United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 2013 No. 40

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 19, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this week is the 10th anniversary of the unnecessary war in Iraq. I urge my fellow Members and the American public to watch MSNBC's documentary, ''Hubris: The Selling of the Iraq War,'' on Friday night of this week at 9 o'clock. The documentary sheds light on the manipulated intelligence that got us into Iraq.

Unfortunately, we have not learned from all we lost in Iraq, as President Obama has also committed us to an additional 10 years in Afghanistan thanks to a strategic security agreement he made without Congress voting on it or even debating it.

This weekend I read two articles that really spoke to the corruption happening in Afghanistan. One was an AP article I read in my hometown paper titled: ''U.S. Helicopter Crashes in Afghanistan Killing One.'' And the other is from The New York Times titled: ''Afghans Protest U.S. Special Forces: Complaints about Night Raids Sparked Cause for Withdrawal.''

I will quote from the first article:

> The crashes come as United States officials are grappling with tough talk from President Hamid Karzai whose recent anti-American rhetoric has complicated relations at a time when international troops are withdrawing from the war.

The article continues saying:

> Karzai started the week by accusing the United States and the Taliban of being in collusion on two deadly suicide bombings last weekend in an effort to create instability and give security forces an excuse to stay.

Karzai is one person we cannot trust, and yet we are funding him $8 billion a month. The New York Times article states that Karzai issued a statement that ''referred to U.S. forces in Afghanistan as 'infidels,' '' echoing language used by the Taliban.

Mr. Speaker, I just do not understand why more Members of the House are not more concerned about President Obama's 10-year security agreement to keep our troops in Afghanistan until 2024—10 more years after 2014—2024. It makes absolutely no sense. We are financially broke as a Nation.

I am currently in the process of finding out exactly how much money it is going to cost the American taxpayer to keep our troops in this corrupt country for another decade past 2014. Whether the cost is $1 or $1 trillion is too much.

Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO and I have introduced H.R. 125, the Congressional Oversight of Afghanistan Agreement Act of 2013, to make sure that the President does not bypass Congress as he continues to do, but gives us a chance to debate any security agreement that will keep our troops in Afghanistan past 2014.

Mr. Speaker, it is our job as Representatives to make sure the voices of the American people are being heard, and it is only fair that we have a debate in Congress on how long our country's future involvement with Afghanistan will continue.

Mr. Speaker, as always, I bring down a poster that shows the cost of war. In this case, you can see these marines, Mr. Speaker, carrying a coffin, a flag-draped coffin. How many more coffins have to be carried by the soldiers and the marines and the airmen and the Navy of this country when the American people demand that Congress pull our troops out of Afghanistan? It is too long to be there until 2014; it is too long to be there until 2024.

May God bless our men and women in uniform, and God please wake up Congress to bring our troops home.

10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE IRAQ WAR

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, although I rise to honor the 10th anniversary of the Iraq war, what I really want to do today is ask: Why? Ten years ago, I stood on this floor and said we were entering a war under false pretenses. No weapons of mass destruction later, I have never been so sad as to be right.

We took out Saddam Hussein with as much forethought as we gave to arming him just a few years earlier. We scooped him out of office and thought a new democracy would suddenly flower in its place.

Printed on recycled paper.

Last week, Robert Dreyfuss wrote an article in The Nation that I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He explains that the CIA is currently training Syrian rebels, some of whom have Sunni fundamentalist ties, at the same time that it is fighting Sunni rebels in Iraq. Recently, dozens of Syrian soldiers fled to Iraq, only to be killed by Iraqi Sunnis. He asked the question:

> When will the United States learn that it doesn't know enough about the Middle East to go charging in there, seemingly without a clue about what it all means?

So here we are: 10 years of neoconservative hawks preaching that we can franchise American democracy and freedom; 10 years of quicksand diplomacy; 10 years of wrong answers, and we still don't know the question.

What has been the cost of all of this? And I don't mean financially. Because, yes, we've spent probably a trillion or more on this war, or will. Yes, as we speak, we are cutting food assistance to kids in this country and funding for R&D that would drive our economy. But we can't appropriate a sum of money to fix the real cost of Iraq. We can't pay back the lives of 4,486 American men and women who have died there, or the roughly 2,000 broken soldiers who came home and took their own lives.

The wounded—physically and mentally. The soldiers who didn't know how not to be a soldier. The families living with a hole in their hearts, and the families living with someone they no longer recognize. Ten years of young men and women leaving their families, living in hell, and coming home to unemployment and to homelessness. To a country that has forgotten it's at war at all. To a country that seems to think a yellow ribbon magnet on their bumper is the only kind of support that our troops need.

And the cost in Iraq? Untold deaths. Let me rephrase that: unknown deaths. We can only guess at the destruction that we have left in our wake: 115,000 Iraqis? 600,000? You can find a number. What was the long-term impact of that on their environment, water, and health. What happens when someone lives in constant fear of becoming collateral damage?

Today, Iraq is a sad shadow of a society that once boasted the best infrastructure in the region. Instability and violence fester on this very day, and now it teeters on the brink of an inevitable civil war.

This is the legacy of our last 10 years, and I still don't understand why. I hope this anniversary will remind us that a whole new generation of veterans are waiting to help reintegrate into civilian life. I believe it's time to elevate our level of commitment to these veterans.

I am introducing a bill to create a commission on veterans care to investigate what we as a society can do to help our men and women come home. I hope it will remind us that no lives, regardless of nationality, should be taken lightly. I hope it will remind us as to why the next time. And I hope it won't take another war to get that answer.

THE CIA TAKES OPPOSITE SIDES IN SYRIA AND IRAQ

Mr. MCDERMOTT. What, really, could be more bizarre than this: as the United States ramps up its aid to Syria's ragtag rebels, whose backbone is comprised of radical Islamists and Sunni fundamentalists, some with ties to Al Qaeda, the CIA is busily engaged in combat inside Iraq with the very same radical Islamists and Sunni fundamentalists, some with ties to Al Qaeda.

Yep, that's right.

We're backing the same guys in Syria that we're fighting in Iraq.

Of course, we shouldn't be involved in Iraq in any way, shape or form, but try telling that to the CIA. According to the Wall Street Journal:

> The Central Intelligence Agency is ramping up support to elite Iraqi antiterrorism units to better fight al Qaeda affiliates, amid alarm in Washington about spillover from the civil war in neighboring Syria, according to US officials.
>
> The stepped-up mission expands a covert US presence on the edges of the two-year-old Syrian conflict, at a time of American concerns about the growing power of extremists in the Syrian rebellion.

The Journal notes that this isn't an accident. It was the result of a carefully thought-out White House decision:

> In a series of secret decisions from 2011 to late 2012, the White House directed the CIA to provide support to Iraq's Counterterrorism Service, or CTS, a force that reports directly to Iraqi Prime Minister Nourial-Maliki, officials said.

The CIA has since ramped up its work with the CTS—taking control of a mission long run by the U.S. military, according to administration and defense officials. For years, U.S. special-operations forces worked with CTS against al Qaeda in Iraq. But the military's role has dwindled since U.S. troops pulled out of the country at the end of 2011.

The paradox, obviously, is that Maliki, the guy we're helping in Iraq, is an ally of Iran's and is sympathetic to President Assad of Syria. That's because were the Sunni-led rebels in Syria to seize Damascus and topple Assad, they'd turn their wrath next door against the Shiite-led Maliki regime, and funnel weapons and fighters to support the Sunni-led rebels in Iraq.

That's not stopping the United States, though, from boosting the fortunes of the Syrian rebels by funneling aid and support to them and coordinating the flow of weapons from Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Turkey. Meanwhile, as The New York Times has been reporting for a while, the same CIA that is trying to squash the Sunni rebels in Iraq is actually training Sunni rebels in a secret program in Jordan, to fight in Syria.

Oddly enough, the rest of the media hasn't picked up on the Times reports on the CIA training efforts in Jordan, and the Times itself hasn't elaborated. How many gangsters are is the CIA training in Jordan? What are they doing?

It all comes together in the recent reports that dozens of Syrian soldiers, loyal to Assad, who fled into Iraq recently, were then massacred by Iraqi Sunni crazies.

We blundered, bungling, into Iraq in 2003 without knowing really a damn thing about the country we invaded. When will the United States learn that it doesn't know enough about the Middle East to go charging in there with guns, seemingly without a clue about what it all means?

□ 1010

A CALL FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I arrived here in Washington, D.C., to serve the people of Montana and my country with a bit of a different resume than many folks have here in Washington. You see, I've spent the past 28 years in the private sector working to grow businesses, having to balance a budget and create good jobs.

I loved my job in the private sector. But when I looked at Washington and the path our economy and our country was on, I knew that things needed to change. So I ran for Congress because the challenges facing our Nation were far too great to just sit back on the sidelines.

As Montana's small businesses know, you can't spend more than you take in. Year after year of Federal deficits with no end in sight doesn't lead to prosperity, doesn't lead to growth—it leads to financial ruin.

I'm also the father of four great kids—two in college and two in high school. They know that as a family, we have to plan ahead for the future. We need to create a budget and then live within our means. These are the same principles that my parents passed down to me. These are the values that Montana families live by each and every day.

Those values are exemplified in Montana's own State legislature, where the only constitutionally required duty is passing a balanced budget. In fact, when our legislature in Montana adjourns in just a little over a month, they will have given Montana a balanced budget, just like they did last year and the year before and the year before that. It seems simple: live within your means and spend no more than you take in. But it's not so easy here in Washington.

Right now we're presented with two very different visions for our country, two visions that will lead to two very different outcomes for this country.

One vision calls for more taxes taken out of the pockets of hardworking American families and more government spending, which adds to the trillions of dollars in debt that will be handed down to the next generation.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about a balanced approach, but they refuse to even balance their own budget.

Our vision calls for a stop to Washington's failed policies and reckless spending. It says American families and small businesses understand you can't spend more than you take in, that you need to balance your budget. It's time for Washington to do the same.

This vision seeks to protect the things that we value most, to keep the promises that we've made to our seniors and to our veterans—I'm the son of a U.S. Marine—while at the same time allowing us to leave a better future to our kids and our grandkids. That's the vision I want to work toward, and that's why I'm proud to support the House Budget Committee's proposals which we will be voting on later this week.

This isn't about passing a budget for one year just one time. This is about creating lasting solutions that help grow our economy and put our country back on track. That's what this budget will do.

SAVING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, as I speak here on the floor, the American Society of Civil Engineers is releasing a report card for America's infrastructure.

The gentleman who spoke before me talked about the legacy that we leave to our country and about growth in the Nation. Well, this is an incredible legacy we're leaving and creating, which is an unbelievable deficit in our Nation's infrastructure. We've gone from No. 1 in the world post-World War II with the Eisenhower era, the national interstate program, to No. 26 in the world. We are spending less of our gross domestic product on infrastructure investment than many Third World countries. It's not only an embarrassment; it is hurting our economy and our growth.

Now, if your kid came home and said, Hey, Dad, guess what? I got my report card. Here it is. Good news. Good news. Oh, it's good news. I went up to a D-plus. A D-plus—that's where America's infrastructure is.

We have a projected deficit over the next 7 years of about $1.6 trillion. That's an unbelievable, unimaginable number, $1.6 trillion. That's as much money as the war in Iraq cost us, an unnecessary and wasteful war. We can't afford to invest in our infrastructure, but we're rebuilding the infrastructure in Afghanistan. There's something wrong with this picture.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, if we don't address this investment gap in all of our infrastructure, by 2020 the economy will lose $1 trillion in business sales, 3.5 million jobs will be lost or foregone and there will be $3.1 trillion less in gross domestic product. If we invested $1.6 trillion, we would get 100 percent return on our investment and 3.5 million more jobs. Not bad, but the people on that side of the aisle don't believe in rebuilding America's infrastructure. They have some wacko theory here of what they call ''devolution.'' We shouldn't have a national transportation policy, no. It should be done by the 50 States. Well, we already tried that. It didn't work too well. That's when Dwight David Eisenhower said we needed an national interstate system, and we built it. Now it's falling apart.

There are 140,000 bridges that need substantial repair or replacement and 40 percent of the pavement on the National Highway System is at the point where there are potholes big enough to put your car in. Maybe if the White House limousine falls in one of those holes we'll get a little more action down there in terms of funding our infrastructure. I've been trying to get them to take a position on this.

We are looking at something even more extraordinary. In 2015—we've been paying for infrastructure out of a trust fund. It hasn't added to the deficit. But it raises taxes. Oh, my God. We can't have taxes for something like that, can we? Not on that side of aisle.

Well, if we don't do something about it, the trust fund is going to drop below zero sometime in 2014, which means we are not going to invest any more in our National Transportation System. For one year we'll go from $50 billion, which is not sufficient to even deal with the deterioration, let alone build out a better, more efficient 21st century infrastructure, to $7 billion. That's hundreds of thousands of jobs gone. That's an acceleration in the deterioration of the system.

We're going to have to talk about revenues. It's the only way to solve that problem, unless you want to devolve it to the 50 States and have the States build interstates that don't match up or maybe they won't build the interstates at all. We don't know what kind of plan is coming from that side of the aisle. But I do know that we need to make these investments. As I already pointed out, we can get a 100 percent rate of return.

It's pretty simple. We would just index the existing gas tax, which hasn't changed since 1993. Yeah, we're paying nearly 4 bucks a gallon. It will be 5 bucks a gallon by Memorial Day. And the money is going into the coffers of ExxonMobil and the other big oil companies. It isn't going to repair infrastructure.

We haven't raised that tax in 20 years. If we just indexed it to construction cost inflation and indexed it to fleet fuel economy, we could issue bonds paid off by that increment on the gas tax. It would be about a penny a year a gallon. When I was driving to work one day and they were changing the cards up there, they were raising it a nickel a gallon just as I drove by. At a penny a gallon, I think most Americans would be willing to pay for that if they knew it was going to save 3.5 or create 3.5 million jobs and put this country back on track and get rid of some of the delays and the congestion and the detours and all the other problems we have.

So let's pay attention to this scorecard, to this report card. If your kid came home with a card like this, you'd do something about it. Congress better do something about it.

DONALD FOISIE—1ST CALVARY DIVISION SOLDIER—PATRIOT—TEXAN

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was June 1950 when the North Koreans decided they would invade their neighbors to the south, South Korea. The war had started—even though the world community called it a ''police action''—but it was a war, and of course South Korea was in trouble. They called 911, and as it has been in history, when you call 911, the United States answers. The Americans went to South Korea to protect our ally South Korea.

In August of the same year, some Americans were occupying Hill 303. Most Americans have never heard of Hill 303. Let me tell you about it.

Hill 303 was being occupied by the 2nd Battalion, 5th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division of the United States Army. It was a small group because America didn't have a lot of troops in South Korea. We weren't ready for this war. The North Koreans, with the aid of the Communist Chinese later, overran the hill—and the Americans, some stayed, some withdrew. One of the individuals who stayed on that hill was a friend of mine by the name of Donald Foisie.

Donald Foisie and his other comrades refused to give ground. The hill was overrun. The North Koreans took the hill. Donald Foisie and one of his friends hid in a rice paddy. They used bamboo canes to get air, and they stayed there for a long time. Unbeknownst to him, 45 other American soldiers had been captured by the North Koreans. And after they were captured, they were lined up in front of a ditch, with their hands tied behind their backs, and they were machine-gunned down in that gully. Later, the Americans retook the hill. They found Donald Foisie and found his murdered comrades.

That was in August of 1950. Things haven't changed much in the Koreas. The North Koreans still have sights on South Korea, but that's another story.

Sergeant Donald Foisie was wounded several times, and received the Purple Heart that day. He stayed in the United States Army until 1962. He came back to Atascocita, Texas—down the street from me—and he had several businesses. He worked for a corporation in Houston. That corporation was an international corporation, and from time to time they would fly the flag of the country that they were hosting that day. When Donald Foisie saw that one of those flags, on one day that he was working, was the Red Chinese—as he called them—Communist flag, he refused to go to work. He didn't believe that the Chinese flag ought to fly on American soil. That's the kind of guy he was.

He spent the rest of his life letting Americans know about the Korean war. Last year, he was at Creekwood Middle School in Kingwood, Texas where the Creekwood Middle School kids honored the veterans of Hill 303—those who were murdered—and had a memorial. He was there, along with many South Koreans, and Ambassador Park from South Korea and myself were there.

Last year, he also attended the Memorial Day service at the veterans cemetery in Houston, and this is where that photograph was taken. He was saluting a crowd of several thousand who had given him a standing ovation after his story was told. You see, he looks pretty good. He's 81 in this photograph. This week, Donald Foisie, United States Army, 1st Cavalry Division—he's still wearing his hat—died. He will be buried this Friday at this same cemetery that he was standing in and honoring on Memorial Day.

He was quite a guy. He was married to Rita for 60 years. He had three kids—Donna, Daniel, and David. He wrote several books. He was in the air-conditioning business, and he worked as a security guard when his knees got bad. But he spent most of his life letting America know about his buddies in Korea in 1950—''the forgotten war,'' as he called it. He wants us to remember what occurred many years ago when young Americans—kids—went over to lands they'd never seen and fought for people they had never known, all in the name of securing liberty and America's interest.

So, today, we honor Sergeant Foisie and his family for his service in the United States Army, for being a true patriot, a true American, a great Texan, and a person who never gave ground.

And that's just the way it is.

10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF IRAQ WAR

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

Ms. LEE of California. Today is a solemn anniversary, a tragedy that began 10 years ago when President George W. Bush launched a war of choice in Iraq, driving our country into a costly, bitter conflict based on falsehoods and hyperbole. It took President Obama's fulfilling his campaign promise to end the Iraq war, and we are grateful that he brought the war to an end, but we must not forget how we got into the war in the first place so that these mistakes are not repeated.

We were told there were weapons of mass destruction. We were warned about mushroom clouds. Now, I offered an amendment at the time that would have taken us down a different path. It would have required the United States to work through the United Nations, using inspectors and maximizing diplomacy and inspections to determine whether or not Iraq was developing weapons of mass destruction. Unfortunately, my amendment failed by a vote of 72–355.

What happened from there? We all know the tragic consequences: President Bush dragged this country into an unnecessary war. No weapons of mass destruction were ever found. The costs of the Iraq war soared far beyond what was projected, and we lost 4,400 American troops in Iraq, and over 32,000 were wounded, not to mention Iraqis.

Once the war started, many of us in Congress quickly organized. Led by Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS and my good friend former Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey and myself, we founded the Out of Iraq Caucus. Over 80 Members joined. Thankfully, on May 25, 2005, Congresswoman Woolsey introduced the first amendment to bring our troops home. From what I remember, there were about 132 votes that that amendment received, but that was not enough to stop the war. It was our way, though, to join the hundreds of thousands of people who marched and protested against what they knew was a war based on misleading information by the Bush administration. Many in this House supported my amendment every year to cut the funding for combat operations and to only appropriate funding for the safe and orderly withdrawal of our troops and our contractors.

Now, we would have saved hundreds of lives had this body used the power of the purse strings to stop this war. Shame on us. Ten years later, today, the full consequences and costs of the Iraq war remain to be seen.

According to a new study by the Watson Institute at Brown University, the war in Iraq has cost $1.7 trillion, with an additional $490 billion in benefits owed to our veterans. Most importantly, we paid for this war most tragically in loss of life and injury, and we poured billions of dollars into nation-building in Iraq with little oversight or accountability. The Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction issued his final report to Congress last month, detailing the billions of United States tax dollars lost to waste, fraud, and abuse.

