs that provide them with housing, with food, with job training, with health care, and the very means to survive. This will further reinforce the growing gap between the rich and the rest of our society, middle class, working poor, and the destitute alike.

Aside from this already distressing point, when the baby boom generation retires, Mr. Speaker, the ratio of workers to retirees will fall to very low levels. This poses difficulties for Social Security since Social Security has been a pure pay-as-you-go system, with the payroll taxes of current workers paying for the benefits of current retirees. This was acceptable as long as today's workers could pay for today's retirees. But in the future, when there are fewer workers to pay for more retirees, the system is going to be out of balance.

So in 1977 and 1983, the Social Security Administration took important and prudent steps towards addressing this issue. It allowed the accumulation of reserves to be used later when needed. These changes were akin to what families do by saving for retirement during their working years and then by drawing down on their savings after they reach retirement. The balanced budget amendment insists that total government expenditures in any year, including those for Social Security benefits, not exceed total revenues collected in that same year, including revenues from Social Security payroll taxes. Thus, the benefits of the baby boomers would have to be financed in full by the taxes of those working and paying into the system then. This undercuts the central reforms of 1983. Drawing down on any part of accumulated reserves under a BBA, required under present law, means that the trust funds were spending more in benefits in those years than they were receiving in taxes. Under a BBA, that would be impermissible deficit spending.

The fifth fault. A BBA weakens the principle of majority rule and makes balancing the budget more difficult.

Most balanced budgets require that unless three-fifths of the Members of Congress agree to raising the debt ceiling, the budget must be balanced at all times. They also require that legislation raising taxes must be approved on a rollcall vote by a majority of the full membership of both Houses, not just those present and voting.

Currently, this provision weakens the principle of majority rule, and that's exactly what the tea party and my conservative colleagues want. Why do they want it? Because a three-fifths requirement empowers a minority, 40 percent plus one, in any given year. It creates a small group of people willing to threaten economic turmoil and disruption unless they get their way, i.e., the Republican freshmen, with the ability to extort concessions or exercise unprecedented leverage over our national economic and fiscal policy. Mr. Speaker, haven't the last few weeks demonstrated how difficult it already is to reach a compromise on a budget? This provision will simply make it impossible.

The final argument, Mr. Speaker, is what I'm calling the Ezra Klein argument. There is a final fault which is not on my list, but it is significant enough to mention. Ezra Klein of The Washington Post cleverly points out in a recent article, entitled ''The Worst Idea in Washington,'' that under a balanced budget amendment, not a single budget of the Bush or Reagan administration would have qualified as constitutional. In fact, the only recent administration which would not violate the requirements of a balanced budget amendment would have been President Clinton's, and that would have been for only two of his budgets. Mr. Speaker, if President Reagan's budgets wouldn't qualify, is this something we should even be considering in this Congress? I don't think so.

I have listed a few, and certainly not an exhaustive list, of the arguments against the balanced budget amendment. The truth is the Federal budget is quite unlike fiscal practices of businesses, families, and States even though we keep hearing the argument: The Federal Government needs to balance its budget like I do at home. The Federal Government needs to balance its budget like our families do. The Federal Government needs to balance its budget like the States do. But contrary to popular myth, except in times of war and recession, the country has a conservative record of keeping deficits actually in line. It's when the States fail, it's when there are wars that we are fighting, and it's when we are looking at unforeseen economic calamity that we need a Federal Government that can reach into the deep recesses of her bounty to bring about a more perfect Union and keep the Nation moving forward. Without the Federal Government, the States cannot do it on their own, and the private sector has shown a reluctance to do it without regulation from the Federal Government to make the Union more perfect.