Speaking with an Iraqi official, Special Inspector Stuart Bowen was told: You can fly in a helicopter around Baghdad and other cities, but you cannot point a finger to a single project that was built and completed by the United States.

Unfortunately, these lost opportunities and tragic mistakes are not behind us. As the daughter of a 25-year veteran of the Armed Forces, I recognize the sacrifices our young men and women have made in Iraq and continue to make in Afghanistan. I am deeply concerned with the widespread incidences of PTSD and the alarming suicide rates among our returning veterans. We need to honor our troops who served and show our support by giving our men and women who served the best health care, the best educational opportunities and the best jobs available. They deserve nothing less.

It is my hope that this reckless and shortsighted decision will mark a turning point in American history and that we will never again wage an unnecessary war. We must use all the tools of American power in resolving disputes, including diplomacy, and we must have sufficient congressional debate. We only debated this go-to-war resolution for probably a couple of hours. We need more debate and oversight before ever putting another U.S. soldier in harm's way.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, just like in Iraq, there is no military solution in Afghanistan. We need to bring the war in Afghanistan to an accelerated end and bring our troops home now. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in expressing his sentiment during a different war, said: The bombs in Vietnam explode at home—they destroy the hopes and possibilities of a decent America.

So let us put this decade of perpetual warfare behind us, invest in our veterans, our children, and get about the business of nation-building here at home.

□ 1030

CONGRATULATING DR. JOSEPH SCHRODT

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, every time I walk onto this floor, it is such an honor and a privilege to be able to represent the great citizens of central and southwestern Illinois, the citizens that have given me this opportunity that humbles me every time we walk through those doors and every time we are able to stand here in this institution and offer what our visions for America are. There are vast differences in our visions for America between many parties. Fortunately, though, there are a lot of similarities and our willingness to begin working together to craft a vision for America that the hardworking taxpayers of this country want and deserve.

But another great honor that this institution allows is to actually honor

some of those hardworking taxpayers in our district on a regular basis. It gives us an opportunity to talk about the many things that those in our districts do on a regular basis. They don't ask for recognition; they just do it because it is the right thing to do.

And that's why today I stand here, Mr. Speaker. I want to congratulate Dr. Joseph Schrodt of Decatur, Illinois, for being honored by the American Medical Association for his 50-year anniversary of graduation from medical school. While Dr. Schrodt's dedication and commitment to the medical profession through the years is a tremendous accomplishment, I would be remiss if I didn't take this opportunity to also thank Dr. Schrodt for all he and his family have done for the entire Decatur area.

Dr. Schrodt's contributions to the area are too many to mention, but his advocacy and hard work on behalf of students and education is something we should all strive to emulate. Whether it was his time spent serving on the board of my alma mater, Millikin University and their board of trustees, or the Richland Community College Foundation Board, or he and his late wife Martha's work to see the health education wing at Richland Community College come to fruition, Dr. Schrodt's impact in the Decatur area will be felt for generations.

So I take this time today, Mr. Speaker, to offer my thanks to Dr. Schrodt and his family for all that they have done and all that they continue to do, and offer my heartfelt congratulations to Dr. Schrodt for this tremendous accomplishment.

THE RYAN BUDGET AND SNAP

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, budget resolutions are moral documents. They lay out a vision of how each party sees the future and where our priorities should lie. Since this is budget week, the week when we will vote on a number of different competing visions for America, it is the right time to talk about the misguided priorities laid out in the Republican budget as presented by Chairman PAUL RYAN.

Once again, Chairman RYAN has proposed a budget that guts low-income programs. The Ryan budget not only does not end hunger now, it actually makes hunger in America worse than it is today.

Simply put, we are currently not doing enough to end hunger now. There are over 50 million hungry Americans in this country; 17 million are kids. Over 47 million rely on SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, to put food on their tables. Without this program, real hunger—the actual absence of food—would be much worse.

The Great Recession is the primary reason hunger is so bad today. Now, don't get me wrong; hunger has been getting worse since the Presidency of Ronald Reagan. We almost eradicated hunger in America in the late 1970s, but hunger has been getting steadily worse in the decades since. But the Great Recession, the worst economic period we've faced since the Great Depression, resulted in millions more hungry people, millions of people who had to turn to SNAP as the safety net that prevented them from going without food altogether.

Recognizing that hunger is a real problem and that we need to end hunger now, I would hope that any budget proposed in this Congress would, at the very least, do no harm to those who are struggling the most in our current economy. Yet the Ryan budget slashes SNAP once again. This should come as no surprise. This is basically the same budget he has introduced over the past few years—and the same budget that voters have rejected over and over again. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the same budget that turns Medicare into a voucher, the same budget that repeals the Affordable Care Act, and the same budget that gives even more tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans. And, Mr. Speaker, it's the same budget that turns SNAP into a block grant.

Some of my Republican friends will provide false arguments about what the Ryan budget really does. They'll say that this just gives Governors flexibility, or they're just combating fraud, waste, and abuse. Mr. Speaker, the real goal of the Ryan budget, and of some of my Republican friends who support it, is to end SNAP as we know it.

SNAP is not just a simple antihunger program; it is among the more effective and efficient, if not the most effective and efficient, Federal program. SNAP has a historically low error rate. Trafficking is going down, and prosecutions of SNAP trafficking are clearly visible as USDA works to reduce that problem. SNAP is a countercyclical program. That means that enrollment increases as the economy worsens. It is a true safety net program, and it has a side benefit of being a stimulus program. Every SNAP dollar spent results in another $1.72 in economic activity.

Yes, SNAP can use some improving, but the wholesale and shortsighted changes included in the Ryan budget are not the answer. The Ryan budget actually cuts $135 billion from SNAP over the next 10 years—$135 billion. That's not a haircut; that's a meat-ax. It's an 18 percent cut, a cut that will cause real harm to low-income families who otherwise could not afford food.

The cuts in the Ryan budget will have a real impact on poor Americans and struggling working families because millions of people on SNAP work for a living. They earn so little that they still qualify for Federal assistance. If they apply these cuts solely to eligibility, these cuts would mean that 8 to 9 million people would be cut from SNAP. If these cuts are applied solely to benefits, then all 47 million people on SNAP would see an average cut of $24 per person per month. That adds up to a cut of almost $1,100 per year for a family of four. That may not seem like much to a Congress that has a ton of millionaires, but a $1,100 cut will do real, serious harm to people whose budgets are already stretched to the limit.

Cuts like these are not just misguided, they're cruel. Combined with cuts to other low-income programs that are included in the Ryan budget, these SNAP cuts will absolutely make hunger in America worse. As we consider a budget, at the very least, we should do no harm, but we really should be striving to make every American's life better. That's our job. Cutting SNAP not only doesn't make anybody's life better, it actually does real harm, harm that will manifest in a less educated population, a sicker Nation, and a Nation that ultimately has to spend more on the hungry simply because we decided to bring austerity to a program that doesn't deserve to be cut.

We are a great country, Mr. Speaker. We are great because we have a tradition of caring about the most vulnerable among us. Let us not turn our backs on one of our greatest traditions. This assault on poor people must come to an end. This assault on the hungry, many of whom are kids and senior citizens, must come to an end.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can end hunger now if we find the political will to do so. The Ryan budget does the opposite. It cuts a vital antihunger program for crass political reasons, an act that makes hunger worse. Let us instead pass a budget that lifts people up, not one that keeps people down.

DECISION TIME IN AMERICA

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, this is decision time in America. We are at a fork in the road, and we have an opportunity to go in either one of two directions. In one direction, the Democratic approach, we can take a balanced approach to dealing with the economic situation that we find ourselves in and our deficit. The other direction, the GOP approach, is to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable amongst us. The Democratic plan will put Americans back to work. The Republican plan will put Americans out of work. It's decision time in America. We can go in one of two different directions.

Now, a balanced approach to deficit reduction has at least four elements to it:

First, invest in the American economy.

Second, increase revenues by closing corporate loopholes that are unfair, unreasonable, and unnecessary.

Third, we can reduce expenditures in a manner that is sensitive to the fragile nature of our economic recovery. We must reduce expenditures in a way that recognizes we still have a long way to go in order to recover, and the meat-cleaver approach advocated by my friends on the other side of the aisle will not make the decision better; it will just make the situation worse.

□ 1040

Lastly, the Democratic approach, the balanced approach, stands up for important social safety net programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid that have nothing to do with the economic situation that we find ourselves in right now.

Why should we invest in the American economy?

Well, we don't have an immediate deficit crisis in America right now. We've cut $2.5 trillion from our deficit over the last several years; and we're prepared, on this side of the aisle, to reasonably do more.

But don't overhype the problem. In fact, objective economists have indicated we don't have an immediate deficit problem in America right now. The Speaker of the House of Representatives has conceded that we don't have an immediate deficit crisis in America right now.

Just on Sunday, the chairman of the Budget Committee acknowledged that we don't have an immediate deficit crisis in America right now. That's why we're pursuing a balanced approach.

What we do have is a jobs crisis. Over the last 4 years, under the leadership of President Obama, we have come a long way, almost 6 million private sector jobs added. But we still, of course, have a long way to go.

Let's just look at the landscape. Corporate profits are way up. The stock market is way up. The productivity of the American worker is way up. Yet unemployment remains stubbornly high, and consumer demand remains stagnant.

That's why the Democratic approach is to invest in our economy, invest in education, invest in job training, invest in transportation and infrastructure, invest in research and development, invest in technology and innovation, invest in the things that will continue to make America a leader in the 21st century.

If you invest in our economy, then you will increase jobs for the American worker. If you increase the jobs available to the American worker, consumer demand will increase. If consumer demand increases, the economy will grow; and if the economy grows, the deficit will decline, and so, too, will our debt as a percentage of GDP.

This is decision time in America; and, clearly, the best decision that we can make is a balanced approach to dealing with our economic problems today.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Alisa Lasater Wailoo, Capitol Hill United Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

As we begin our work today, we pause to give thanks for: each world leader, especially Pope Francis beginning his tenure today, each political party, each Congressperson and their staff, each individual citizen they represent, and all their diverse gifts and disparate needs.

As we begin our work here today, we ask You to reveal: where we've become desensitized to the struggles of Your children, where we've let pride prevent holy possibilities, where we've chosen self-preservation over challenging partnerships.

As we begin our work here today, remind us: that Your limitless love overcomes our limitations, that You have a dream for Your globe that surpasses our wildest imaginations, that You can work through the minutia of detailed legislation and the grand vision of this Nation.

So as we begin our work today, we pray that we may do so ready to trust the lead of Your tender and tremendous love.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WENSTRUP 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 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BUDGET PLAN

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, the American people, regardless of political affiliation, expect elected leaders in Washington to offer a plan to reduce mounting deficits and revive our stagnant economy. House Republicans agree and have offered another responsible plan to balance the budget with responsible reforms.

Meanwhile, the best plan Senate Democrats can come up with continues to spend more money than we take in. They call for a balanced approach, and yet their budget never balances and includes $1.5 trillion in new taxes. At least Senate Democrats have finally come around to offering a plan, after spending the last 4 years on the sidelines. The President has yet to submit his budget to Congress, already 6 weeks behind his legal deadline.

Budgets offer a picture of how government plans to steward taxpayer money. The Senate budget asks for higher taxes to fund higher spending, to finance ever-growing government.

My constituents are tired of the cavalier and unserious approach that has become all too common in Washington. I'm pleased that the House Republican majority continues to take its responsibilities seriously and produce budgets which balance, getting us back on track to fiscal sanity and a healthy economy.

ADDRESSING OUR UNEMPLOYMENT CRISIS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's now been 807 days since I arrived in Congress to address jobs, and the Republican leadership has still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis. More than 12 million American families do not have the luxury of waiting on this issue. They are devastated. There are five students in my

district who graduated from Harvard in 2011, and they're still looking for work. Think of the lost talent.

It's time for Congress to understand that unemployment is an urgent national crisis. It results in lost tax revenue, higher government expenditures, and unbearable levels of human suffering.

Mr. Speaker, our real deficit is unemployment. Let's eliminate this true deficit by bringing the President's American Jobs Act to the floor for a vote. It deserves a vote.

Mr. Speaker, our mantra should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

HONORING MARTIN MUMAW III

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exceptional Hoosier, dedicated public servant, and a good friend of mine, Martin Mumaw III—a man with a strong desire to help others and a man who has been a tremendous asset to the Eighth District of Indiana.

Martin has dedicated over 40 years of service to Indiana, the Eighth District, and Daviess County Republican Parties. He is currently serving his fourth term in elected office as Daviess County treasurer. He also has worked with many civic organizations and within the Republican Party as precinct committeeman, county chairman, and member of the Eighth District Central Committee.

His public service and civic engagement have been a means by which Martin has improved the lives of those around him. His dedication and service led former Indiana Governor Robert Orr to name him ''Sagamore of the Wabash'' in 1988, an award for distinguished public service.

While his public service has been tremendous, Martin is probably best known for his fellowship, kind heart, and sense of humility. He's never met an enemy and is the first to extend a helping hand.

I'm proud to stand here today to honor Martin's history of service, a history to which we all owe a debt of gratitude. God bless you, Martin Mumaw.

GOP BUDGET

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

Ms. CHU. Two thousand dollars; $2,000 is what you will lose if the Republican PAUL RYAN budget goes through.

What does $2,000 mean to you?

For a single mom, it could mean the difference between feeding her family or seeing her kids go hungry. For hard-working Americans, it could mean the car payment, or gas money, or prescription drug money that you need to pay each and every month. But to the GOP, $2,000 is the amount they are taxing middle-class families in their ''new budget,'' the PAUL RYAN budget.

But not everybody has to pay more. The truth is that in this budget, if you're an oil company or corporation taking jobs overseas or a yacht owner, you have nothing to fear with the GOP budget. Your lifestyle is totally secure.

Once again, working families will pay more so the rich can pay less. For the sake of middle class Americans, we must oppose the Ryan budget.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TOM GRIFFIN

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, next to me is a photo of Doolittle Raider Tom Griffin's memorial service I recently attended in Green Township, Ohio. Tom Griffin was an inspiration to everyone who had the honor to know him. I had the great pleasure to meet with and talk to Tom many times over the years. We shared the podium quite often at Memorial Day services, for example, and at veterans' events all over the community.

Tom was a man who literally lived history. In those darkest early days of World War II, when Tom and 79 other Doolittle Raiders took off from the deck of the USS *Hornet*, they had no idea whether they would survive the day.

The American people back then got a much-needed boost when they learned of the heroics that took place that day over Japan. But Tom cringed at the word ''hero.'' He felt that he was just doing what he'd been trained to do. And Tom Griffin went on to risk his life for his country for years following the Doolittle raid, culminating when he was shot down over Sicily and spent 22 months in a German POW camp.

Tom recently said, ''What a life I've lived.'' May we all strive to live a fraction of the life that Tom Griffin did. May God bless Tom Griffin.

□ 1210

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS REPORT CARD FOR AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the American Society of Civil Engineers report card is out for the quality of America's infrastructure, and the results are a national disgrace and an embarrassment. America gets a D grade for the quality of its infrastructure.

According to the World Economic Forum, we're 24th in infrastructure quality. In 2001, we were No. 2, and we also had a budgetary surplus.

There are 69,000 structurally-deficient bridges in this Nation. Every second of every day, seven cars drive on a bridge that is structurally deficient; but the Republican budget plan that will be voted on this week cuts infrastructure spending by 32 percent per capita over the next 10 years.

The United States Chamber of Commerce that represents the so-called job creators estimates that we will lose $336 billion in economic growth over the next 5 years.

China spends 9 percent of its economy on infrastructure; Europe, 5 percent; the United States less than 3 percent.

Moreover, you just spent $89 billion rebuilding the roads and bridges of Afghanistan, and $69 billion rebuilding the roads and bridges of Iraq, and you propose to cut infrastructure spending per capita by 32 percent.

This is a national disgrace and embarrassment.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAJOR TOM GRIFFIN

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, in 2008, at 92 years old, Major Tom Griffin stood up at a Veterans Day event in Cincinnati, and he told his story as one of the Doolittle's Raiders that attacked Tokyo after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor.

Managing to bail out after the attack and making his way to China, Tom returned to the U.S., deployed once again, this time to Europe, and was a POW for almost 2 years. Tom Griffin never said, why me; but, rather, why not me?

Growing up in the Depression, Tom Griffin learned to put service above himself. Over the years, I saw Tom tend to other veterans as they aged, and he was there for their final separation from service on Earth.

Tom Griffin has completed his Earthly mission. However, the positive effects of his work will never perish. But are we worth the sacrifice made by Tom Griffin and so many others?

Will history show that we treasured the gift of freedom that he handed us?

We all need to commit to ensure that Tom Griffin's efforts on behalf of freedom will not have been in vain. May he be able to look down at us and say, well done.

Tom Griffin, you led a good life. You were a good man and the greatest of Americans. Thank you, and God bless you, Tom Griffin.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to recognize the contributions that women have made to our society throughout history. As this month marks both Women's History Month and the American

Red Cross Month, I want to take this opportunity to celebrate the lasting contribution of one woman, the founder of the American Red Cross, Clara Barton.

Clara Barton was a true leader, a woman of poise and purpose. During the Civil War, Ms. Barton found common ground by helping everybody in the wake of disaster. She provided medical supplies to the injured, food assistance to the hungry, compassion for all.

Since its founding in 1881, the Red Cross has been a reliable lifeline for Americans and the citizens of our world. Clara Barton passed away in 1912 at the age of 90, but her legacy lives on. It should serve as a reminder to women and to men that the business of helping others is a business worthwhile.

To the women in my district and throughout the country, thank you for your confidence, thank you for your leadership, thank you for your compassion that has helped us move forward.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MARTY STUMBAUGH

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Marty Stumbaugh from Cabot, Arkansas.

A hero is someone who is admired for their courage, nobility, and service to others. Firefighters have long been admired for these traits, and Marty Stumbaugh was a shining example. His life's work was to serve his community as a firefighter. Marty did his job each day with a sense of responsibility and honor.

In addition to serving his community fighting fires, Marty was a former justice of the peace in Lonoke County and constable in York Township. Marty was president of the Cabot Professional Firefighters Association and a member of Mt. Carmel Baptist Church.

Family was the most important part of Marty's life. Marty loved his wife, Mindy, and their two children, Mason and Macy, more than life. Additionally, Marty had close relationships with his siblings: Netta, Karla, Robbin, Corky, Stubby, and Stewart.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and the entire community of Cabot, Arkansas, in honoring the life and service of Marty Stumbaugh.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

(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, on National Agriculture Day, we honor the hardworking efforts of America's farmers, farm workers and processors who provide our family with safe and affordable healthy foods.

As a third-generation San Joaquin Valley farmer, I'm proud to represent our agricultural way of life that drives our economy. More than half of the Nation's fruits and vegetables are grown in California. The San Joaquin Valley produces over $25 billion in gross value per year, which creates jobs and helps feed our Nation.

Each American farmer needs over 144 people, and they're doing it environmentally safer than ever before. It's more important than ever to remind people that our agricultural economy still touches every part of our lives.

Take a moment today to think about the hand that picked the tomato, or the dairyman, and thank them for that glass of milk. These are among the hardest working Americans that I know.

Let me, again, thank the farmers, the farm workers, and the food processors on National Agriculture Day for your hard work in putting the food that we eat on America's dinner tables.

SERIOUS BUDGETARY ISSUES FACING OUR NATION

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the serious budgetary issues facing our Nation. It seems many in this town have forgotten what a budget is, so I thought I'd provide a quick reminder.

Webster's Dictionary defines ''budget'' most simply as a plan for the coordination of resources and expenditures—a plan for the coordination of resources and expenditures. It's fairly straightforward, and something the American people understand. Frankly, it's something House Republicans understand.

Mr. Speaker, every year since I've been a Member of this body, we have passed a responsible budget. Once again this year, the House Republican budget reduces government spending and gets our debt crisis under control. This, in turn, helps secure the future for our children and grandchildren and creates more jobs and opportunities today.

Senate Democrats finally came to the table and introduced a budget. Unfortunately, it never balances, despite the fact that it raises taxes by $1.5 trillion.

We're still waiting on a budget from the President, though I suspect we'll see a March Madness bracket from him before we see a budget.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve a real budget, and I plan to continue fighting to ensure they receive one.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET IS NOT A PATH TO PROSPERITY

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, what's the message?

The message is that Congressman RYAN's budget is not a path to prosperity for our country.

Why? Because we lose with jobs. His 10-year budget destroys 2 million American jobs, according to the Economic Policy Institute.

We lose with families and children, because families and children who have income below $200,000 would have to face a tax increase averaging more than $3,000 a year.

We lose with seniors. According to the AARP, as they stated, the GOP budget will shift costs to seniors and end the Medicare guarantee. Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable health care coverage seniors have contributed to through a lifetime of hard work definitely is not the answer.

Mr. Speaker, the American path to prosperity is not for citizens to lose, as we do under the Ryan budget, but to move forward, as set forth in the Democratic alternatives.

□ 1220

CALL FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, a ''balanced approach'' should not be hardworking Americans give and government takes. This year, the Federal Government will collect a record $2.7 trillion. Federal spending will far surpass this. Continuing to increase revenue while Federal spending grows, with no end in sight, is not a balanced approach. The balanced approach that we should pursue is a budget that balances and a budget that protects the present and builds for the future.

We're presenting a budget that moves to that end and actually balances by slowing the rate of spending increases. This is a concept that the Washington elite will label as extreme. Yet this is a concept that American families call common sense, and something they do every week. American families have watched government grow and their budget shrink. That's not right.

Why is a budget that balances important for the American people? The answer is found in examples that we see now going on in Western Europe. Governments that overspend and, as a result, underperform hurt the people that they're designed to help the most. Our budget will prevent this type of financial crisis from happening in our country. It will keep the promises to our families and seniors and protect the future of the American Dream.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Later today, we're going to begin consideration of the Republican budget, a plan that not only voucherizes Medicare but retains $40 billion in subsidies to the oil industry and requires approval of the Keystone

XL pipeline. At a time when climate change is affecting more and more people throughout the country, the majority is committed to keeping our economy dependent on fossil fuels and ignoring the serious challenge that it represents. The $75 billion in damages from Superstorm Sandy, the ongoing drought in much of the West, including my home State of Arizona, don't seem to be enough evidence that it's time for serious action.

Climate change is global. A United Nations report indicates that because of climate change, 3.1 billion people will be in extreme poverty by 2050. If we want to make a sizable dent in the human contributions to climate change, we have to start making those responsible for pollution accountable and pay for it. This is the sort of leadership the American people are looking for from Congress. Climate change is real. It is not a problem that will go away. We cannot ignore it. We have to face it head on and not bury our heads in Canadian tar sands.

A BALANCED BUDGET IS GOOD FOR THE COUNTRY AND ITS PEOPLE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as I visited 100 businesses in 100 days last summer, the families who operate and work in those businesses were frustrated with Washington's inability to live within its means. The Federal Government's overspending is hurting their ability to grow. Why? Because small business owners know that there's no such thing as a free lunch. They know that the Federal Government's overspending will come back to us in the form of higher taxes and unfunded entitlements and a weaker economy.

House Republican plans reduce government spending and enact much-needed reforms. Perhaps most importantly, they balance the budget within 10 years.

According to a recent op ed in The Wall Street Journal:

> The spending restraint and balanced-budget parts of the House Budget Committee plan would boost the economy immediately.

It is time Washington starts being part of the solution. A balanced budget is good for the country and good for its people.

IN MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS AT HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT

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

Mr. HORSFORD. I come to the floor with a heavy heart today. I am deeply saddened by the loss of life as the result of an explosion during a live-fire training exercise at Hawthorne Army Depot last night, which is located in the northwest part of Nevada's Fourth Congressional District.

I had the honor and privilege of visiting the depot in January and meeting with the fine men and women who work there. The families of those affected are in my thoughts and prayers, and I hope for the recovery of those who are in critical condition and who are receiving medical care as I speak. The losses we have learned about this morning are painful. We have lost seven marines. Others are wounded. My office is in contact with the Governor of Nevada, local officials, and military command to receive updates on the situation.

My thoughts and prayers are with the community of Hawthorne. I will be leaving as soon as possible to return to Nevada to be with our grieving community and servicemembers. I ask for this body's prayers and thoughts for our men and women in service.

OBAMACARE AND JOBS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Health Subcommittee investigated how the new health care law, ObamaCare, is impacting job growth and worker opportunities across the country. The results are not good. The recovery continues to be well below what we need to keep up with workers entering the marketplace. Youth unemployment remains very high, and ObamaCare is showering employers with new red tape.

In our hearing, restaurant group owner Tom Boucher from New Hampshire testified about his struggles. So far, he has spent more than 100 hours with human resources staff trying to prepare for the law. The anticipated economic burden has delayed his plans to open a new restaurant. These are good jobs that could have been created.

ObamaCare is perversely discouraging companies from hiring full-time workers. Many job seekers find that they can only find part-time work right now. We need a dynamic economy creating good private sector jobs. Instead, ObamaCare is forcing employers to spend more time worrying about taxes and accounting and hiring part-time employees. That's not the reform our ailing economy needs.

FUNDING THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

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

Mr. COHEN. People sometimes ask why we can't find common ground. There's an area we should be able to find common ground on—and we don't—and that's funding for the National Institutes of Health, which is going to be cut in the sequester by close to a billion dollars. There was an amendment in the Senate that tried to put funding back in the continuing resolution for NIH, and it failed on a party-line vote, with 54 Democrats and Independents voting ''yes'' and 46 Republicans voting ''no.''

Republicans say the reason they want to cut spending and voted the sequestration in is we're putting a debt on the next generation. Let me submit, Mr. Speaker, that the research that's done at the National Institutes of Health to find cures for cancer, heart disease, diabetes, Alzheimer's, AIDS, and post-polio cures and treatments will affect the next generation more than this generation.

We talk about the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense should be the National Institutes of Health, because the enemy is disease, and we need to conquer it and keep our loved ones alive and keep ourselves alive and have better cures.

We talk about infrastructure—and I support that—but the most important infrastructure is the infrastructure of the human body. And that's what the National Institutes of Health works on. We should work together and fund the National Institutes of Health for all of our constituents.

COMMENDING MISS TEEN MONTANA, ABBI HELLAND

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Abbi Helland, a remarkable young woman from Glasgow, Montana, who was recently named Miss Teen Montana International. Abbi is the daughter of Pete and Allison Helland and the granddaughter of Montana's former Congressman, Ron Marlenee, and his wife Cindy.

Abbi is passionate about reading and making sure that Montanans of all ages have access to books. She'll be working with our State's schools, libraries, and book stores to promote reading education and to support the ''I Love to Read Week'' in Montana communities. She also will work to install programs to send books overseas and to expand access to books for Montana's seniors.

Abbi is a true example of the spirit and drive that we value in my home State of Montana. She'll represent our State well as our ambassador to the Miss Teen International competition in Chicago this July.

Congratulations, Abbi. We're proud of you.

VOTE AGAINST THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, every budget should be viewed through the lens of the American people. The hard-working Floridians I represent want to

know: Does the Ryan budget put Americans back to work or back on unemployment? The moms and dads I represent want to know: Does the Ryan budget invest in our children or does it ignore our outdated public schools? The small business owners I represent want to know: Does the Republican budget fix our rigged Tax Code or does it protect special interest loopholes? The retirees I represent want to know: Does this budget protect Medicare or does it abandon seniors in the face of skyrocketing health care costs?

The answer is: no. No, the Ryan budget will not put people back to work. No, it doesn't invest in our schools. No, it does not end special interest giveaways. No, it does not protect Medicare.

The Ryan Republican budget does not stand by our communities, and it doesn't invest in our future. That's why I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Republican budget.

□ 1230

A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we teach the importance of a balanced budget to our schoolchildren, such as those we had today, but apparently this basic financial principle is not good enough for our President, who says he won't even chase a balanced budget for the sake of balance.

Mr. Speaker, to help the President find a better reason, I would suggest we examine the economic damage caused by runaway public debt. In 2011, Greece, Italy, and Portugal each amassed public debt greater than 90 percent of their economic output. For Greece, the debt was a stunning 165 percent of their gross domestic product. All three countries are now undergoing wrenching austerity and suffering through prolonged recessions and unemployment.

What would this scenario look like for hardworking American families? The burden of unsustainable public debt and increased taxes would lead to higher interest rates on mortgages, car loans, and other credit. Ignoring this problem would bring on higher inflation, reducing the purchasing power of American families and inflicting the most pain on the poor and middle class.

Mr. Speaker, we must support our families. We must support a balanced budget.

RYAN BUDGET ATTACK ON NEVADA SOLAR PROJECT

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget that's being debated this week and, in particular, to the unfair and inaccurate attack on a clean energy company that's located in my home State of Nevada. The Republican proposal refers to the Solar Reserve project as ''an ill-fated venture.''

Had he done his homework, Budget Committee Chairman RYAN would have discovered that this cutting-edge solar project is not ill-fated but, instead, has a long-term contract with our State's largest utility. It has created 450 good-paying jobs for Nevadans and is running on schedule and under budget.

The assertions being made in the Republican budget undermine the success of renewable energy programs, the jobs they create, and the investment they represent in our Nation's future energy needs.

In Las Vegas and across the country, Americans have made it clear that our budget should be a path forward for a strong middle class and a serious investment in the next generation of Americans.

Let's reject these mathematical gimmicks and unsubstantiated attacks and get to work on a real budget.

TRUST ACT

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share something that has been at my heart and will, in the coming days, be at the heart of my first bill introduced in the House. When Members of Congress break the law, they break trust: they break trust with their colleagues, hurting our ability to work together; they break trust with the American people who sent them here; and they break trust with the Constitution they swore to uphold.

I will be introducing the Trust Act. This bill is simple. It does not distinguish between types of offenses or the possible reasons behind them. It makes clear that a Member of Congress convicted of any felony will forfeit the taxpayer-funded portion of their pension.

If our servicemen and -women who lay their life on the line for our Nation lose their pension with a dishonorable discharge, should not Members of Congress be held to the same standard?

These days with public opinion of Congress at record lows and public debt at record highs, the Trust Act is a place to start in restoring the faith of the American people to their government. I am pleased to present this opportunity to my colleagues to restore trust to taxpayers, and I ask them to join me in this effort.

WASTE IN IRAQ

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service and sacrifice of the nearly 5,000 coalition troops, including 28 of my brothers and sisters from Hawaii, soldiers like First Lieutenant Nainoa Hoe of Kailua or Sergeant Deyson Cariaga from Honolulu, whom I had the honor of serving with, who paid the ultimate price during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Today marks the 10th anniversary of the American invasion of Iraq. And while this war has largely faded from the headlines, we must take every opportunity to learn from our experiences. There are many lessons we should learn, one of the most egregious being the serious waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars, waste that was apparent to those of us on the ground as well as to outside experts. An alarming report this month by the special inspector general for Iraqi reconstruction also determined at least $8 billion of our reconstruction funds have been wasted.

In Congress today, we have an opportunity to learn from that lesson. We have to pursue commonsense ways to balance our budget without hurting our middle class families, endangering our national security, or shortchanging our veterans. We must focus on our mission to serve the people who sent us here and honor our servicemembers and their families who have made immeasurable sacrifices in the service of our country.

BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I remember when $1.4 trillion was a lot of money. 1.4 trillion dollars is the amount of money the Federal budget increases under the House Republican budget proposal—an average of $140 billion a year, 40 percent over the decade. But listening to my House Democratic colleagues, you would believe our budget cuts spending to the bone. You would believe that our Federal Government can't survive on a penny less than a $2.1 trillion increase.

Admittedly, that $700 billion is a lot of money. It's 50 percent more than requested under the House Republican budget proposal. But it is important to remember that every penny of that $700 billion is borrowed from the future of the young people growing up in this great country today.

Mr. Speaker, families all across America balance their budget. The Federal Government should balance its budget, too.

FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, around the country this time of year, it is known as March Madness as the NCAA

basketball tournament is about to begin. But it is March madness in Washington as well, as the debate starts today over what kind of country we are going to leave to our children and grandchildren.

Later this afternoon, the House begins this conversation in earnest with a debate over the Federal budget. For the third year in a row, House Republicans will offer a budget that will balance, and this time we are putting forward a plan that will do so in 10 years. We do this by making careful cuts in spending and without raising your taxes.

Unfortunately, the President hasn't submitted his budget yet; although he was required by law to do so on February 4. And the proposed Senate budget raises taxes by $1.5 trillion without ever balancing.

Mr. Speaker, the pathway to getting our country back on track begins today. Let's remember America's children and grandchildren as we engage in this important debate.

FORT HOOD

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, 3½ years ago, our Nation was viciously attacked when an Islamic extremist opened fire on our troops at Fort Hood. We lost 14 innocent Americans that day, 12 military servicemembers, one civilian, and an unborn child.

Since the attack, the Ford Hood community has seen and felt an outpouring of support from across the State of Texas and the Nation, but not from the Federal Government. Currently, the troops killed and wounded in this horrible attack are denied the treatment, benefits, and honors granted to soldiers who are attacked overseas in a declared combat zone. The Pentagon deems this attack ''workplace violence'' rather than ''combat violence.''

This is shameful, and Americans should be outraged by the administration's refusal to acknowledge this wrong. Our troops were attacked on U.S. soil in a blatant terrorist attack, and we owe it to these patriots and all who wear the uniform to provide for them. They willingly and admirably put their lives on the line every day to protect our freedom.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 705, the Fort Hood Victims and Families Benefits Protection Act, and start providing the needed assistance for the victims and families of this terrible tragedy. Our troops deserve better.

May God bless all who serve.

□ 1240

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 25, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 115, PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 113TH CONGRESS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 122 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 122

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Brady of Texas and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from March 22, 2013, through April 8, 2013—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved;

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment; and

(c) bills and resolutions introduced during the period addressed by this section shall be numbered, listed in the Congressional Record, and when printed shall bear the date of introduction, but may be referred by the Speaker at a later time.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, that was a mouthful as the Clerk was reading through this resolution, and it was an exciting mouthful. I'm not sure that folks actually were able to get from just the prose the excitement that is in this rule today.

What this rule provides for is two very important things. I'm going to take them in order of my personal passion, but they're both equally important. Number one, this rule provides that every single Member of this House—not just Republicans, not just Democrats, not just folks who are favored, not any particular category—but every single Member of this House who represents a constituency back home had an opportunity to submit their own budget for the United States of America.

So often, the problem in this town is not enough good ideas, Mr. Speaker.

We don't have that problem today because every Member of the House that chose to submit a budget is going to have their budget considered and debated on the floor of this House if we pass this rule today.

Now, that is only five budgets, Mr. Speaker, five plus the Budget Committee's mark, because it's not easy to put together a budget. A lot of folks talk a good game about what they would do if they were king for a day; but when you try to craft your own budget, you've got to put, literally, money where your mouth and ideas are.

In this rule, we make in order a Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget, a Progressive Caucus substitute budget, and a substitute budget by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). We make in order a budget introduced by Mr. MULVANEY from South Carolina that tries to capture the essence of what the Senate is working on right now, and we make in order a budget produced by the Republican Study Committee. All of those exist as an alternative to the budget that was produced by the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure of sitting on the Budget Committee. What you see here in my hand is the Budget Committee report. We produced this on March 15. It's bound and it's published. They did a very nice job. It's been proofread, and the minority has had a chance to add their views. That was March 15 that we produced this budget.

But as we sit here today with March quickly leaving us, what we do not have yet is a budget from the United States President. I only point that out, Mr. Speaker, to say I understand that it's hard to produce a budget. I know because I produced one in this cycle. I had the great pleasure of working with a team that produced the Republican Study Committee budget and produced the House budget. So in a time period where the President has failed to follow the legally required mandate of introducing a budget by the first week of February, I've had the great pleasure of producing two budgets.

My friends on the Progressive Caucus have produced a budget. My friends on the Congressional Black Caucus have produced a budget. My friend, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, has produced a budget. And I think it is fair when we ask in this debate why we have been denied a chance to look at the President's budget. We didn't see it in February. We didn't see it in March. Word has it now we might see it in April.

It's hard work to produce a budget, but it's important work. In fact, it's legally required work. I take great pride not just that the House will meet its statutory deadline, but that we're meeting it in this very open and honest forum as this rule proposes.

But the second thing this rule does, Mr. Speaker, is it provides for consideration of the committee funding resolution. This Congress doesn't have a penny to spend except for pennies that we take from the American taxpayer. That's the only place any revenue comes into this United States Government. Part of that revenue goes to fund this very institution.

Thrift begins at home, Mr. Speaker. Before you and I arrived in this body, Mr. Speaker, the committee process here in this House was authorized to spend $300 million a year. Now, the committees do amazing work. It's important work to produce reports like this Budget Committee report, and they do the oversight on the executive branch. I don't for a minute suggest that the work that the committee structure does isn't critical to the functioning of our Republic. But every single account in the United States Government has to be looked at, examined, critiqued, and reformed if we are to get our fiscal books back in order.

The very first committee funding resolution you and I had a chance to vote on, Mr. Speaker, we reduced that committee funding from $300 million back in the 111th Congress down to around $260 in the 112th.

□ 1250

Here we come down again to $240 million in this resolution. In the 26 now short months that you and I have served in Congress, Mr. Speaker, this body has examined its own books and reduced its spending by 20 percent on committees. That is not an easy task. That's not a task that came lightly. That's a task that has taken tremendous effort by both the majority and the minority.

But my question is, Mr. Speaker, if we can do it, as the American people expect us to do, what could the executive branch do? If we in the people's House can take 20 percent out because our constituents have demanded that we view every single dollar with an eye toward thrift, what could the executive branch do if only they would partner with us as we begin the leadership right here in this body?

None of the easy decisions are left, Mr. Speaker. The only decisions left to be decided in this budget, to be decided in this rule, are the hard decisions. We have provided in this rule the opportunity to consider every alternative that Members have proposed to decide these solutions, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Through numerous budget resolutions and campaign pledges and appearances on Sunday talk shows, the majority has made clear that their vision for America is a vision that says the Nation can no longer care for our seniors, that we must halt vital scientific research and that we should let our bridges and schools crumble because we can't afford to invest in the future.

In short, I believe that it is an extreme and cynical version for America and one that I strongly reject.