Let me add one final quote, Mr. Speaker. In 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr., stood not very far from this auspicious location and delivered a speech at the feet of Abraham Lincoln, at the feet of Abraham Lincoln's memorial at the end of our Mall. He began by saying, today I stand in the shadow of a man who 100 years ago set the slave free. But 100 years later, they find themselves still trapped and still isolated in the ghettos and the barrios and the rural areas of our Nation. He said, Mr. Speaker, today we have come here, in a sense, to cash a check. Now imagine that. Martin Luther King, Jr., at the other end of this Mall, is looking in the direction of Democrats and Republicans in the Congress of the United

States. And he says, Mr. Speaker, we've come here to cash a check, a check that should give us upon demand the riches of security and of freedom and justice. But America, Dr. King says, has issued us a bounced check. It keeps coming back marked ''insufficient funds.'' But I refuse to believe that there are no funds in the great vault of opportunity of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am 46 years old, and I've had the privilege of serving in this Congress for nearly 16 years. I remember on September 10, 2001 when we stood here on the floor of this Congress, my dear colleagues, and this Congress declared that it was broke, that it couldn't find money for anything. We took a vote on September 10, 2001, to defund education programs for the most vulnerable children in our Nation.

□ 1520

Every Member of Congress, mostly from conservatives, and many conservative Democrats, came and made the argument that we could no longer afford to provide high-quality education for your children, that we could no longer afford to provide health care for all of the American people, that we could no longer afford it. And just 24 hours later, the tragedy, the great tragedy of the 20th century, terrorists attacked the World Trade Center and flew a plane into the ground in Pennsylvania and landed a plane on our Nation's defense system at the Pentagon. Just 24 hours later, the Congress of the United States that did not have the money to provide for education for our children, the Congress of the United States that did not have the money to provide health care for all of the American people, suddenly it found an unlimited amount of money to chase down Saddam Hussein. And we are spending an unlimited amount of money, just 24 hours later, to find Osama bin Laden in a cave in Afghanistan. Ten years later, we haven't found him yet. Yet we continue to spend billions and billions and billions of dollars.

So on one day the government is broke. Twenty-four hours later, Dr. King says the Nation has issued us a promissory note, and it keeps coming back marked ''insufficient funds'' for priorities that matter to the American people.

Our government, Mr. Speaker, needs the flexibility to respond in times of economic downturn or in war in a way that businesses, that families, and that States never have to consider.

I have been in the House long enough to know now that when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle came into the majority with large deficits and debt, I knew their first response would be to cut social spending, to weaken government regulation and underfund protection of workers' rights and civil rights and environmental protections. You name it.

I wish I could say I didn't see this coming, but conservative politicians want to get government off the backs of finance, off the backs of finance and industry. They are willing and ready to use the current economic situation to do it, and they intend to place the burden on the backs of the middle class, of seniors, of children, of veterans and the poor.

The Republican budget that we voted on today does just that. The balanced budget amendment aims to make it a permanent fixture.

Mr. Speaker, I know we can do better. We cannot balance the budget on the backs of middle class Americans. We need to achieve the America of everyone's dreams. The burden of that dream must rest squarely on the shoulders of every American that can carry it.

I find it offensive that some of the most profitable corporations in this country pay no taxes and some even get a refund. I find it offensive that the richest 400 people in this country who have more wealth than half of all Americans combined have an effective tax rate of only 16.6 percent.

In the words of William Jennings Bryan: ''When I find a man who is not willing to bear his share of the burdens of the government which protects him, I find a man who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours.''

With those wise words, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REAPPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of the Civil Rights Commission Amendments Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 1975 note), the order of the House of January 5, 2011, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Commission on Civil Rights for a term expiring December 15, 2016:

Mr. Michael Yaki, San Francisco, California.