For more than a decade, the needs of our country were neglected while the majority led two unfunded wars and gave unaffordable tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires, and we now have the cost for the last war in Iraq of $3 trillion borrowed. In all the discussions on the deficit and what bad shape we are in, nobody ever talks about that war and how that has kept us from rebuilding the infrastructure in the United States that cries out for it.

These two decisions unraveled the balanced budget achieved by President Clinton and exploded our Nation's debt. Now after a decade of reckless financial management, the majority is proposing another budget that is as unserious as it is extreme.

Take, for example, the field of scientific research. More than 50 percent of our economic growth since World War II can be attributed to the development and adoption of new technologies, yet the budget proposes drastic cuts to research at the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, among others.

As any scientist will tell you—and I am one—you cannot turn research on and off like a faucet. Across the Federal Government, researchers are on the brink of discoveries that could cure diseases or open entire new fields of commerce. But under the majority's budget, that valuable research will be ended and these important discoveries will probably not be made in the United States.

The majority wants to impose such cuts on top of cuts contained in the sequester, even though the effects of the sequester are just beginning to be felt. For example, in the coming weeks, airport control towers will begin to close, affecting flight schedules and stranding travelers. Many of these towers are located in the rural parts of our country where there are no other alternatives for long-distance travel.

In addition, border patrol agents will be furloughed, which not only affects security but the success of our economy. According to the Congressional Research Service, more than $1.3 billion a day in trade crosses the U.S.-Canada border. This trade is dependent upon the effective operation of our border security agents. The effects of the sequester are already impacting trade by causing backups at the border and leaving goods and supplies stranded en route to their destination.

Furthermore, it is often forgotten that 5 years after I–35 collapsed above the Mississippi River, we have still failed to repair our crumbling infrastructure.

Earlier today, the American Society of Civil Engineers released a 2013 report card for America's infrastructure. They found that one in eight bridges in my home State of New York is structurally deficient and one in nine

bridges across the United States is the same. A very prominent engineer stated just this past week that there are bridges in major cities in areas of the United States which he would not cross for fear of falling into the water. At the same time, more and more engineers and transportation experts are warning that our bridges will soon be too unsafe to cross unless we act.

These bridges aren't alone. Everything from schools to airports to train stations and highways are literally crumbling before our eyes.

Water systems in many of the major cities in parts of the United States are almost a century old and almost unusable.

Think, Mr. Speaker, for a moment, think of the jobs that would be created, as badly as we need them to put people back to work, if we could not decide to starve again our country's needs and instead start to rebuild the needs and put people back to work.

I think it's inexcusable that instead of responding to the crisis that we have, the majority spent the last 2 years lurching from crisis to crisis and repeatedly introducing legislation such as today's budget legislation that guts investment in the Nation's infrastructure instead of putting us back to work rebuilding the country.

A telling illustration of the failed approach is that they have included the repeal of the Affordable Care Act as the central tenet of their budget proposal. During the 112th Congress, the majority held more than 30 votes in the last 2 years just to repeal the Affordable Care Act, eating up valuable time and costing taxpayers millions of dollars in the process. Despite this expensive folly, the majority wants to do it again. In order to balance the budget, the majority believes we should repeal the lifesaving law and once again legalize health insurance discrimination based upon preexisting conditions, force young adults off their parents' health insurance and open the doughnut hole for our Nation's seniors.

Mr. Speaker, before we were able to pass the health care bill, eight States and the District of Columbia in the United States considered domestic violence to be a preexisting condition and insurance companies were not required to cover victims. Are we going to go back to that if this repeal is achieved?

The majority also wants to cut financial assistance to students in need. The budget cuts Pell Grant assistance by $83 billion over the next 10 years and allows the interest rates on need-based student loans to double. In a time when we are falling so far behind all other industrial countries in the number of persons who go to college, the United States that used to be first now is about 12th.

By all objective measures, drastic and extreme cuts such as these can be seen as unnecessary cruelty not needed to balance the budget. Indeed, just this past weekend both Speaker BOEHNER and Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN said on Sunday television shows that this Nation does not face a debt crisis. When asked about it yesterday, Chairman RYAN indicated that, yes, he had said that.

So despite saying that to everybody, scaring America half to death, keeping businesses from being able to plan the future, they continue to promote a dystopian vision of the future in order to convince Americans that we have to adopt their extreme policies today. It is under this guise that the majority proposes their most extreme transformation of America's social safety net in today's budget.

Once again this year, the majority proposes to end Medicare as we know it and turn the promise of guaranteed health care into a voucher program. Unlike Medicare, the majority voucher program would not guarantee seniors access to the health care they need. I think we thoroughly discussed that last year when it failed and certainly during the last election when it failed. This would drive senior citizens into the market with a defined income that they could use to buy their own insurance if they were physically or mentally able to do so.

This is the same failed proposal, and it has been opposed by Americans, as I said, at the ballot box. But we continue today to defy the wishes of the American people with a quest to end Medicare as we know it, and it should be a telling reminder of where priorities lie.

These extreme cuts stand in sharp contrast to the tax reform contained within their budget. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, in order to enact the majority's tax reform and to not increase the deficit, middle class families would have to pay $3,000 more a year and the wealthiest Americans receive a $245,000 tax break.

□ 1300

Once again, the majority has shown they would rather take away vital programs from our Nation's most vulnerable than raise a single dollar in taxes on America's wealthiest citizens.

Mr. Speaker, such a budget is neither original nor serious, nor is it acceptable to the American people. We've been down this road before, and it is discouraging and dangerous that the majority insists that we go down it yet once again. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the majority's budget proposal and today's rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to refer the gentlelady to the House Budget Committee report.

If she were to read just the first few pages, she would see that spending increases under this budget by $500 billion in the next 5 years and by $1.5 trillion over the next 10. I promised myself I would count how many times we heard the words ''extreme cuts'' applied to what is a half-trillion dollars in new and additional spending, but I confess I've lost track already today.

With that, I would like to yield 5 minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman of the Rules Committee, a man who crafted this rule that has allowed all ideas on the budget to be considered today. He would be the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, who sits on the Rules Committee and who also sits on the Budget Committee and is doing an awesome job on behalf of this body and the people of Georgia.

Today, the American people have a chance, really, to see firsthand the rolling out of what we call the Ryan budget. PAUL RYAN, who is the chairman of our Budget Committee, once again leads, I believe, the intellectual thought process on talking about the future that we should have in this country. Certainly, the budget is that primer—that guiding post, that opportunity for us to lay out a philosophy about what Republicans stand for. Today, the American people are having a chance to hear from our colleagues, the Democrats.

Of course, as you listen to our colleagues—our friends, the Democrats—talk, everything about a budget, if you're a Republican, is about harming the middle class, is about ruining the country, is about our heading in the wrong direction. That is because they've taken the simple approach. They will try and fund everything: they will try and fund hospitals; they will fund airports; they will fund schools. They will do all of these amazing things, but the facts of the case are that that process and that future do not work.

Yesterday, PAUL RYAN, before the Rules Committee, very carefully argued the point that really is embodied on this slide, which talks about a responsible way forward for this country, because, you see, we have the authority and the responsibility to make sure that what we do sustains our future: that it's something that creates not only more jobs but opportunities for the future of not just ourselves but of our children and our grandchildren.

For 4 years, this House was led by Democrats, and you can see the laws that they passed and the amazing amount of spending that it would place upon our country. We don't even show in here individually where Social Security is as that will go bankrupt—Medicare, bankrupt; Medicaid, insolvent; our inability to be able to pay for our future by creating jobs today.

The free enterprise system is exactly what Republicans support and believe in because that is the American Dream—not government spending and government jobs but, rather, a vibrant free enterprise system whereby there are employers who want to hire people to become employees, to have careers, to then make this country better and stronger. The way you do that is by lowering government spending, by having a public-private partnership, not by having the Federal Government be responsible for everything from a one-

size-fits-all health care industry to the government control of every part of our lives.

So, yesterday, PAUL RYAN—very effectively, I believe—came before the House Rules Committee and talked about a vision forward. What's very interesting is that everybody else talked about let's just stick it to the rich. Let's raise taxes trillions of dollars. Let's go and stick it to special interests, like people who provide gasoline at the pump, and raise taxes on oil companies. Well, ladies and gentlemen, every time you raise taxes, you raise prices, and every time you raise prices, the consumer has to pay more for it. These are the ideas that make America less able to be prepared for its future and that cost more money.

That's why, when you look at this slide, you see where the laws already enacted by the Democrats are leading America to where we will be functionally bankrupt. We are following the European model—exactly what they have done over there for a number of years—and now we are seeing firsthand Iceland, Greece and, just yesterday, Cyprus. This is the pathway down which our friends, the Democrats, if they get their say, will lead us.

Republicans, through PAUL RYAN, spoke about we want to make sure that Medicare, that Social Security, that the free enterprise system are alive and well by making these plans and the process therein ready for the employers and the workers of tomorrow. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about reforms that will ensure the things that the American people want and need—and, yes, even at the National Institutes of Health so that they will be prepared for our future.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we're talking about today. I can't wait until PAUL RYAN and the Republicans engage Democrats on the floor with facts and figures. This is a primer to what we'll see.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to a member of the committee on the budget, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her continued tremendous leadership on the Rules Committee.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule; and I think the previous speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee, really laid out why I'm totally opposed to this rule and the bill.

As a member of the Budget Committee, let me just say that I've had a chance to study this GOP budget, which is full of choices that would undermine our Nation's future for the continued benefit of special interests, the wealthy and, yes, big oil companies—oil subsidies. It creates more income inequality, and it shreds the safety net. It is in keeping with the overall effort we've seen over and over again to dismantle government, increase inequality and leave the most vulnerable people on their own.

We should reject this very warped vision of America, and we should call this budget for what it is. Republicans call it a Path to Prosperity, but it really is a path to poverty for the middle class, for working families, for children, and for our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, the majority did not support the amendment that I offered in the Budget Committee that would set a goal of cutting poverty in half in 10 years, which listed and reaffirmed those government-supported programs, such as the earned income tax credit, which lifts people out of poverty even though we tried to come to some agreement on language; but, quite frankly, if they supported that goal, they would have accepted my amendment, and their budget would have made some radically different choices.

The reality is we hear the rhetoric that claims to support a goal of ending poverty while at the same time making devastating cuts that put more people into poverty. The fact of the matter is you cannot pretend to fight poverty while you make brutal cuts to the very programs that lift millions of Americans out of poverty.

The Republican budget would make devastating cuts that will increase child hunger, cut off millions of seniors from access to health care, and throw struggling families off TANF during the middle of a jobs crisis. Blocking Medicaid, turning Medicare into a voucher program, and gutting food assistance to our children and our seniors will not reduce poverty. It will just make it worse.

When you look at this Republican budget, for example, it takes 66 percent of the budget cuts from programs for people with low or moderate incomes. It would cost 2 million jobs in 2014, and it would slash $135 billion over 10 years by cutting 8 million to 9 million people from the SNAP program—our nutrition program, our food stamps program—which is one of the most effective antipoverty programs in the United States.

The American people deserve more. They deserve a budget that creates jobs, a budget that creates opportunity for all, not a budget that creates more poverty. So I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule and to vote ''no'' on this budget because it is a pathway to poverty.

□ 1310

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. If I can just ask my colleague from California before she leaves, and I have the great pleasure of serving with her on the Budget Committee, and I would certainly disagree with most of her characterizations about the work product there, and look forward to dispelling those tomorrow, but today with this rule, I heard you encourage our colleagues to reject this rule. This is, of course, a rule that has made every single idea of every single Member who had a budget plan in order. Does that not satisfy the gentlelady's need for a full and open debate on our budget priorities?

Ms. LEE of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'm happy to yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE of California. I don't think I mentioned a full and open debate. What I wanted to talk about was the rule that allows for the presentation of this budget and listed all of the support programs that really keep people out of poverty. And also the fact that yes, we tried, as you know, in the committee to put together an amendment that would actually do that on a bipartisan way. But you can't ignore the fact that we need SNAP. We need food assistance for children and women. We need all of those programs.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I would not ignore those at all. I believe we have made priorities of those in this budget. I look forward to debating that tomorrow.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), another one of my colleagues on the Budget Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I have the privilege, as Mr. WOODALL mentioned, of serving with him on the Budget Committee and serving with him on the Rules Committee, and being a fellow member of the Republican Study Committee with him. And I want to thank him for all he's done, quite frankly, to fashion both the Ryan budget and the RSC budget, and to bring us such an excellent rule today.

Writing a budget in the end is always about making choices. And, fortunately, this rule provides this House with multiple choices, a variety of options, and a great deal of time for debate. We'll have an opportunity to debate the budget offered by our friends in the Congressional Black Caucus. We're going to have an opportunity to debate the Progressive Caucus's budget, the Republican Study Committee's budget, and what we think will be the Senate budget—or at least as close to it as we can determine at this time. Obviously our friends on the other side of the aisle will present their substitute budget, and we'll have the underlying budget, the so-called Ryan budget, the Republican budget. So I think those are a lot of choices that this body will have to work through in the next couple of days. I'm proud that this rule allows that degree of choice and facilitates debate.

Personally, I support both the Republican Study Committee budget, and should it fail to achieve majority, the underlying Ryan budget. Both of them make tough choices. First and foremost to me, they both come into balance. Now our Republican Study Committee budget, which my friend Mr. WOODALL had more to do with than any other Member in crafting, comes in a little faster. I actually think that's a good thing. But the Ryan budget also comes into balance within 10 years. That's important not just for the sake of bookkeeping; it's important because

we all know that private sector growth depends on the confidence that taxes aren't going to continually go up, and that the public sector will remain in check.

I think by giving that kind of assurance, both of those budgets facilitate what I know all of us want, and that's the creation of more and better jobs for the American people. After all, if budgets that never balanced and record deficits got job creation, we would be coming off the four best years in modern American history because we've had four $1 trillion deficits in a row, another that will ''only be'' $850 billion this year. That has yielded us less than 2 percent growth a year. We all know if we took the number of Americans that have left the workforce and recalculated our unemployment rate, it wouldn't be 7.8 percent; it would be about 10.5 percent.

So the path that my friends on the other side recommend doesn't work, and the balance in both the RSC budget and the Ryan budget are a much more promising course. And they achieve that balance while not raising taxes. I think that's very important, too. We certainly aren't undertaxed in this country. Now my friends on the other side clearly believe that we are. They are going to offer multiple tax increases in all their budgets. I like a budget that does not require tax increases.

Finally, both these budgets, the Republican Study Committee budget and the Republican budget, come to grips with the reality that we have to reform entitlements. Now we have our preferred way of doing that, but there could be others. Unfortunately, our friends on the other side are largely silent about that important choice.

As my friend, Mr. WOODALL, mentioned in his remarks, the Ryan budget in particular is hardly a radical budget. It's going to increase spending every single year over a 10-year window by about 3.5 percent. The main Democratic alternative is at about 5 percent. Can't we live at 3.5 percent and have a balanced budget in 10 years as opposed to going to 5 with higher taxes and not balance the budget within that 10-year window?

Again, I'm proud of my Democratic colleagues for joining in the debate. I appreciate the fact that they're going to put multiple budgets on the floor. I wish the President's budget was available. I'm going to assume some day it will be. It should've been here months ago, quite frankly. But sooner or later he will get it into debate.

In my view, all of the Democratic budgets are unacceptable for three very simple reasons: each and every one of them calls for much bigger government, much bigger than we've had historically, and all of them call for higher taxes. And frankly, most of them never, ever, ever balance at all—not in 10 years, not in 20, not in 30. So effectively, our friends are offering more expensive government, bigger government, and an eternal and ever-expanding debt. I don't think that's a choice that the American people want to make.

I want to urge support of this generally excellent rule. It provides every Member of this House an opportunity to participate in this important debate. I want to urge passage of the Republican Study Committee budget, and failing that, the underlying Ryan or Republican budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for yielding me this time and rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill that essentially is the Ryan budget.

I want to say to the prior speaker that the way you balance budgets is to put people back to work. This budget, the Ryan budget, will actually cause 750,000 more people to be added to the ranks of the unemployed. When you have 12 million people in our country who've been out of work for a long time or they can't find a decent-paying job, you can't balance budgets with that level of unemployment. This is an anti-growth budget.

I want to focus my remarks, however, mainly on senior citizens and the impact of this budget on seniors. The Ryan budget turns a very cold heart to America's senior citizens. It ends the Medicare guarantee. It throws nearly 50 million Americans receiving earned health care benefits through Medicare to the cruel marketplace and rising health care prices. And it takes away the 10-year guarantee of Medicare's solvency that we passed in the Affordable Care Act. Forty-one million Americans over the age of 65 will be affected, as will 9 million disabled Americans receiving Social Security benefits. That's evidence of a cold heart.

Now the poorest citizens in America are senior women over the age of 80 years. Over half of Medicare's beneficiaries earn annual incomes of less than $23,000. The Republican Ryan budget doesn't even see them.

The Ryan budget hurts the poorest seniors by putting senior farmer's market nutrition coupons, for example, on the chopping block. To qualify for $50 to buy fresh fruits and vegetables, a senior has to earn less than $15,000 a year. Now, under that budget, 863,000 more seniors will be cut off of a fragile lifeline of coupons for better nutrition. Fifty dollars.

The Ryan budget already cut a million meals for fragile seniors across this country. Now, the Ryan budget piles more harm on them.

Meanwhile, Wall Street titans, who took our Nation to the brink, have earned record bonuses, millions and millions and millions of dollars. So it's $50 for seniors, or multibillions for those who have so much already. That's not even on the scale of justice.

The Ryan budget will cause more illness among our seniors. Seniors will be forced to pay thousands of dollars for medicines they can't afford. It will eliminate free preventive screenings for seniors for cancer and diabetes. So America will yield more illness. The Ryan budget will eliminate free annual checkups for seniors who can't afford to pay for a checkup, and it'll stop free mammograms and prostate screenings for them. It's a cold-hearted budget for seniors.

□ 1320

The Ryan budget will hurt them. It is bad for Medicare. It is bad for seniors. It's bad for our country.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman another minute.

Ms. KAPTUR. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this rule and the underlying budget. Stand up for America's seniors. You know, if you go to any food bank in this country, senior citizens are coming in at an increasing rate of 37 percent. Just look at the lines.

I ask every one of my Republican colleagues this weekend, when you go home, go to your food banks. Look who's in line. Ask yourself what you're going to do to fix the budget for our senior citizens across this country.

Stand up against the coldhearted Republican budget. It's really the forces of darkness at work in here. Open your eyes to what is happening across this country. Vote against this rule and vote against the underlying budget.

Stand up for the seniors of America. In every family in this country, they've earned the right to have a worry-free existence. This budget hurts them.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Ryan budget and vote against this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to speak to accusations of forces of darkness. I've found in my time that light is one of those great illuminators. How convenient in that route.

And I would just refer folks to the budget that's posted online. It's budget.house.gov.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the budget report is there that goes through line item by line item by line item and increases spending, not by the 5 percent that current law would do it, that current law that is sending our children and our grandchildren to bankruptcy, but increases spending by 3.5 percent instead. And within that, the gentlelady from Ohio, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely right. We've got to make priority choices about where it is we want our dollars to go.

But I would say to the gentlelady—and I know her heart is pure as she talks about the investment and where she wants to make it in this country—tell me what it is that you and I are willing to pay for today, and let's make that investment.

You know, I think about Hurricane Sandy, for example, all those families in need that we wanted to help; and, you know, we didn't raise a single penny here to do it. We asked our children and our grandchildren to pay for every nickel.