The Chair announces that the term of appointment of Mr. Todd Gaziano to the Commission on Civil Rights expires on December 15, 2013.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 216. An act to increase criminal penalties for certain knowing and intentional violations relating to food that is misbranded or adulterated; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; 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.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1308. An act to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act to extend the termination date for the Commission, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUNYON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 43, 112th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, May 2, 2011, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1285. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S. Honey Producer Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Order; Termination of Referendum Procedures [Document Number: AMS-FV-07-0091; FV-07-706-FR] (RIN: 0581-AC78) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1286. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program; Amendment to the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances (Livestock) [Document Number: AMS-NOP-10-0051; NOP-10-04FR] (RIN: 0581-AD04) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1287. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Walnuts Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0060; FV10-984-1FIR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1288. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2010-2011 Marketing Year [Docket Nos.: AMS-FV-09-0082; FV10-985-1A IR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1289. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Country of Origin Labeling of Packed Honey [Document No.: AMS-FV-08-0075] (RIN: 0581-AC89) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1290. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Section 610 Review [Document Number: AMS-FV-10-0006] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1291. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Avocados Grown

in South Florida; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0067; FV10-915-1FIR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1292. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2010-2011 Crop Year for Tart Cherries [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-930-4FR] received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1293. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the National Emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1294. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 4-11 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Agreement with the Kingdom of Sweden; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1295. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Pursuant to section 527(f) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 1994 and 1995 (Pub. L. 103-236), a report listing outstanding expropriation cases; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1296. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-028, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1297. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 11-013, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1298. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-141, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1299. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's fiscal year 2010 annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1300. A letter from the Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission United States and Mexico, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1301. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2010, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1302. A letter from the Secretary, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's annual report for FY 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1303. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XA245) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1304. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2011 and 2012 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XZ90) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1305. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2011 and 2012 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 101126522-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XZ89) received March 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL PURSUANT TO RULE XII

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 358. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 20, 2011.

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. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1570. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to employers for the value of the service not performed during the period employees are performing service as members of the Ready Reserve or the National Guard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. POSEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. WEST, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MICA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1571. A bill to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. LANDRY:

H.R. 1572. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to improve safety at manned offshore installations, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 1573. A bill to facilitate implementation of title VII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, promote regulatory coordination, and avoid market disruption; referred to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, concerning length and weight limitations for vehicles operating on Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1575. A bill to make certain individuals ineligible for visas or admission to the United States and to revoke visas and other entry documents previously issued to such individuals, and to impose certain financial measures on such individuals, until the Russian Federation has thoroughly investigated the death of Sergei Leonidovich Magnitsky and brought the Russian criminal justice system into compliance with international legal standards, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow penalty-free withdrawals from individual retirement plans for adoption expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 1577. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize advance appropriations for military personnel, reserve personnel, and National Guard personnel accounts of the Department of Defense, generally title I of the annual Department of Defense appropriations Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 1578. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health

care system's assessment and response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOLT, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1579. A bill to improve compliance with mine safety and health laws, empower miners to raise safety concerns, prevent future mine tragedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KIND, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SHULER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HALL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H.R. 1580. A bill to preserve Medicare beneficiary choice by restoring and expanding the Medicare open enrollment and disenrollment opportunities repealed by section 3204(a) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. MCCARTHY of California (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H.R. 1581. A bill to release wilderness study areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management that are not suitable for wilderness designation from continued management as de facto wilderness areas and to release inventoried roadless areas within the National Forest System that are not recommended for wilderness designation from the land use restrictions of the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Final Rule and the 2005 State Petitions for Inventoried Roadless Area Management Final Rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. MCCARTHY of California (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1582. A bill to address the application of the national primary ambient air quality standard for ozone with respect to extreme nonattainment areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the Secretary of the Treasury provide a Tax Receipt to each taxpayer who files a Federal income tax return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 1584. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to exempt maintenance activities from certain analysis requirements; referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, 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. LANKFORD:

H.R. 1585. A bill to allow States to elect to receive contributions to the Highway Trust Fund in lieu of participating in the Federal-aid highway program or certain public transportation programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 1586. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, concerning approval of applications for the airport security screening opt-out program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina):

H.R. 1587. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code with respect to modification of certain mortgages on principal residences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANSECO (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DOLD, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BACA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1588. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to assure meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WU, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KIND, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1589. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of voluntary advance care planning consultation under Medicare and Medicaid, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 1590. A bill to provide for the disposition of the Space Shuttle Discovery upon retirement; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 1591. A bill to guarantee that military funerals are conducted with dignity and respect; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and Armed Services, 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. BERKLEY (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1592. A bill to limit United States assistance to the Palestinian Authority if the Palestinian Authority unilaterally declares a Palestinian state; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an unlimited exclusion from transfer taxes for certain farmland and land of conservation value, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 1594. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that installment sales treatment shall not fail to apply to property acquired for conservation purposes by a State or local government or certain tax-exempt organizations merely because purchase funds are held in a sinking or similar fund pursuant to State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WU, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1595. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make all veterans eligible for home loans under the veterans mortgage revenue bond program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1596. A bill to provide for the use of funds in the Hazardous Substance Superfund for the purposes for which they were collected, to ensure adequate resources for the cleanup of hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, 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 Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1597. A bill to permanently prohibit oil and gas leasing off the coast of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDOZA (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to promote energy independence and self-sufficiency by providing for the use of net metering by certain small electric energy generation systems, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. COLE:

H.R. 1599. A bill to facilitate economic growth and development in Indian country, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, Financial Services, 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 Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1600. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to take actions to ensure that not fewer than 2 air traffic controllers are on duty and physically situated within the air traffic control room or tower of certain airports at all times during periods of airfield operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 1601. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend certain expiring provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1602. A bill to amend title 31 of the United States Code to require that Federal children's programs be separately displayed and analyzed in the President's budget; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 1603. A bill to establish the Emergency Trade Deficit Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H.R. 1604. A bill to facilitate certain activities, alleviate the extra regulatory burdens, and reduce costs related to carrying out projects of the Central Valley Project, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1605. A bill to reduce Federal spending in a responsible manner; referred to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. ENGEL (for himself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1606. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to provide oral health services to aged, blind, or disabled individuals under the Medicaid Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 1607. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to extend the suspension of the limitation on the period for which certain borrowers are eligible for guaranteed assistance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 1608. A bill to include the county of Mohave, in the State of Arizona, as an affected area for purposes of making claims under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act based on exposure to atmospheric nuclear testing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 1609. A bill to amend the War Powers Resolution to limit the use of funds for introduction of the Armed Forces into hostilities, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. GARRETT):

H.R. 1610. A bill to provide end user exemptions from certain provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. GRIMM (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 1611. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the designation of Clean Energy Business Zones and for tax incentives for the construction of, and employment at, energy-efficient buildings and clean energy facilities, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1612. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a commission on urotrauma; referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. HECK (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. HELLER):

H.R. 1613. A bill to amend title VI of the Clean Air Act to make a restriction on the use of class II substances inapplicable to certain fire suppression agents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1614. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat amounts paid for umbilical cord blood banking services as medical care expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 1615. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Gallium metal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1616. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to integrate public libraries into State and local workforce investment boards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. LEE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. STARK, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. HANABUSA):

H.R. 1617. A bill to strengthen communities through English literacy and civics education for new Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1618. A bill to require the filing of certain information regarding a residential mortgage in any proceeding for foreclosure of the mortgage; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1619. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code, to require commemorative works in the District of Columbia and its environs to be constructed of materials that are grown, produced, or manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1620. A bill to improve Federal land management, resource conservation, environmental protection, and use of Federal real property, by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to develop a multipurpose cadastre of Federal real property and identifying inaccurate, duplicate, and out-of-date Federal land inventories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. JONES, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 1621. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the Centennial of Marine Corps Aviation, and to support construction of the Marine Corps Heritage Center; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1622. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for voluntary incentive auction revenue sharing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. STARK, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1623. A bill to reauthorize the Assets for Independence Act, to provide for the approval of applications to operate new demonstration programs and to renew existing programs, to enhance program flexibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1624. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish uniform national standards for the interconnection of certain small power production facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 1625. A bill to prohibit funding for the Development Innovation Ventures (DIV) program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr.