I don't need encouragement to visit those food banks. I've been there already, and I know exactly what the gentlelady's talking about.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman be kind enough to yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I'd be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, then you've seen them in the line. You've seen the senior women in the line in all these food banks, a third of an increase, sir.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, indeed I have. I've seen our neighbors there filling those needs as well.

Again, it is so frustrating to me, Mr. Speaker, in this body, we do not argue about who are the poorest and the neediest among us. We know with certainty who those folks are. What we argue about is whether it's your and my obligation to feed and clothe those folks, or whether we should pass that obligation along to our children and our grandchildren.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, it is immoral. It is immoral for us to ask our children and our grandchildren to pay bills for charity that you and I are not willing to do ourselves today.

I'm so pleased that this rule has made every idea available on the floor of the House for a vote today, but we must choose to do it ourselves. The time for passing the bill to our children and grandchildren is long gone.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I'm pleased to yield another minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

I would say to the gentleman, what you said was very, very important, because we do have choices in a budget. And you know, sir, at the food banks around this country, there isn't enough food being provided. They're absolutely at the edge. There isn't enough to go around. That's where the Government of the United States has to come in.

We can't ask our seniors to have any less meals. We can't ask our seniors to take any other nutrition cuts. There simply isn't any slack there.

Now, maybe you live in a community that's more affluent, I'm not sure. I represent three of the lowest income communities, urban areas in this country, and I see what's happening there. And you know, if you look at the amount of subsidy going out to the producers in our country, we could nick that just a little bit, and we could find the funds to help our seniors.

I would invite you to Ohio. I would invite you to see a State that still has 7 percent unemployment and what happens at these food banks. It's vitally important that we not cut help for senior citizens. There isn't any loving child or grandchild in this country that wants to hurt their grandmother or their mother or father.

I think that your budget is misguided, and I would commend the gentleman, please look at those lines. Restore the funds I'm asking for. And I invite you to Ohio.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds just to say to the gentlelady, my sister and brother-in-law and two beautiful nieces live in Athens, Ohio, one of the poorest regions in southern Ohio. I know exactly what the gentlelady is saying.

We do have to make these choices, and I commend our friends in the Congressional Black Caucus budget and the Progressive budget for laying out their guidelines for raising taxes by $4 and $6 trillion, respectively, to try to pay for some of those priorities; but even in those budgets, they still never balance.

I'm saying that you and I today, from the great wealth that is in this country today, have a chance to either pay for things that we think are important or borrow money from our children and our grandchildren to pay for things that we think are important. You and I are closer to death than we are to birth. These bills are going to be paid by our children and our grandchildren. And today, for example, the President's budget, we've never seen a budget that projected paying back even a penny over the next 75-year window.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker.

I would welcome the opportunity to work closer across the aisle than we are here today to address those needs that we all agree on. I would say to the gentlelady, our disagreement is not on whether or not those needs exist; it's whether or not you and I are obligated, morally, spiritually, as a function of our community, to serve those needs or whether we can pass that bill on to others.

I know the gentlelady has a strong passion for doing that. I hope she would join with me so that we can do it together, not ask someone else to do it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman kindly yield just for a couple of seconds here——

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to yield to the gentlelady.

Ms. KAPTUR.—Just to say that the first obligation is to feed the hungry, feed the hungry. And I don't think the gentleman would want to have on his conscience any harm to the senior citizens of this country, so I'd ask you to rereview your budget and fix it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank both of my colleagues. I thank the gentlelady and the manager of this rule.

I vigorously rise to oppose this rule, the underlying bill, the Republican proposal for a budget. And I really do speak from the heart, because when you go home, it is often the best time of the service to your Nation because you get to see hardworking Americans, no matter what region you live in. And so I'm very proud to associate myself and support the Van Hollen Democratic budget substitute, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

The singular theme that rides through all of these budgets, which is the very question that is raised, whether or not it's a teenager coming out looking for a summer job; whether or not it's a college student with their bright, new diploma holding it up, looking for America's great opportunity; or whether it's someone who has worked for a period of time, well-qualified, but just can't find the job to get back into the market. I know there are those who are listening, my colleagues, who have constituents like that. Every single budget, including the Van Hollen budget, the Democratic budget, helps to create jobs, gets rid of the sequester and, in actuality, brings back the 775,000 or 750,000 jobs lost by the Ryan budget, plus more.

The Congressional Black Caucus focuses on maintenance for public transit and highway and airports, creating jobs. The Congressional Progressive Caucus focuses on making work pay and emergency unemployment compensation.

But here's the story that I think is under the underlying Ryan budget—good friend of ours, of course, we work together—and the underlying premise.

I am tired of raising up the generational fight. Just because the Greatest Generation fought in World War II, are we to say to our children and grandchildren, ''You know what, we don't want to burden you when the military calls you, when your Nation needs you; we don't want to burden you''?

□ 1330

There's no way to protect what our grandchildren and children will have with this budget, other than the fact that the Democratic budget invests in people.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. When you have a preschool program, when you have programs that transition women out of their homes after raising their children and into jobs, when you have a program that allows young people with a college degree to get a job, when you have programs that invest in infrastructure and build highways and bridges that America is begging for—like the Hoover Dam—that our grandchildren and children will receive in

America, that we invested in, they'll receive a gift. And they'll be able to work with their hands and their minds, and they will have the ability to pay down any debts and they'll close any deficit. And they'll be grateful to do it, because America will be the greatest Nation that it can.

Don't constantly pound us with our grandchildren and our children. Right now, today, America can afford to pay for what we are doing in the Van Hollen Democratic budget because we are creating jobs, we're building infrastructure, we're making America greater—the very America that people around the world admire.

So I want to vote for a growth budget. I want to vote for one that reduces unemployment under 5 percent. I want to vote for one that lifts America so that our children and grandchildren will have the benefit of all that we've done for them, and they'll have the benefit of paying for what America promises.

Vote for America's promise. Vote against the Ryan budget.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to a new member of the Rules Committee, but a senior member and leader of this House, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and certainly thank him for leading this rule on the floor this afternoon.

This is an important vote we're going to have today. The rule that will bring various budgets to the floor is a very fair product. As the gentleman knows, as we sat through the hours of debate in the Rules Committee last night, this is not just the product of the Budget Committee that is coming to the floor. It's not just Chairman RYAN's budget that is coming to the floor. But these are budgets that have been proposed by a number of different groups within the Congress—the Congressional Black Caucus, the Progressive Caucus, the Democratic substitute, the Senate budget is going to be offered as a substitute, where people can vote, and the Republican Study Committee. At the end of all that time, if none of the budgets receive the majority vote in the House of Representatives, then and only then will the product of the Budget Committee be voted on by the entire House. My expectation is that that is the budget that will pass.

But our argument here today is not over what is contained within the Budget Committee's product anymore than it is what's contained with the Progressive's budget product. After all, what we're voting on today is the rule that will allow us the ability to debate these differences in philosophy on the floor of this House tomorrow, on C–SPAN, transparent for all the country to see; and they'll able to see the big philosophical differences that exist.

We heard in the Rules Committee last night that it's unfair to bring the Senate budget to the floor of the House for a vote because the Senate budget has not been voted on on the floor of the Senate and that obstructionist Republicans in the Senate will keep the Senate from voting; but, actually, that's not true. The Senate, under its own rules, can bring the budget to the floor of the Senate and pass it with a simple majority. That's a 50-plus-1 majority. There's not enough Republicans in the Senate to block that or any other budget.

So the discussion that it's unfair to bring the Senate budget to the floor of the House to vote on before the Senate has a chance to vote, the Senate could have voted on their budget at any time. The Senate could have voted last year for a budget. The Senate could have voted the year before for a budget. They chose not to because they did not want to put it out for the American people to see what their core philosophical belief is, which is that you have to raise taxes by a trillion dollars on the American people in order to pass a budget.

We hear it time and time again that the greatest antipoverty program in this country is a job. The growth that is provided for in the budget that will be debated upon—and I hope pass tomorrow—we can't discount the importance of that growth.

I just came from a hearing in the Energy Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce. We were fortunate to hear from one of the members of the Railroad Commission in Texas. The Railroad Commission doesn't have anything to do with trains anymore. It has all to do with energy. And Commissioner Smitherman from Texas was at the committee hearing, and I asked him a question. I said, In the Ryan budget that we will hear about tomorrow, there is an estimate of $11 billion over the next 10 years that will be paid to the Federal Government because of development of oil and natural gas on Federal lands. I said, I'm from Texas. That number seems a little bit light to me. I would expect the amount of revenue produced on Federal lands from oil and gas production, assuming we don't legislate it out of existence through the Environmental Protection Agency. And he said, In Texas, the 2-year budget figure for oil and gas severance taxes is $7 billion.

Well, that would be a significantly greater amount than the $11 billion estimated in the Ryan budget. I asked Mr. RYAN about this last night at the Rules Committee. This is the amount that is allowed under Congressional Budget Office expectations. But, honestly, if we free up the energy that we have available within our own shores, within our own borders, that is a jobs program that would go a long way towards producing that unemployment rate of 5 percent that the gentlelady from Texas just referenced.

I know this because in the district that I represent in north Texas, gas production from a geologic formation known as the Barnett shale has yielded significant economic benefits and significant employment as a result. In fact, when the Nation entered into a recession in December of 2007, constituents in my district basically read about it in the newspapers because it wasn't until 12, 13, or 14 months later when the price of natural gas came down so low that we actually felt the recession in Texas.

So let's utilize that energy that's at our disposal. Life without energy is cold, brutal, and short. We have the ability to produce energy on our own shores. One of the things where I think we can look to the Ryan budget for leadership is allowing that energy to be produced on Federal lands.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. May I inquire from my colleague if he has further requests.

Mr. WOODALL. I will say to the gentlelady I do not have further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. In closing, Mr. Speaker, my Democrat colleagues and I have spoken at length today about the dangerous shortcomings of the budget proposal of Mr. RYAN. Fortunately, Representative CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, has an alternative proposal that significantly reduces the Nation's deficit while creating jobs and protecting programs like Medicaid and Medicare. And unlike the majority's proposal, Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget repeals the sequester, which is estimated to cost the Nation 750,000 jobs this year.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN has repeatedly tried to avert the sequester. He has come to the Rules Committee numerous times with proposals to replace the sequester with responsible budget cuts and has been repeatedly denied the opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on the House floor.

By voting for Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget, every Member of this Chamber can vote to do away with the sequester. On behalf of the thousands of Americans who are facing pay cuts, furloughs, and job losses, I urge my colleagues to repeal the sequester today and vote to balance the budget in a responsible way.

Mr. Speaker, while the majority would like you to believe that a looming debt crisis is imminent, it is simply not true. Even this last weekend, both Speaker BOEHNER and Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN said on television there is no immediate budget crisis facing our Nation. Please think of that, my colleagues, as you vote.

In acknowledging this reality, it is important to realize that it is possible to make investments in our economy today, create jobs, repeal the sequester, and still reduce our deficit in a responsible and balanced way.

In closing, I urge my colleagues not to be scared by the rhetoric that sometimes we hear. Instead, I urge my colleagues to support one of the multiple

budget proposals that reduce our deficit responsibly while creating jobs today and protecting the important programs like Medicaid and Medicare for generations to come.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1340

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentlelady for being with me on the floor today.

I'll say that we sometimes have some controversy in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. There's a lot of responsibility that lies in the Rules Committee. With 435 folks here in this Chamber, and we all would like to have our say—and we'd all like to have our say probably more than once—the Rules Committee is tasked with managing that debate.

I'll tell you, I think the rule we passed last night is the best rule we've done all year along. Now, my colleague from New York may think I'm damming it with faint praise. But I would say that having this open debate that we will have tomorrow on budgets is about the best we can do in this institution, Mr. Speaker. To allow every single idea, every single individual from the most junior Member who was just elected 2 months ago to the most senior Member who has been here 40 years, if you have a budget idea, you get to have it heard on the floor of the House. In this case, Mr. Speaker, that's going to be six budgets we're going to look at tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe having an open process is important. We made in order the Progressive Caucus budget. That Progressive Caucus budget raises taxes by $5.7 trillion—unashamed, unabashed. Tough economy; let's raise taxes by $5.7 trillion, and let's increase spending even more than we are today. I'm glad that that budget is going to be here on the floor.

The Congressional Black Caucus raises taxes $4.2 trillion. Mr. VAN HOLLEN's substitute raises taxes $1.2 trillion.

As you saw from the chart that the chairman of the Rules Committee had on the floor of the House earlier, Mr. Speaker, we don't have a tax problem in this country, we have a spending problem in this country. If we took everything from everybody, we still wouldn't have enough money to pay for all of the promises that previous Congresses and previous Presidents have made. What that translates into is fear.

We can do better for the American people than election after election to scare them with the looming bankruptcy of programs that they depend on. Yet we know the Social Security Disability Insurance program—already out of money, Mr. Speaker. The Medicare program—which my mom and dad depend on—going out of business in 2023. The Social Security retirement program, Mr. Speaker, not enough money to fund future promises. We have a chance to either ignore those promises or embrace those challenges.

I will tell you we do not have a crisis in this country; we have an opportunity in this country to do the things that we have long known we needed to do.

In 1983, Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats came together, extended the life of the Social Security program and provided certainty and security to another generation of America's seniors. We have an opportunity tomorrow to do the same thing for the Medicare program, or to kick the can down the road and ensure uncertainty, crisis, and fear in yet another generation of Americans who depend upon these programs.

I urge all my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support this rule that will allow every single idea to be considered tomorrow. And when you come to the floor tomorrow, choose that budget that makes the tough decisions.

It takes no courage at all to let someone else pay the bills, Mr. Speaker. It takes no courage at all to let the next generation sort out the problems. The courage is coming together today to say, even though the weight is going to fall on our shoulders to solve the problem, we owe it to the next generation. We owe them nothing less.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule. I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1415

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 122; adopting House Resolution 122, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 25, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 115, PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 113TH CONGRESS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 122) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—223

Alexander	Coffman	Gibbs
Amash	Cole	Gibson
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	Gingrey (GA)
Bachus	Conaway	Gohmert
Barletta	Cook	Goodlatte
Barr	Cotton	Gosar
Barton	Cramer	Gowdy
Benishek	Crawford	Granger
Bentivolio	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Bilirakis	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Bishop (UT)	Daines	Griffith (VA)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Grimm
Blackburn	Denham	Guthrie
Bonner	Dent	Hall
Boustany	DeSantis	Hanna
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Harris
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Hastings (WA)
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Heck (NV)
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Buchanan	Ellmers	Herrera Beutler
Bucshon	Farenthold	Holding
Burgess	Fincher	Hudson
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Camp	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
Campbell	Fleming	Hultgren
Cantor	Forbes	Hunter
Capito	Foxx	Hurt
Carter	Franks (AZ)	Issa
Cassidy	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Chabot	Gardner	Johnson (OH)
Chaffetz	Garrett	Johnson, Sam
Coble	Gerlach	Jones

Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt
Amodei
Collins (GA)
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Flores
Fortenberry
Graves (MO)
Harper
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Lynch
Miller, George
Nadler
Pelosi
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (NJ)

□ 1444

Mr. VISCLOSKY and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 189, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—224

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Aderholt
Amodei
Collins (GA)
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Graves (MO)
Harper
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Lynch
Miller, George
Nadler
Pelosi
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (NJ)

□ 1453

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 77 on H. Con. Res. 18, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 78 on H. Con. Res. 19, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 79 on moving the previous question for H. Res. 122, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 80 on H. Res. 122, I am not recorded because I was absent due to a death in the family. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 133, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—272

Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Cleaver
Coble
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fleming
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Horsford
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—133

Amash
Andrews
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Butterfield
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
Duffy
Edwards
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Forbes
Foxx
Fudge
Garcia
Gardner
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gowdy
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (FL)
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Roe (TN)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Slaughter
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Waters
Wittman
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—25

Aderholt
Amodei
Collins (GA)
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Harper
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Lynch
McCaul
McIntyre
Miller, George
Nadler
Pelosi
Rigell
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Yarmuth

□ 1501

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 19, I missed 3 rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on #79, 80, and 81.

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE TWENTY EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–22) on the resolution (H. Res. 127) dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth Congressional District of Texas, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 127 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 127

Resolved, That the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth Congressional District of Texas is dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 113TH CONGRESS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 122, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the resolution is considered as read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $10,072,374; Committee on Armed Services, $13,127,070; Committee on the Budget, $10,277,648; Committee on Education and the Workforce, $13,905,526; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $19,041,032; Committee on Ethics, $6,040,918; Committee on Financial Services, $14,788,964; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $14,776,224; Committee on Homeland Security, $14,067,176; Committee on House Administration, $9,201,120; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $8,779,516; Committee on the Judiciary, $14,154,032; Committee on Natural Resources, $13,111,658; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $17,880,874; Committee on Rules, $5,714,816; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $10,565,510; Committee on Small Business, $5,985,376; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $16,364,614; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $6,097,092; and Committee on Ways and Means, $16,846,822.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2013, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2014.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $5,036,187; Committee on Armed Services, $6,563,535; Committee on the Budget, $5,138,824; Committee on Education and the Workforce, $6,952,763; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $9,520,516; Committee on Ethics, $3,020,459; Committee on Financial Services, $7,394,482; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $7,388,112; Committee on Homeland Security, $7,033,588; Committee on House Administration, $4,600,560; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $4,389,758; Committee on the Judiciary, $7,077,016; Committee on Natural Resources, $6,555,829; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $8,940,437; Committee on Rules, $2,857,408; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $5,282,755; Committee on Small Business, $2,992,688; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $8,182,307; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $3,048,546; and Committee on Ways and Means, $8,423,411.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2014, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2015.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, $5,036,187; Committee on Armed Services, $6,563,535; Committee on the Budget, $5,138,824; Committee on Education and the Workforce, $6,952,763; Committee on Energy and Commerce, $9,520,516; Committee on Ethics, $3,020,459; Committee on Financial Services, $7,394,482; Committee on Foreign Affairs, $7,388,112; Committee on Homeland Security, $7,033,588; Committee on House Administration, $4,600,560; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, $4,389,758; Committee on the Judiciary, $7,077,016; Committee on Natural Resources, $6,555,829; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, $8,940,437; Committee on Rules, $2,857,408; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, $5,282,755; Committee on Small Business, $2,992,688; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, $8,182,307; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, $3,048,546; and Committee on Ways and Means, $8,423,411.

(c) REVIEW OF USE OF FUNDS IN FIRST SESSION.—

(1) REVIEW.—None of the amounts provided for in section 1 for a committee named in subsection (b) may be available for expenses of the committee after March 15, 2014, unless the chair or ranking minority member of the committee appears and presents testimony at a hearing of the Committee on House Administration held prior to such date to review the committee's use of the amounts provided for in section 1 during the first session of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress and to determine whether the amount specified in subsection (b) with respect to the committee should be updated on the basis of the review.

(2) WAIVER.—The Committee on House Administration may waive the application of paragraph (1) to any or all of the committees named in subsection (b).

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(b) BALANCE.—The balance of the reserve fund under this section shall be equal to the sum of the following:

(1) The amount by which the amount made available for ''House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select'' for fiscal year 2013 exceeds the amount that would be made available for ''House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select'' by division C of the Department of Defense, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (H.R. 933, as passed by the House of Representatives on March 6, 2013), as reduced pursuant to the provisions of division D of such Act.