PAUL, Mr. COBLE, Ms. HAYWORTH, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 1626. A bill to amend chapter 9 of title 44, United States Code, to limit the printing of the Congressional Record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 1627. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for certain requirements for the placement of monuments in Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. MORAN (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1628. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a retail tax on disposable carryout bags, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ISSA, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KELLY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HECK, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1629. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 1630. A bill to establish a procedure to safeguard the surpluses of the Social Security and Medicare hospital insurance trust funds; referred to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. NADLER (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1631. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for adjustments in the individual income tax rates to reflect regional differences in the cost-of-living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. REYES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 1632. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the ''Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. HURT, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. KISSELL):

H.R. 1633. A bill to establish a temporary prohibition against revising any national ambient air quality standard applicable to coarse particulate matter, to limit Federal regulation of nuisance dust in areas in which such dust is regulated under State, tribal, or local law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1634. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the financing of the Superfund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1635. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for investments lost in a fraudulent Ponzi-type scheme; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1636. A bill to establish expanded learning time initiatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1637. A bill to safeguard the Crime Victims Fund; referred to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, 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. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1638. A bill to stimulate the economy, provide for a sound United States dollar by defining a value for the dollar, to remove the authority of Federal Reserve banks to pay earnings on certain balances maintained at such banks, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, 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. POSEY (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COLE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 1639. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1640. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to bring the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 1641. A bill to direct the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to plan to return to the Moon and develop a sustained human presence on the Moon; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. CHU, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1642. A bill to prevent the illegal sale of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1643. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate bird-safe building materials and design features into public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RIVERA:

H.R. 1644. A bill to amend section 412(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit the provision of cash assistance or medical assistance to any refugee who, after entering the United States, travels to a country that supports international terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1645. A bill to construct a specialty hospital and toxins research center on the island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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. RUNYAN:

H.R. 1646. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to preserve jobs and coastal communities through transparency and accountability in fishery management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 1647. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program under which certain veterans may submit claims for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary to any regional office of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACA, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Ms. SUTTON,

Mr. TONKO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1648. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1649. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the continuing authorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1650. A bill to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1651. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to create a designation for property owners who take actions to reduce nutrient and sediment runoff into the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 1652. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 to make modifications to the Chesapeake Bay environmental restoration and protection program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 1653. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase the dollar amount requirements for articles and merchandise under the administrative exemptions and entry under regulations provisions of that Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 1654. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for additional opportunities to enroll under part B of the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1655. A bill to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by imposing additional economic sanctions against Iran, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Financial Services, and 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 Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 1656. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to urban Medicare-dependent hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 1657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the enforcement penalties for misrepresentation of a business concern as a small business concern owned and controlled by veterans or as a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1658. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs telehealth clinic in Craig, Colorado, as the ''Major William Edward Adams Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1659. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for qualified fuel cell motor vehicles and to allow the credit for certain off-highway vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1660. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act, to adjust dollar limits on check hold policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 1661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow loans from certain retirement plans for the payment of certain small business expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1662. A bill to encourage financial institutions to meet the needs of borrowers in low- to moderate-income communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WEST (for himself, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 1663. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily provide the work opportunity tax credit for small businesses hiring unemployed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 1664. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to modernize and enhance the Federal Government's response to oil spills, to improve oversight and regulation of offshore drilling, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H. Con. Res. 44. A concurrent resolution calling for an independent international investigation of the April 10, 2010, plane crash that killed President of Poland Lech Kaczynski and 95 other individuals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARROW, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H. Con. Res. 45. A concurrent resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces who are serving in, or have served in, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn; referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. JONES (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H. Res. 229. A resolution honoring the Air Force Mortuary Affairs Operations at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, for its service in providing dignified transfer of our Nation's fallen heroes to their families and loved ones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. POLIS):