(2) The amount by which the amount made available for ''House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select'' for fiscal year 2014 exceeds the amount made available for ''House of Representatives—Committee Employees, Standing Committees, Special and Select'' for fiscal year 2013.

(c) ALLOCATION TO COMMITTEES.—Amounts in the reserve fund under this section shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 251A or 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any change in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of House Resolution 115, which is providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress and which authorizes committee budgets for the 113th Congress.

Earlier this month, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration held two very lengthy and very informative days of hearings with our chairmen and with our ranking members from all of the 19 House committees. Each of them testified about their respective budgets, the commitment to uphold the longstanding two-thirds, one-third allocation between majority and minority offices; and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, they talked about doing more with less, which is a topic that we are all very, very familiar with.

This funding process and these discussions significantly impact the legislative process as these committees are where, of course, the legislation that comprise much of our work begins, where our vital oversight functions occur, which is why throughout this process we adhered, Mr. Speaker, to two very important principles. First of all, we said we need to live within our means, and then prioritizing the finite resources that we have provided to us

in the Congress by hardworking American taxpayers.

As we all know, sequestration went into effect on March 1, 2013, and Congress must live with further cuts, just as every other agency of government must live with similar cuts. As a result of the sequester, the total committee authorization level must be reduced by approximately 11 percent, in the 11 percentile range. And that means if we authorize above that amount, then we will have to take the money from somewhere else.

When ensuring that committees have adequate resources, obviously, we have to consider their legislative objectives; we have to consider their anticipated workload and authorize the finite resources available in a way that best suits the needs of the House of Representatives as a whole.

Although the sequestration is not certainly the ideal way to cut spending, cuts are imperative. They must happen. Our government is too big, too involved, and too costly. As those who are charged with the care of taxpayers' dollars, we need to lead by example, and we must control our spending. We must live within our own means.

Now, this may be a far more strict budget than many had hoped or anticipated, but like so many Americans, we are coping with our circumstances, and we are making cuts to our budgets in a way that any American business or American family would have to, as every local unit of government, every State around the country has had to do. Certainly during these very trying economic times, we also have to make value judgments and budget accordingly.

To match the available post-sequestration funding level, the total authorization amount for House committees must be reduced, as I say, by about 11 percent from the 2012 level; and, therefore, with very few exceptions, each committee authorization has been reduced, again, within that 11 percent range or certainly within a percentage point or so of the 11 percent.

Based on the anticipated workload for the 113th Congress, the Budget Committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Select Committee on Intelligence have been given very much smaller reductions, a very slight reduction from the 11 percent. But every committee certainly will be faced with important oversight responsibilities for 2013. However, given that getting our economy moving again and defending this Nation are the foremost priorities that we face, the dire need for tax and entitlement reform to help grow our economy, to create good-paying private sector jobs and the increasing cyberthreats to our digital infrastructure, it was determined by our committee that these three committees certainly are the tip of the spear in doing some of the most important work for the American people.

We must remain, as well, committed to leading by example in cutting government waste, rooting out inefficiencies, and conducting essential and efficient oversight of our vast administrative agencies.

House Resolution 115, Mr. Speaker, we believe fulfills that mission. I would also point out that this House resolution not only reduces committee expenditures, but it also authorizes total committee funding for the 113th Congress at a level which is lower than 2005. I think that bears repeating—a level lower than 2005. By comparison, overall nondefense discretionary spending by the executive branch has actually increased 16.7 percent since 2008—quite a big difference there.

As I said before, as chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I certainly understand the challenges of stretching committee resources, and I have a very deep appreciation for every committee's ability to absorb these cuts and their commitment to functioning at a high level, even with the reduced resources that they have, and that is due certainly in no small measure to the outstanding leadership that we have with each committee chairman and each ranking member on all of our committees, really, all committed to delivering a very high level of service to the American people.

Some of my colleagues, I know, have voiced their opposition to this measure calling for a freeze in committee spending. They say that freezing spending for committees at 2012 levels is a more balanced approach. But since sequestration, we just don't have the money to cover a freeze. We do not have the money.

So I would simply state that spending beyond our means, in my opinion, is not a balanced approach. In fact, I would say it's a bit irresponsible. As I said before, every American family, every small business, every State and local unit of government must live within their means, and so must the U.S. House of Representatives.

□ 1510

Mr. Speaker, again, this resolution has required us to make some very difficult but very necessary decisions. And I want to personally thank, and certainly all of our committee members thank, each chairman and each ranking member who testified before our committee, and our committee staffs as well, who are often unrecognized for the vital work that they do.

I would urge, Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 115, living within our means and prioritizing our finite resources like the rest of America.

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 115 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 115 represents the next step in a slow march towards making House committees incapable of conducting the oversight with which they are charged and further limiting the power of this equal branch of government.

Mr. Speaker, with these cuts, we are not talking about the loss of new equipment, the next computer, or printer. No. With these cuts, we are talking about gutting our capacity to do the jobs we were sent here to do by the American people. The work product of our committees is only as good as the talented men and women that we are able to employ. And they are very able.

The House is lucky to have such a well-seasoned and skilled group of individuals carrying out the people's business. In fact, this is one of the things we always agree on—the quality of the people that work in these committees. It is at the highest level. But for how long?

If this resolution passes, there will be a 21.3 percent reduction in funding for committees since the 111th Congress. More appalling is the 26 percent cut the Judiciary Committee will sustain during the same time, particularly as they move forward to address comprehensive immigration reform that we all seem to agree on now and the initiatives to reduce gun violence.

As the chairman of the Rules Committee stated last week when he testified before our committee, ''We do not have something we can cut or manage on a moving forward basis. We have by and large taken ourselves down to the bare bones.'' Now we're down to the bare bones. Repeatedly, we heard from committee chairs that the only thing they have left to cut are personnel expenses.

The Veterans' Affairs chairman stated, ''We have no choice but to find these savings in our personnel budget.''

And the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said:

> We want to make certain that those individuals who will make a sacrifice and come up here and work for a reduced wage will stay with us. There is a question of how long, deeply, we can cut.

Of course there is a question, and I think the question is before us.

The chairs and ranking members of the House have been responsible stewards—we have heard that already—and they have been. And they have achieved incredible savings. But this resolution's lack of funding also hurts our ability to find governmentwide cost savings.

In fact, it does just the opposite. The committees conduct oversight over billions and billions of dollars of Federal spending and have found savings within their respective agencies. However, without high quality people that have the institutional knowledge and expertise, they will sacrifice the ability to perform strong, responsible oversight.

The chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee illustrated this best when testifying about the savings his auditors were able to provide the government. He stated:

> Cutting back for us is, in fact, an opportunity to lose the very auditors that will

guarantee you multiple savings. We would like to work with the committee to allow us and other committees to find similar savings. But we must ask that you not allow the audit committee to be reduced when, in fact, we can return you more than 1,000 times our budget.

One thousand times. In Mark, it is only 100 times. Fourfold in other parts of the Bible. Here is 1,000 times.

Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle have embraced the idea of doing more with less. We have all grappled with the idea of not filling empty positions, denying requests for travel and forgoing necessary technology upgrades in our offices. But there is a point where additional cuts undermine our ability to do our jobs effectively.

Based upon the testimony that we have received during our committee funding hearings, I believe that there is a bipartisan agreement that this funding resolution could represent that breaking point. In the end, the American people will be the ultimate victims.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution. I urge a ''no'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to yield as much time as he may consume to an outstanding member of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chair for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 115, but I appreciate, quite honestly, the concerns just raised. And let me try to address some of them, if not all of them.

There are victims in this country, for sure. But the real victimization will occur if this House, if this Congress, if this President does not get ahold of the deficit and debt situation that we are incurring. Right now, we are in the middle of debating different budgets, the priorities that we have as parties, as Americans, et cetera.

On the one hand, we have a budget that balances in 10 years—radical for this town. On the other side, we have budgets that never, ever balance. If we don't get ahold of these deficits so we can finally start attacking the debt, and if we continue to leave to future generations our bills—to me, Mr. Speaker, the most immoral thing I can think of, really, that we can do in civic life is to leave our bills for future generations to pay. There will be the victimization.

Yes, we are going to have a hard time at the committee level, and certainly even with our MRAs that have been cut in the past, to try to do our work. But what I heard in these committee hearings from our chairman and our ranking members each is that they pledge to continue their legislative and oversight activities despite these budget cuts. So there is not going to be any victimization here with this House resolution.

The other thing this House resolution does is finally lets us lead by example, Mr. Speaker. How can we have a national family discussion? How can we have a discussion about the morality of leaving our bills for future generations to pay if we are not willing to suck some of it up ourselves? And, yes, we are doing it. Do you know who else is doing it? The military.

I would like to say here on the floor of the House that those excuses should now be taken off the table. We are leading by example in what we have cut through our MRAs already and this House resolution. And guess what? So has the military.

Let's finally get to a discussion and action, more importantly, regarding the real drivers of our debt—the social entitlement programs of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. And, yes, many of our constituents will say, Hey, wait a minute. Don't call those social entitlement programs. We paid into those, therefore, we should get out. And that is true. But what is also true is that on average—let's take Medicare, for example, Mr. Speaker—we are paying in about 40 percent, again, on average, of what we are taking out. It is immoral, wrong, to let that 60 percent get paid for by people who don't even yet exist and, therefore, don't have a say in the matter.

House Resolution 115 lets us lead by example so that we can finally get to the rest of the conversation about the drivers of our debt. Guess what else? The interest we owe ourselves as private citizens—and, more increasingly, other countries like China, countries that don't necessarily have our best interest at heart, nor should they have to have our best interest at heart—we are paying more to them in interest because of this debt than we are spending on homeland security, education, and roads combined.

That breeds weakness, that fosters instability, that creates victimization. House Resolution 115 will give us the moral authority and the real authority to continue having this discussion, to lead by example, which is so well needed in this country right now at this time. The fact of the matter is, we shouldn't have to have oversight of the budgets of the executive branch if the executive branch and this President were to lead and recognize the debt that we are in, the deficits that we run, and rein in his own people, rein in his own organizations, create a culture of doing more with less.

□ 1520

As it has been famously stated by a former Governor in Indiana: people will never miss the government that has been cut.

It goes without saying, with regard to individualism, people can do more for themselves and people can do more for each other than any faraway Federal Government program can. Let's continue leading by example. Let's continue this fiscal fight that we are engaged in. Let's pass—let's strongly support—House Resolution 115.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work on the committee. I am pleased he is managing this bill today. It's good for the next generation of Members to learn the procedures of the floor this way—putting them right in the line of fire.

I would also like to thank the chairman for how she handled our marathon hearings. I've had her job and know how difficult it is to be juggling the schedules of all our fellow Members and of our fellow chairmen and ranking members.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, though, in opposition to this resolution. We have cut committee funding for the last 3 years. We are past the point of cutting what we want, and we are now into cutting what we need—our ability to attract and retain expert staff.

I asked the same question to every ranking member and every chairman who came in front of us. I asked them, if they're into cutting their personnel, whether or not they've thought in their own minds if it would hurt them in the jobs that they could do and in the jobs they do for the American people on those committees. Every man and woman said it would be an issue for them, that they would have a problem. Again, we cut in 2012 and gave people positions at lower salaries. These people, without question, make double, triple, four times the amount of money they can in the public sector. They're dedicated—they're dedicated people—but sometimes dedication doesn't pay the bills that they do acquire and that they do have.

Their main concern was keeping people on their staffs who had institutional knowledge, people who had the knowledge of how this House works. As you all know, when you first get here, it can be a quagmire—you don't understand what's happening; it moves too fast—but these men and women who are here for many years, they do know that, and they keep this train running. To hurt them and not be able to retain them would be a major, major disservice with just the institutional knowledge that they have.

Again, I get it. I understand the cutting. I understand we've got to cut some other people, but if we cut these staff members—the people who have been here—and try to attract other people who can do the jobs that our committee staffs do, I think that it would be hurting the American people.

We need to defeat this resolution and give the committees the appropriate resources that they need to do their basic work and to do what the people sent us here to do.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The fact of the matter is that this is all the money that we have to spend.

Believe me, I am sympathetic to the arguments that it would be nice if our committees didn't have to make any cuts. Again, if we don't make some cuts because of the sequestration, this money has to come from somewhere else. I guess we're sort of looking for other ideas of offsets for those who are saying that we should not pass this resolution.

What kinds of things would they offset?

We've certainly watched the White House close tours to groups because they said the sequester impacted the Secret Service's ability to protect the President when the American people came into the White House. I don't know if they're suggesting we should close the Capitol Building or what have you. I don't think that kind of suggestion would go very far.

But, again, where do you offset if you're not going to cut any spending here?

I will also say this: I come from southeast Michigan, which arguably was ground zero during the most painful economic transition, certainly in my lifetime, that happened in our Nation here recently, and we're trying to get ourselves out of that. We were number one in all of the categories you didn't want to be number one in. If I'd have told our local county or our local units of government that they'd have to cut 11 percent, they would say thank you, because they've cut anywhere from 30 to 40 percent. There were just incredible amounts of cuts that happened. Furloughs have happened with employees. That has been going on for years, actually. That's my neighborhood.

When we think about the amount of borrowing that we're doing as a Nation—as everybody knows, we are now to the point of $16 trillion in national debt with no end in sight, and we've been running deficits for, certainly, the last 5 years of well over $1 trillion and, in many cases, $1.5 trillion annually, and we're borrowing 42 cents on every dollar that we spend—if we do not have the political will to make any kind of cuts ourselves to where we can't even cut our own committee budgets here in the House while these kinds of cuts are being absorbed by other areas, I just think that this resolution will be a very vivid demonstration of the differences of what we think ''leading by example'' actually means.

I will tell you as well, as a grandmother, I do not want to look at my two little grandchildren and say, Hey, do you mind paying the bill, because I don't have the political will. I just can't do it. Too hard for me. I don't want to break a sweat here. Would you mind paying?

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I just cannot get to that place. I think this resolution is very, very important. I recognize the painful cuts that are happening. It's not easy. That's why the American people sent us here—to have the political will and to make the hard decisions. I would hope that my colleagues would support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the Democratic whip and the former ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I heard the gentlelady from Michigan's comments. I have three grandchildren of my own and two great grandchildren. The gentlelady said we don't want to turn to them and say, We don't want to pay our bills. You pay them.

That's what we did in '01 and '03. We cut revenues. We cut revenues deeply. We didn't cut spending—we increased spending—on the theory that the people who were going to get the benefit were voting and that the people who were going to get paid and who were going to have to pay the bill weren't voting. It worked to some degree; but we didn't pay, as the gentlelady suggested we ought to, our bills. As the gentlelady probably knows, we had a provision in place which said we ought to pay as we go. If we buy a war, we ought to pay for it. If we buy a tax cut, we ought to pay for it. If we buy a prescription drug, we ought to pay for it and not ask my children or my grandchildren or your children or your grandchildren to pay for it. I agree with the lady, but that's what we've done.

Now we are about the process of undermining the people's government by slashing its funding so it cannot provide the services that the people want and need and vote for, and now we will slash the ability of this House to do what the people expect us to do. I'm sorry the former Secretary of State left the Chamber. He's the Secretary of State. He says we ought to lead by example. By golly, I'll tell you: the people in my constituency, they hope we're not the example of how to work. They hope we're not the example of the dysfunction that they ought to follow, that we're not the example of ''do it my way or no way,'' which is what we've been doing.

The people of the United States of America send us here, and they want us to make sure that we adopt policies that will help them and their families, that will create jobs and grow our economy. That's what they want. What the people of the United States also want is to make sure we can conduct the oversight of their government. That's our responsibility. The previous gentleman said, Well, the executive ought to lead, and then we wouldn't need to do oversight. I didn't get that, frankly, at all. The executive is a separate and equal branch of government, but we are the first branch of government. We are article I. We are the people's House. We represent the people, and they expect us to make sure their government is operating properly. To the extent that year after year we reduce our ability to conduct the oversight necessary to ensure that the people's government is operating consistent with law and on behalf of the people of the United States—to the extent that we undermine that ability—we undermine free government, a free people, a free country.

□ 1530

We undermine the ability of this government to make sure that the executive is doing the right thing. And to the extent that the population of this country keeps growing, as it does every year, it needs us to be on the job. And what we're saying, of course, is: Well, we have a sequester. Sequester starts with ''S''; it stands for stupid. It is an irrational policy that we've adopted. And we've adopted it. It just didn't happen. It didn't come out of the air. It didn't fall from the trees. We adopted sequester. It's an irrational, ineffective, inefficient, negative policy that we've not only allowed to go into place, but in the budget we passed, we adopted it one more time, not by mistake but by policy. It was a bad policy. I didn't vote for it. It's irrational.

I tell people around the country, you know, it's like the family has a budget. You have a food budget and you have a movie budget. Somebody loses their job and so your income goes down. So what you do is you sit around the table and say: We'll cut food by 10 percent and movies by 10 percent. What rational human being would do that? Nobody. They'd say we're not going to go to the movies this month so we can put food on the table and make sure that our family is well fed.

But that's not what we're doing. The sequester that we're now pursuing, somewhat mindlessly, in my opinion, with respect to our ability to do the job that the people expect us to do, is to cut food by 10 percent and movies by 10 percent.

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

Mr. VARGAS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. My friends, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I want the American people to know we've cut committee funding for 2 years in a row because we understand that we're asking everybody to notch in their belt by one or two notches, and we ought to do the same. And we have. But if you undermine the people's ability to do their job, you're going to be in trouble.

Woodrow Wilson once wrote: ''Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition.''

That's what we are here, we're on public exhibition. The TV is on, people are watching us, and people are seeing us.

But what Woodrow Wilson also said was: ''Whilst Congress in committee rooms is Congress at work.''

That's where we really do our work. We vote on it here, but committees are critically important creatures of oversight and of action.

I think the gentlelady is a good Member of this House, and she's been given a tough responsibility. She laments the fact that we have no money. We have no money because we said we didn't need it; we have no money because we can operate government without it.

Mr. Speaker, I hear your gavel, and I will close, but I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. Let's make sure that the Congress of the United States can do the job that the people expect.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this committee funding bill, which would hurt the ability of Congress to do its work effectively.

This bill would cut the funding for House Committees by an additional 11% in order to meet the irrational demands of sequestration—on top of huge cuts imposed last Congress.

Committees have lost around a quarter of their funding in the past few years, and this has meant fewer staff positions and the possibility of furloughs.

Most, I think, do not realize just how important committees are to the work we perform on the American people's behalf.

Woodrow Wilson once wrote:

> Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition, whilst Congress in its committee-rooms is Congress at work.

Eroding the ability of committees to do their work seriously limits the ability of Congress to engage in the people's work.

The Speaker and majority leader have said many times that this House ought to follow regular order.

To do so, we must have strong and fully functioning committees.