H. Res. 230. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that the House may not consider any reported bill until at least 72 hours after it is reported; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H. Res. 231. A resolution urging that the United States, the Government of Iraq, and other responsible actors ensure that humanitarian protections are upheld for the residents of Camp Ashraf in Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H. Res. 232. A resolution recognizing the recent admission by Richard Goldstone of the deeply-flawed conclusions in his report to the United Nations Human Rights Council and urging the Administration to take steps to reverse the damage done by the Goldstone Report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Res. 233. A resolution welcoming the new state of Southern Sudan, encouraging Sudan and Southern Sudan to resolve separation issues and the future of the Abyei region, and urging the Governments of Sudan and Southern Sudan to abide by the principles of peace, democracy, and human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MYRICK (for herself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HALL, Mr. KISSELL, and Mrs. SCHMIDT):

H. Res. 234. A resolution recognizing the importance of breast cancer early detection efforts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H. Res. 235. A resolution recognizing April 23 as National Sovereignty and Children's Day in Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois introduced a bill (H.R. 1665) for the relief of Ewa Mozdzen, Jaroslaw Mozdzen, and Sylwia Mozdzen; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution reads, ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mrs. ADAMS:

H.R. 1571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes. . . .''

By Mr. LANDRY:

H.R. 1572.

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 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 1573.

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 make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 1574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 1575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. RIGELL:

H.R. 1577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 1579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 & 18 of Section 8, Article I, of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. McCARTHY of California:

H.R. 1581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 relating to the power of Congress to ''dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

By Mr. McCARTHY of California:

H.R. 1582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 1584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment to the Constitution:

''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 1585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment of the Constitution:

''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 & Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, 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 of Officer thereof.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, sec. 8, cl.4 (the Bankruptcy Clause), and Art. I, sec. 8, cl. 18 (the Necessary and Proper Clause).

By Mr. CANSECO:

H.R. 1588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill modifies the Social Security Act, which Congress enacted pursuant to its powers under the commerce clause of the U.S. Constitution, as well as its powers to tax and spend for the general welfare. Congress has the power under those provisions to enact this legislation as well.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 1591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution states that all legislative powers are vested in the Congress of the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that ''Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . .'' (Section 8, Clause 1). Further clarifying Congressional power to enact an income tax, voters amended the Constitution by popular vote to provide that ''Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived . . .'' (Sixteenth Amendment). This legislation, which relates to income taxes, modifies the income tax code enacted by Congress pursuant to this constitutional authority.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that ''Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . .'' (Section 8, Clause 1). Further clarifying Congressional power to enact an income tax, voters amended the Constitution by popular vote to provide that ''Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived . . . .'' (Sixteenth Amendment).

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: ''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Mr. CARDOZA:

H.R. 1598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to its authority under Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution to regulate Commerce with foreign

Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which allows Congress to regulate trade amongst the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to treaties lawfully entered into and ratified pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article II, Section 2, Clause 2.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 1601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS 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.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clauses 1 and 18 and Article 1 Section 9 Clause 7.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the constitution.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 1604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3—Power to Regulate Commerce

''The power to regulate commerce is the power to prescribe conditions and rules for the carrying-on of commercial transactions, the keeping-free of channels of commerce, the regulating of prices and terms of sale.''

''If, as has always been understood, the sovereignty of congress, though limited to specified objects, is plenary as to those objects, the power over commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, is vested in congress as absolutely as it would be in a single government, having in its constitution the same restrictions on the exercise of the power as are found in the constitution of the United States.''

Gibbons v. Ogden, 22 U.S. (9 Wheat.) 1, 196–197 (1824).

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 1605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 Section 8 Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 1607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 1608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 1609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 11, 12, 13, 14, and 18.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 1610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 1611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12

The Congress shall have Power to raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer term than two Years;

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 1613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 1614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 1615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 1616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 1617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I; and

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power ''[t]o establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization . . . throughout the United States.''

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I. Section. 8.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 1619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

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. KIND:

H.R. 1620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article Section 8.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 1621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to clause 5 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states, ''The Congress shall have the Power to . . . coin Money, regulate the Value thereof and of foreign Coin . . .''

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1623.