I urge my colleagues in both parties to oppose this bill.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minority whip's comments. I have great regard for him as well. I thought it was interesting, Mr. Speaker, listening to him talk about the President's sequester as an irrational kind of a thing. Of course, it was the President's idea. I don't dispute that it is not the best way to cut spending. Many may say it's an irrational approach. Again, the President's sequester, the President's idea.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Just so we're pretty accurate, as the gentlelady knows, your side offered a bill which was called Cut, Cap, and Balance. The alternative in Cut, Cap, and Balance was sequester. I didn't vote for that. I'm not sure how the gentlelady voted on it. It passed this House overwhelmingly with Republican support and with opposition on our side before Jack Lew suggested to HARRY REID that that might be one way to get off the lack of action in making sure that America paid its bills. The only reason I interrupt the gentlelady is because I think it is important to understand that your Cut, Cap, and Balance, passed before that suggestion was made, included sequester as the fallback if we didn't reach the numbers. If it's the President's, it's the President's via Cut, Cap, and Balance which your side of the aisle passed and sent to the Senate as presumably good policy.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding. She was very kind to do that.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for pointing out the sequencing of the sequester, the President's sequester, the President's idea of the sequester, and I appreciate that. I still say with the President's sequester that what's going to happen with this vote is a very vivid demonstration, again, of who is actually committed to doing more with less. My colleague, the gentleman, the minority whip, also has given us sort of a historical lesson of various things in his observation of the way things had gone earlier on, and I would point something out as well since we are talking about committee budget cuts.

In 2007 when the other party, the Democrats, took control of this House, they immediately increased the amount of spending on committees by 8.9 percent, almost 9 percent; immediate increase. Then in 2009 as they kept control of the Congress, again they increased committee spending, that time by 8.9 percent. Now keep in mind, this was at a time—which I had mentioned previously, being from southeast Michigan—everybody else, it seemed like, certainly every State government, every local unit of government, every school district, many, many businesses, certainly American families, were making cuts. That was not happening here with committee spending.

In 2010, this House shifted control. The Republicans took control. And what did we do with committee spending as a way to show that we wanted to do more with less, that we understood that we needed to get a handle on this out-of-control Federal spending, we actually cut committee budgets by 9.5 percent for the 112th Congress, and as we are debating now, another 11 percent cut that we're looking at.

This is at the same time that the House, under Republican control, has also cut what we call our Members' representational allowances, our MRAs, which has been very painful for all of us as well. We cut 5 percent, then in the 6 percentile. Now just a couple of weeks ago, effective immediately with the sequester, another in the 8 percentile cuts for all of us. All of us are doing more with less. And believe me, I understand there's no sympathy for Members of Congress, but I certainly point that out.

At the same time if you look at nondefense discretionary for the executive branch, almost a 17 percent increase during that same time. So I just think when we look at this resolution, we see how important it is. Again, I am not minimizing how painful it will be for the committees, but it's really the new reality, I think, and it's important for those of us here in the people's House to do the people's work with the amount of money that we have available, and to do it to the very best of our ability. And I know certainly Republicans and Democrats are committed to doing that.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, you and I were in Rules last night when I made the statement that I'm going to make here today. When I was a child, I learned that you can be penny-wise and pound foolish.

What winds up happening here is for a protracted period of time, we have not been able to retain the kind of staff, the hardworking people that really do the grinding work in committees, as Mr. HOYER pointed out, and we leave them without the ability to get a raise. And I don't know about you all, but what's going to wind up happening with my staff is some of them are going to get better jobs because they are better served by going into the private sector.

If we want to retain good people, we have to pay good people. And at a time when the public is more aware of what we are doing and making more demands, as rightly they should upon us, we decide to put ourselves in a position to not be able to serve the public.

In the final analysis, some of what we are doing is trying to save our Republican colleagues. They get two-thirds of whatever it is that we're talking about. But we should not be ashamed of what we do here. We deserve the honesty that we would want the American public to expect of us as we conduct our work.

□ 1540

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, I'd like to thank the chairwoman from the committee. She was very gracious during the committee hearing, and I learned quite a bit from her. I want to thank her for that.

And I, in particular, want to thank the ranking member. The ranking member gave me the opportunity to speak here. That normally doesn't happen to freshmen, and I really appreciate that. He has a reputation of being very gracious and kind, and I appreciate it. It was certainly demonstrated here today.

I do have to respond, however. There was the issue of immorality that was brought up before, and as a former Jesuit, I'm very comfortable with that type of language. And I believe it was said that leaving bills for other generations, future generations, was the most

immoral thing we can do. I certainly would challenge that premise. I think there's a lot more immoral things that we can do. However, when you do take a look at the issue of immorality and saying that we're going to leave this huge deficit, this huge debt to future generations, I think that that is immoral.

However, it's interesting, the argument on the other side is just simply the argument of cuts and not revenue. So, for example, corporate jets, there are loopholes for them now. We could close them. It wouldn't hurt the millionaires and the billionaires to pay taxes on them. It wouldn't hurt them one bit. And that, of course, would cut—it would cut the debt, the deficit that we leave to these future generations, reducing the immorality. We could have the wealthy, instead of paying 12, 13 percent on average, pay what middle class people pay. That certainly would cut the debt and deficit significantly, reducing, once again, the immorality.

But it's interesting, talking about immorality. The Bible certainly speaks to that. In Amos, the prophet Amos, if you look it up, you'll see that Amos speaks about the anawim, and the anawim are God's little ones. The little ones, then, were the orphans and the widows. Because of the condition that they were in, it was very difficult for them to survive. And we then, or at that time, the Israelites, were going to be judged on how they treated the anawim.

That carries forward into the New Testament. If you look in Matthew, Matthew 25, they say: How are we going to be judged? How are we going to be judged?

Jesus makes it easy. He says: whatever you do to the least of my brothers, you did to me. Then he goes through a litany of things. He says: when I was hungry, you gave me to eat; when I was thirsty, you gave me to drink; when I was a stranger—interestingly, when I was a stranger, we're certainly having that conversation with immigrants today—when I was a stranger, you welcomed me; when I was ill, you cured me. Interestingly, too, when I was a prisoner, you came and visited me. It didn't say if you were innocent, by the way. It didn't say that. It said: when I was a prisoner, you came and you visited me. That's how we're going to be judged.

And these budgets, these budgets should go towards those values. That's what's moral, taking care of those that are thirsty and hungry, those that are strangers. And these committees work hard to make sure that happens, and they do a very good job. In fact, no one's argued that they don't; just the opposite. What we have heard from the committee chairs is: don't cut us because we can do even a better job. And not only that, you're loading the work on us.

So I would conclude, and again thank the ranking member and certainly thank the chair for the opportunity. And I would urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution. I appreciate the opportunity, again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure, at this time, to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. I've listened to this debate. It's primarily about the amount of money we spend on our committees here in the House. Taxes have just been inserted into it, and I have to respond to the comment about corporate taxes or tax breaks for corporate jets. It's an easy target. It's something the Democrats have repeatedly targeted in their budget resolution, something the President proposed to offset sequestration. And of course, the wealthy, with their big fancy corporate jets or corporate executives with their jets are easy targets.

But there is a lot of collateral damage any time this issue comes up. We forget about the people who fly those planes, the people who clean the planes, the people who fuel the planes, the people who run the facilities where those planes are hangared, the people who manage the flight operations, the people who manufacture those planes, which is, I would point out, the number one export industry in the State of Arkansas.

Much like in 1990 when the budget deal targeted the yacht industry in New England for a special luxury tax, it didn't raise the revenue that was projected. It did devastate that industry, leading to catastrophic layoffs, and resulted in the repeal of that measure within just a matter of months after it passed.

So while I appreciate the Democrats' desire to raise taxes every few months, I think that our spending crisis, or our debt crisis, is driven by spending, and we should be careful about singling out specific industries that provide good, high-paying jobs to hardworking Americans.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I certainly want to thank Mr. VARGAS for controlling his time. Mr. Speaker, he did a very good job. We certainly welcome him to the committee and look forward to working with him, as we also thank the ranking member, Mr. BRADY, for his extraordinary work on behalf of the committee, and we look forward to continuing to work with him.

Obviously, we have a bit of a disagreement, Mr. Speaker, on the committee budget cuts here; but I certainly would also applaud the work of all of our chairmen of our committees, as well as all of the ranking members, who very diligently went through their budgets trying to make the appropriate cuts and will continue to do that now, when this resolution is certainly passed, as we go forward, I think, for all of us, really, trying to create a fiscally responsible level of funding here and, again, something that allocates resources in the very best way that we can, that allows this House to complete its work on behalf of the American people.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would say, I believe that we are leading by example with this resolution today, and we need to show that the important work of government can certainly be done, and we can do it well with less. Doing more with less, that's a very well-used term, but it is certainly appropriate for this, during times of tight budgets.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 115, a resolution to fund the House standing and select Committees for the 113th Congress. As a member of the House Administration Committee, I have first-hand knowledge of the work that went into this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

As you know, with the implementation of the sequester on March 1st, across-the-board spending cuts took effect. In the wake of this, the House Administration Committee had a chance to hear from our colleagues—the Chairman and Ranking Member of each House Committee—about how they would handle the impact of the sequester.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Committee acted in a deliberative and fair manner when determining Committee budgets for the 113th Congress. Each Committee serves an important function, and while all will have to continue to produce good work with less, I am confident that they will succeed.

In the 112th Congress, the House recognized that economic difficulties were forcing the nation to tighten its belt. Rather than continuing runaway spending, this body chose to demonstrate that we were serious about getting our fiscal house in order by enacting an 11.4 percent cut in Committee funding. Today's vote gives us an important chance to show that, while families across the country are struggling to make ends meet, the House plans to continue leading by example.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this resolution includes cuts that will force Committees to make tough decisions. However, when the government faces across the board cuts, this institution should not be exempt. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 115.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 136, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—272

Alexander	Bachus	Barr
Amash	Barber	Barrow (GA)
Bachmann	Barletta	Barton

Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NAYS—136

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Forbes
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—23

Aderholt
Amodei
Collins (GA)
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Fortenberry
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Harper
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Lynch
Miller, George
Nadler
Pelosi
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (NJ)
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1630

Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. CONYERS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. ROE of Tennessee, PASTOR of Arizona, QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Messrs. COLE and LOEBSACK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 82, on consideration of H. Res. 115, a resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress, because I was questioning the Director the Federal Bureau of Investigation in my capacity as chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I missed a rollcall vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on No. 82.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 25, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25.

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

□ 1614

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 consideration of the bill (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to bring forward and present the budget resolution for fiscal year 2014. We believe that we owe the American people a responsible, balanced budget, and that is precisely what we are bringing to the floor today. Our budget balances the budget within 10 years, and it does so without raising taxes. Balancing the budget will help us foster a healthier economy, and it will help us create jobs.

In fact, two leading economists at Stanford University today released a study analyzing our budget and its positive effects on the economy and jobs. In the first year, they said it would, ''boost the economy immediately,'' increasing growth of our economy by a whole percentage point, which translates into about 500,000 jobs right away. That's about $1,500 in extra

take-home pay for families who are struggling to get by today.

By the end of the budget window, according to these economists at Stanford University, it would add 3 percent of economic growth to the economy. That's 1.7 million jobs in 1 year alone and about $4,000 more in take-home pay because of higher economic growth. More take-home pay means more control, more freedom, and more prosperity for families.

We are not simply here to balance the budget because we like looking at clean spreadsheets. It is not even an accounting exercise. The reason we are balancing the budget is to improve people's lives. It is to bring needed health to the economy and to bring certainty to families and businesses so they can get ahead.

We know that a debt crisis is coming, Mr. Chairman. We know that it's coming because we've watched what other countries have done when they continue to kick the can down the road and ignore the tough choices they need to make to get our fiscal house in order. We're doing that.

Now, what are we trying to do specifically in our budget? We want to restore opportunity. We want to repair our broken safety nets so that they're designed to get people out of poverty on to lives of self-sufficiency by reforming our welfare programs. We want to make sure that the seniors who are relying on programs as important as Medicare actually get the benefits they organized their lives around. We want to make sure that the next generation, those of us who follow our parents into retirement, actually have a Medicare program we can count on. And we have those bipartisan reforms here.

Everybody needs to pitch in, and everybody needs to propose a solution to our problem because, Mr. Chairman, if we don't tackle this fiscal problem in America, it will tackle us.

Now, to their credit, the Democrats on the Budget Committee are bringing a budget to the floor. To their credit, the Progressive Caucus is bringing a budget to the floor. To their credit, the Black Caucus is bringing a budget to the floor. To their credit, the Senate, finally, for the first time in 4 years, is bringing up a budget.

Budgets are about choices. The problem we have is not now that they're doing a budget—that's good news; that's great—it's what's in their budget. If you take a look at our budget—as I mentioned, our budget balances the budget. We believe a balanced plan is one that actually balances the budget. There is not another budget that's being offered here other than the Study Committee budget that actually balances the budget, other points notwithstanding.

Now, why do we balance the budget? Because we don't want our children to be drowning in debt. We want to make sure that this sea of red ink that the CBO is telling us is coming, we pay off our debt and give our kids a debt-free nation. That's what we do.

Take a look at the other budgets that are being offered. Let's take a look at the Senate Democrats'. That has a tax increase that's about $1.5 trillion; that has a spending increase of about $4.8 trillion off of our budget. If you take a look at the House Democrats', that's a $1.2 trillion tax increase, with a spending increase of about $4.896 trillion off of this budget. If you take a look at the Black Caucus budget, the CBC budget, that's a tax increase of $2.8 trillion, with a spending increase of $5.7 trillion, only to be outdone by the Progressive Caucus budget. That is a $5.683 trillion tax increase with an $8.698 trillion spending increase in their budget.

□ 1620

Taking more money from hard-working families to fuel more spending in Washington is not going to solve our budget crisis, is not going to balance our budget. It's more of the same. And more of the same means we have a debt crisis. When we have a debt crisis, everybody gets hurt. The people who are on the safety net, the seniors who have already retired, they're the ones who get hurt the first and the worst in a debt crisis.

This is a responsible plan. It's a plan for economic growth. It's a plan for tax reform. It's a plan to open up our energy stores that we have here so that we can be energy independent. We have vast amounts of energy reserves that we need to tap so we can put people to work, bring down gas prices, and stretch paychecks further.

We've got to control our spending appetite. We've got to reform programs like Medicare so they're solvent. We've got to reform our safety net so that it works to get people on their feet. That's what this budget does.

In a nutshell, instead of spending $46 trillion over the next 10 years as we are currently poised to spend, we spend $41 trillion. Instead of growing spending on average at 5 percent a year, we grow it at 3.4 percent a year.

So for all of the predictions of doom and gloom and how evil and terrible and horrible our budget is, it increases spending every year by 3.4 percent a year instead of 5 percent a year. The difference is we balance the budget. The difference is we let families keep more of their own take-home pay. The difference is we make sure our kids inherit a debt-free future. The difference is we do what's necessary to create a healthy economy, more take-home pay, faster economic growth, and better jobs. That's why we are here, to balance the budget.

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

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

Last fall throughout this country, we had a vigorous debate. President Obama laid out his vision of how we deal with some of our big challenges with respect to the economy and the budget, and Governor Romney did the same thing. Both of them said the American people face a very important and fundamental choice, and the American people chose.

They chose to support President Obama's vision of accelerating economic growth, putting more people to work, taking a shared-responsibility approach to our long-term deficits so we bring them down in a balanced and smart way, and they rejected the idea that we're going to move the economy forward by giving windfall tax cuts to the very wealthiest in the country and that somehow the benefits of that would trickle down and lift everybody up. They rejected that lopsided approach that balanced the budgets on the backs of everybody but the folks at the very top. It balanced the budget on the backs of our kids' education by slashing important investments.

In that category of spending that we make these important investments for our country and our future, they doubled the cut from the sequester. Those are investments in our kids' education. Those are investments in science and research to help power our economy. Those are investments to help modernize our infrastructure. They cut transportation by 15 percent when we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

Mr. Chairman, the American people rejected the kind of uncompromising, lopsided approach that we see once again presented here in the House. It is the same thing we've seen for the last 3 years, as if we hadn't even had a debate last fall.

In the Democratic alternative, we focus on the main issue right now and in the future. We don't only want strong economic growth in the future; we want to see accelerated job growth right now. We've seen some momentum in the jobs market in the last couple of months, but the Republican budget will put the brakes on that growth.

The chairman of the Budget Committee can quote economists all he wants. There are economists that say it will do this or it won't do this or it will do that. But we have an umpire here in the Congress. We have a referee. It's called the Congressional Budget Office. They're nonpartisan. They're independent.

They tell us if you follow the approach of the Republican budget and keep the sequester in place through the end of this year, that by the end of this year we will have 750,000 fewer Americans working than otherwise. Why would we want to do that?

They tell us that if you take the approach followed by the Republican budget, that economic growth this calendar year will be cut by one-third. Why would we want to do that?

The Congressional Budget Office also tell us that a full half of our deficit this year is as a result of the fact that there are still lots of people looking for work who haven't found a job, and they project that three-quarters of the deficit next year in 2014 is as a result of

the fact that you have too many people who are unemployed. So let's attack the root of the problem right now and help put people back to work rather than put the brakes on the economy. That's what our budget will do.

This calendar year, in addition to preventing the 750,000 lost, we will generate another 450,000 jobs by investing in the economy. Next year, the difference between our plan and our colleagues' plan is 2 million more jobs under our budget proposal.

We believe that you've got to deal with the budget deficit, and at the same time you also need to focus on the jobs deficit to help deal with the budget deficit.

We also reduce the deficit in a steady, sustained way. We do it with balance. We do it with targeted cuts. But we also do it, Mr. Chairman, by eliminating some of the tax breaks and tax expenditures for very high-income individuals.

We heard from Governor Romney and we heard from the chairman of the Budget Committee last fall and this year that there are trillions of dollars of tax expenditures that disproportionately benefit very wealthy people. Under the Republican plan, they say we're going to get rid of some of your tax expenditures for high-income people, but we're going to bring down your top rate. So in the end, the folks at the very top actually get a big windfall.

We say let's eliminate some of those tax breaks for very wealthy people in order to help reduce our deficit so when you combine that savings with targeted cuts, you can reduce it in a balanced way rather than increasing the tax burden on the middle class, which is what their budget will do.

We also want to make sure we keep our commitments to our seniors and not transfer the risk and cost of rising health care costs onto the backs of seniors as the Republican budget does.

We don't reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, as the Republican budget does, which means that seniors with high prescription drug costs will end up paying thousands more out of pocket over the period of this budget.

In our budget, we make sure that student loan interest rates, which are set to double in July from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, we make sure they don't double. The Republican budget makes sure that they do. That will make college less affordable to millions of students.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by talking about the deficit impacts because the Republican budget does hit this—they say they're going to hit this political target of balance in 10 years. But it's a hoax because they say at the same time that their budget balances, that they're repealing all of ObamaCare, all of the Affordable Care Act.

The reality, Mr. Chairman, is they get rid of all the benefits of the Affordable Care Act. So the millions of Americans who would have had more affordable coverage, they won't get it; and the people who will no longer be excluded from getting coverage because of preexisting conditions, they'll make sure that they're denied coverage because of preexisting conditions because they take away the benefits.

But the dirty little secret, Mr. Chairman, is they keep the savings from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare. Without those savings, that budget doesn't balance.

So if we did what our Republican colleagues here say they want to do, which is this instant—repeal ObamaCare—they wouldn't have a budget that was in balance. You don't have to take my word for it. The Heritage Foundation, a very conservative think tank, just issued this statement: ''Perhaps the biggest shortcoming of this budget''—meaning the Republican budget—''is that it keeps the tax increases associated with ObamaCare.'' It keeps those.

It keeps all the savings in Medicare that were achieved as part of the Affordable Care Act where we achieved them by reducing the overpayments to the private insurance companies by changing the incentive structure to focus more on the quality of care rather than the quantity of care.