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 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

H.R. 1624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 1625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 1626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Each House may determine the Rules of it Proceedings.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution reserves to Congress the power to raise and support Armies and provide and maintain a Navy, as well as make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 1628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which provides that the Congress shall have Power:

''To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;''

''To regulate Commerce . . . among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;'' and

''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7. No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, sec. 8, cl. 1 ''Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises. . . .''

Art. 1, sec. 8, cl. 18 Necessary and proper clause.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

The Congress shall have Power to establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 1636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause I.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 6

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 7 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RIVERA:

H.R. 1644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Interstate Travel Regulation of the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey:

H.R. 1645.

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. RUNYAN:

H.R. 1646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 1647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill in enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 1653.

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 as stated in Article I, Section 7 and Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1654.

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 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 1655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 1657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (to make rules for the regulation of land)

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises . . .''), and the 16th Amendment.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEST:

H.R. 1663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and excises to, pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 1664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 23: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 24: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. STARK, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 58: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 59: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 64: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 65: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 100: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 112: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 114: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 154: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 177: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 178: Mr. HONDA and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 181: Mr. ROSS of Florida and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 190: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 210: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, and Ms WOOLSEY.
H.R. 287: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 289: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 303: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 320: Mr. LANCE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 321: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 329: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 361: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 365: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 374: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 412: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 420: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 426: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 432: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 436: Mr. HALL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. FINCHER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 452: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LANCE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 458: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 459: Mr. HERGER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PLATS, and Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 466: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DOLD, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HALL, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. POSEY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 517: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 527: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 558: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. REYES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 567: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 591: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 594: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 605: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DOLD, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BERG, Mr. LATTA, Mr. AKIN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 614: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 615: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 616: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 640: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 645: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. CRAVAACK, and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 664: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 672: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 674: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 695: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 709: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 718: Mr. WOLF, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. GERLACH, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 719: Mr. COLE and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 721: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 750: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 757: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 763: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 787: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 800: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 822: Mr. BACA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. CRAVAACK, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 827: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 831: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 835: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 849: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 870: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 879: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 883: Mr. LUJÁN and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 909: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 938: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 942: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 948: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 960: Mr. LONG and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 965: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 984: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 985: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1004: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1012: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1027: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HALL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1041: Mr. NUNNELEE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 1063: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1065: Mr. AUSTRIA and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1082: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 1089: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1090: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1091: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 1092: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1112: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1123: Ms. BASS of California.
H.R. 1133: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1134: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1138: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1161: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1167: Mr. GUINTA and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1181: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 1182: Mr. FORBES and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1187: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1190: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1195: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1206: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1214: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1218: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 1219: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 1229: Mr. PAUL, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 1230: Mr. PAUL, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, and Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 1231: Mr. PAUL and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 1234: Mr. HEINRICH and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1236: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1240: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1249: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 1259: Mr. POSEY, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 1265: Mr. AUSTRIA and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1281: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1285: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1286: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. CRAVAACK, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 1287: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
H.R. 1288: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1299: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1309: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1310: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1322: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1323: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BONNER, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1327: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PAUL, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1332: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, MR. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1337: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 1340: Ms. BUERKLE.
H.R. 1341: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1342: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DOLD, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1351: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1375: Mr. WELCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 1377: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1380: Mr. PAUL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1390: Mr. KELLY and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1391: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1397: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1404: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1416: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1417: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1418: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1425: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1426: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1427: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1433: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1440: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1449: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1463: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1474: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1482: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1497: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1506: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 1508: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1510: Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 1517: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1520: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1527: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1533: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1536: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1537: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1539: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 1546: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1547: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1551: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1558: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. CRAVAACK.

H.R. 1563: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. DUFFY.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. PENCE, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. HUNTER.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 25: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H. Res. 47: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H. Res. 86: Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Res. 98: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. REHBERG.

H. Res. 111: Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. RAHALL.

H. Res. 134: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H. Res. 137: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 180: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 184: Mr. PEARCE and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 187: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H. Res. 211: Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 222: Ms. PELOSI.

H. Res. 225: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 227: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. NEAL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1081: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.