□ 1630

Do you remember all those Medicare savings that we heard our colleagues demagog in the last election last fall? They keep all those savings, and their balance wouldn't balance without them.

Our budget dramatically cuts the deficit and makes sure that our deficits are not growing faster than the economy, down to 2.4 percent by the end of the window. We stabilize the debt below where the CBO projects today, we stabilize 70 percent GDP. And, yes, we also will balance our budget in the same year that the Republican budget from last year balanced.

If this were just a race to balance the budget first, then people should vote for the Republican study group proposal—4 years. But if your priority is jobs and economic growth, as it should be as part of a measured and balanced approach to reducing the deficit, then you need to support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say the gentleman from Maryland is right: yes, we do balance the budget. Guilty, and proud to be guilty of that. We think balancing the budget is important.

More to the point, in the revenues we are saying we don't like this current Tax Code, so we can raise the same amount of revenue as the government with a better tax system, one that is pro-growth, one that creates jobs. That is precisely what the Ways and Means Committee is doing. That does not include the ObamaCare taxes, but it includes replacing the current revenue code that hurts jobs and hurts economic growth.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise because today's budget is the budget that helps American families. I rise today to support a budget that recognizes that the status quo is not only unacceptable to American families, but it is also unsustainable to the economy.

This budget that is before us now will finally restore much needed certainty, certainly to the economy, promote fairness, and provide those American families with the opportunity they are looking for to prosper. Importantly, this budget stops spending money that we simply do not have. At the same time, it advances commonsense changes in proposals to strengthen our Nation's safety net programs. We do that for American families.

So the Path to Prosperity takes us the first step towards reversing the path to debt and decline that the President and his fellow Democrats have laid out for the American people. To say that President Obama and the Democrats over in the Senate have failed to lead this Nation in what is probably the most predictable economic crisis in our Nation's history would be a drastic understatement.

Why is that? On February 4, the President's budget was due. On March 19, the American people are still waiting. It was over four times in 5 years that this President has failed to basically follow the law of the land and to submit a budget on time.

It is interesting that the President's brackets are always on time. His budgets, not so much.

The Senate Democrats are not any better. It took them almost 4 years to produce a budget that increases government spending by $265 billion, raises taxes on this country by almost $1 trillion; and, at the same time, it has cut health care providers by almost $300 billion.

Over the period covered by the budget, deficits under the Senate plan are going to be nearly $4 trillion—yes, $4 trillion larger than those under the House Republican budget that we are talking about right now.

Every family, every family in the country, every family in America, they understand the necessity of having a balanced budget. The President and Senate Democrats could surely learn by going back to their districts and learning from the example of American families across the country in how to set a budget. Families don't have the luxury of waiting for the next election. They don't have the luxury, if you will, of going through yet another cycle. Quite frankly, as we stand here today in Washington, neither does Washington.

Let's stop the spending insanity, if you will. Let's start putting the country back on track, and let's do this for the American family.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, who recognizes how important it is to keep our economy moving forward, not backwards.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this ill-conceived budget. For working families this project could mean a tax hit of $2,000, making it harder for families to afford rent and put food on the table.

The GOP plan also shortchanges seniors, ending Medicare in 10 years. Equally problematic, the Affordable Care Act would be repealed, reducing health care assistance to 176,000 families in my district and preventing 68,000 young people in my part of New York from staying on their parents' insurance.

We can also expect our economy to take a hit with 2 million jobs vanishing next year alone. Is this what we need to get this economy growing again? And for small businesses, this budget will mean losses. Sixteen thousand small firms in my district will lose tax assistance when purchasing health care, and thousands of would-be entrepreneurs around the country will see technical assistance and other services dry up, preventing the creation of new startups and blocking job creation.

Mr. Chairman, budgets should be about priorities. The American people rejected these flawed priorities last year when they voted to reelect President Obama. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' so we can approve a budget that is balanced, that is fair, that will create jobs, and that will move our Nation forward, together.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this budget resolution.

I just want to take a moment, too, to applaud the chairman and the members of his committee, and especially the hardworking staff of his committee for producing this document—a mere little band of less than 30 staffers.

By contrast, the President, with all the vast resources at his disposal in the executive branch, is now, I think, into the sixth week beyond his deadline in which he cannot pass his own budget. I assume that he will one day submit something. I hope that we will have a chance to vote on it. I will be curious to see if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle can produce more than the zero budgets that his budget produced last year.

The Senate, however, is even worse. They haven't produced a budget in 4 years. After seeing the budget that they will vote on, I now know, perhaps, why they did not produce such a document. It has over $1.5 trillion in new taxes, almost $1 trillion that are recognized, almost $500 billion to replace sequestration in unspecified closures of so-called loopholes, and another $100 billion in unspecified closures for new and ultimately failed stimulus spending.

And it never reaches balance—ever. The only thing we hear from balance on the Senate or the President is as a euphemism for new tax increases.

Finally, I want to point out that the last time the Senate passed a budget 4 years ago, I was a captain in the United States Army sitting at forward operating base Mehtar Lam in northeast Afghanistan. And I want to specifically single out the defense measures in this budget and to applaud, again, the leadership of the chairman and the Budget Committee for protecting our military, for giving it funding that it otherwise would not have and the flexibility it needs to help protect and keep this country safe. The Defense Department is the one area in government where the strategy should drive the budget, not the budget drive the strategy.

And the second way that it protects our military is from a debt crisis. This budget, as we have heard, is designed to postpone and ultimately prevent a debt crisis caused by out-of-control reckless spending in anemic economic growth of the kind you have seen in countries in Europe already.

If that were to happen, not only would it impact families all across the country when their interest rates for mortgages and farms and small businesses and education increase, but it also would crowd out all other kinds of priorities in our Federal budget. So it would immediately impact, as well, our troops, their families, and our veterans.

□ 1640

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, actually the Republican budget does follow some of our European friends, but follows them in the wrong way.

The strategy places like the U.K. have followed is an austerity approach—immediate deep cuts. And guess what that did? That sent them back into a recession. And again, the umpire around this place, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, said that if you take the approach in our Republican colleagues' budget, you'll have 750,000 fewer jobs by the end of this year. That is not a growth strategy. We cannot afford, here in the United States, the European-style austerity plan that is hurting those economies.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for yielding me this time.

Today I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget, a budget that makes absurd claims to reducing the deficit by repealing crucial government authority to protect our economy. Lest we forget, the Lehman Brothers disorderly bankruptcy sparked the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Should a megabank fail in the future, the Dodd-Frank Act specifically authorizes regulators to dissolve the failing firm, fire its executives, wipe out shareholders, and deny the claims of creditors. The gentleman from Wisconsin calls this a bailout—erroneously—concluding that the Dodd-Frank Act enshrines ''too big to fail'' when, in fact, it provides all of the necessary tools to end it. If Dodd-Frank actually did what the Republicans say, why does no large firm want to be designated as ''systematically significant''?

The Republican proposal also deceptively suggests that a repeal of the liquidation authority generates real savings to the American taxpayer. The Dodd-Frank legislation designed this authority to pay for itself over time, with any initial up-front costs being completely recouped by selling assets and imposing an assessment, after the resolution, on financial institutions with more than $50 billion in assets. The law specifically states that taxpayers shall bear no losses from the exercise of any authority under the liquidation title.

Once again, the Republican budget is misleading and dishonest. The National Journal has called the Republican proposal a ''budget gimmick,'' and even The Wall Street Journal dismissed it as mere ''budget quirks.''

If the authority to wind down a megafirm is repealed, the American taxpayer would be called on again to bear the risk of another financial crisis like in 2008, which the GAO found cost the U.S. economy $13 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this Republican budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to my friend from Maryland.

He keeps saying that the CBO says this plan is going to cost 750,000 jobs. That's an analysis done on the sequester starting with looking at calendar year January through calendar year December. Well, where are we? This budget doesn't deal with fiscal year 2013. It starts in October. So he's using a comparison of a statistic that they use, the same kind of economic short-term analysis they used to say that the stimulus would create millions of new jobs. They're using the same kind of analysis and say the sequester will cost these jobs, and it's a cut that isn't even in this budget.

More to the point, the Senate Democratic budget has the same appropriations number we have in our budget for fiscal year 2014. The point is what the CBO does say over the long term, if you

achieve this kind of deficit reduction that we are, a million new jobs a year by the end of the budget window—a 1.7 percent faster economic growth. CBO says that about this budget, about achieving this kind of deficit reduction. Stanford economists. You can create a million jobs a year. So you're seeing a consistent theme here: cutting spending and growing the economy and creating jobs.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), a senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you've been to Spain or not, but I have, just once. It's a beautiful country—nice people, great food, and at one time a large, vibrant, and growing economy, but not today. Today in Spain, over half of the people under 25 years old can't find work. The unemployment amongst all ages in Spain is about what we had during the Great Depression—not the Great Recession, the Great Depression of the thirties. And people on government medical care there can't get it. They can't get it when they want it because they've had to close a lot of their medical clinics in order to save money.

They had to do that because they waited too long to fix their fiscal problems. They waited until they had a debt crisis, and then they had to do what my friend from Maryland said: they had to impose an austerity program. They raised taxes and cut spending very quickly in a matter of just a year or so because that's what they had to do to continue being able to sell their debt.

That, Mr. Chairman, is exactly what we don't want to do. This is not speculation. This is not something we have to think about. It's there for us to see, and not just in Spain and Greece and Cyprus—in Japan, in a different form. It's there in other parts of the world. When you borrow so much money that people won't lend you any more, then you put in this austerity which causes these problems.

Unfortunately, that is what my friends on the other side of the aisle, their budgets will lead us to. More debts, more deficits, kind of a sugar high. They'll say: Oh, yeah, we're going to spend all this money; we'll create all these government jobs. For awhile we'll feel good, until the debt crisis comes, and then all that goes away.

What the Republican budget does is balance in 10 years, and not so that CPAs like me can achieve some symmetry that makes us feel good. It's because when you balance the budget, you set this balance up. It frees up the economy. People know that we're on that track to balance in 10 years. We won't have a debt crisis. People will know we won't have a debt crisis. The economy is freed up from the burden of too much debt, of knowing that there's a problem with no solution. There will now be a problem with a solution.

The economy will be freed up, both on the government side and on the private sector, and there will be more jobs and more jobs. That's what the Republican budget promises: an economy that grows and sustainable job creation, not a 1- or 2-year sugar high followed by a collapse. We've seen what not to do. We know the path not to take.

This Republican budget is the path we should take. I hope everyone will support it.

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

First, I want to point out again that our Republican colleagues cannot have it both ways. You can't claim you're going to balance in 10 years and claim that you got rid of all of the ObamaCare provisions, because if you look at this chart, you'll see in the year 2023, 10 years from now, they claim a balance of about $7 billion, right there. And yet if you look at this blue section here and the red section, you've got the revenues from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare, and the savings from Medicare that our colleagues campaigned against last fall, but they kept them right in their budget. Without those items, they don't come close to balance. In fact, they're about $400 billion short, in the 10th year, from balance.

We believe you've got to focus on getting the economy moving right now. That's why we call in our budget for getting rid of and replacing the sequester now, so you achieve the same deficit reduction over a longer, more measured, targeted period of time and don't do damage to the economy. And we reduce the deficit in a steady way so that it's way down below the growth in the economy by the 10-year window; and we do it in a way that is balanced, meaning we ask for shared responsibility. So we do it through a combination of cuts, but also we do say, for folks at the very high end of the income ladder, we can get rid of some of those tax expenditures, tax expenditures that our Republican colleagues have talked about, but not simply to reduce the rates for high-income individuals, but to help reduce the deficit as part of a balanced approach.

□ 1650

Now, if you look at the math on the Republicans' tax reform plan, it drops the top rate for folks at the very top from 39 percent all the way to 25 percent. We know that's going to cost about $4 trillion. They say they're going to make all that money up by taking tax expenditures away just from high-income people. The math doesn't work that way. You're going to have to increase taxes on middle-income taxpayers, or you're not going to hit your deficit target, one or the other.

So in the Budget Committee, we Democrats said, look, let's say to the Ways and Means Committee, when you do tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle-income taxpayers. And we had an amendment—I've got it right here—Protect the American Middle Class from Tax Increase. We said, if you're going to do tax reform, at least make the commitment that you're not going to increase taxes on middle-income families in order to finance tax breaks for the folks at the very top. Every one of our Republican colleagues on the committee voted ''no'' on that amendment. The committee's got lots of policy instructions on other stuff, but a policy request statement about not increasing taxes on the middle class, they all voted ''no.''

So we believe we have to reduce our deficits in a smart and vigorous but also balanced way, asking for shared responsibility going forward, not violating our commitments to seniors by reopening the doughnut hole, not by shredding Medicaid, which they cut by over $810 billion, and which would be one-third less in 2023 than it would otherwise be.

And, by the way, Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind people that two-thirds of Medicaid spending goes to seniors and individuals with disabilities.

So it's not a question of whether we reduce our long-term deficits, it's how we do it, and we do it in a balanced way. If this was just a race to be the first to balance, then you should support not the chairman's budget. Support the Republican Study Group, that other budget. But if your priority is to grow jobs and the economy, then you should support the Democratic alternative budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

So here's what my friend is saying, and I have three problems with what my friend from Maryland said. I have a problem with what he said in the beginning, in the middle, and in the end of what he said about all of what is happening here.

Here's his plan for economic growth: borrow more money and go and spend that money. Remember the stimulus? They're saying do it again. Then raise taxes. That's going to help the economy. Oh, and it's a balanced plan.

Here's the problem: their balanced plan doesn't balance the budget. We actually asked the CBO—they're claiming they will balance the budget in 2040. The CBO doesn't verify that. They're having to make assumptions that the CBO won't even back up to claim that they can somehow balance the budget.

But when I look at their deficits in their budget, yeah, they get the deficits going down in the first few years, and then it starts going back up. How on Earth do you tax $1.2 trillion, net increase spending, and claim you're balancing the budget?

Look, we've been trying this economic program for a while. We tried the borrowing and the spending. That didn't work. We just hit the economy with a $1.6 trillion tax increase. The

economy's not roaring right now. And what they're saying is let's do that all over again.

We are saying, fix the Tax Code. Replace it with a pro-growth tax system that helps small businesses, that helps job creators, that helps families. Get government spending appetite under control. The government is supposed to be spending 5 percent a year, on average, over the next 10 years. That's too much. That's more than the family budget gets. We say bring it down to 3.4 percent a year.

And so when you take a look at all of the smoke and mirrors, all of the claims, none of the Democratic budgets that are being brought to the floor here ever, ever balance the budget. How is that a balanced plan?

Balancing the budget is what every family does. Balancing the budget is what every business does. Balancing the budget is what every local government does. Surely our Federal Government can do this.

And one of the key ingredients to growing this economy, to making American businesses, big and small, competitive so that they can create jobs and give people more take-home pay, is to reform our tax system.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who is in charge of reforming our tax system.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a Federal budget that balances so we can strengthen our economy, create more jobs, and allow American workers to start seeing an increase in their paychecks again.

I know we can do it. I was a part of a team, a Republican Congress and a Democrat President, that balanced the budget for the first time in a generation. We focused on areas where we agreed and we made some tough choices, and we should do that again.

Balancing the budget is not just about the economy. It's about critical programs like Medicare and Social Security and the benefits they provide to millions of Americans. Social Security is already spending more money than it brings in, and the Medicare trust fund is going broke fast.

What does that mean?

Well, if Congress and the President don't act, America's seniors will face significant benefit cuts. That means smaller Social Security checks, up to 25 percent less, and fewer doctors willing to take Medicare.

So what should we do?

First, we pass a budget that balances, and that's what Republicans are doing. The Democrat substitute continues a policy of borrowing and spending and raising taxes and never gets to balance. Our budget, with pro-growth tax reform, has been scored by outside experts to create a million jobs in the first year alone.

Second, we need to look at the areas where we agree with the President and start making the reforms necessary to save programs like Social Security and Medicare.

The President said he's willing to use a different formula, chained CPI, to determine Social Security benefit increases. I know that policy will be included in the RSC budget. It's an area of agreement between the parties. Well, Mr. President, if we agree, then let's do it.

The same goes for reducing Medicare subsidies.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an extra minute.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has yet to expire, but the gentleman has 1 more minute.

Mr. CAMP. The same goes for reducing Medicare subsidies for wealthier seniors.

The American people expect us to make progress where we can. Let's not let our differences stand in the way. And if we agree on a policy, let's come together to start protecting and preserving critical programs like Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we actually have a kind of a yardstick that we can use to measure whether these budget approaches have a balanced approach, meaning that they ask for shared responsibility. You have the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles commission report, and they said we should reduce our deficits in a steady way through a combination of revenue, but also targeted cuts.

This Republican budget is totally lopsided. It provides tax windfalls to folks at the very top, and balances the budget at the expense of everybody else.

What we've proposed, actually, when you take into account the $1.5 trillion in cuts we made over the last couple of years and the $700 billion in revenue from January, and what we have in this budget, we actually have a higher ratio of cuts to revenue than that bipartisan Simpson-Bowles plan when you look at everything that's embedded in it. So that's measured against a bipartisan approach, and that gets us to where we need to be without hitting all the other priorities we have in our country.

With that, let me yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has looked at these numbers backwards and forwards, and I look forward to his comments.

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

Mr. LEVIN. This Republican budget is tone deaf, the result of blind ideology. But, you know, I've been listening to what's been said so far today, and the Republicans say, but they don't say how. We've just heard, we know we can do it, but you don't say how.

□ 1700

So what we come up with on the Republican side is a mirage—and, I think, a dangerous one.

Let me give you have an example, talking about their proposals on taxes. Under their budget, the top rate is to be reduced from 39.6 percent to 25 percent. The AMT will be repealed. The corporate tax rate will be cut from 35 to 25 percent. But you won't find one syllable in the Republican budget on how all these tax cuts will be paid for. They don't identify a single tax policy that will end.

The Republican budget would mean a huge tax cut for the very wealthy—several hundred thousand dollars a year—and leave a nearly $6 trillion hole in the deficit that would lead to tax increases for middle-income families. That isn't balance. That's total imbalance. At the same time, Republicans propose cutting $3.3 trillion from programs for people with low or moderate incomes, including hundreds of billions of dollars from food nutrition and Medicaid programs.

So I want to end by asking when the Republicans come and talk about their tax proposals, name a specific that they would address. It's not in the Republican budget. Name one, name two, name three. Otherwise, it's worse than empty.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank Chairman RYAN for his distinguished leadership in bringing this budget to the floor. I rise in high support of it. I also am very proud. It's one of the highest honors I have had in my short time here to serve on this committee, not because of chairman RYAN only, but because of the members. By members, I mean Republican members and Democrat members. I note for the Record that Mr. LEVIN is not a member of the Budget Committee. But there are great people who are. That's why it's perhaps because of some of that pride that I'm disappointed to hear the ranking member characterize the accomplishment—because that's what it is—the accomplishment of balancing within 10 years as some sort of political goal.

Families who are trying to put food on the table, neighborhood associations, nonprofits, and for-profit businesses, for that matter, that have to make a budget balance every day, every month, ever year, I think should be offended by that characterization. It's not a political goal.

You know what's political, Mr. Chair? It's never balancing. You know what's political is the immoral idea that we are going to put more on our plate now, add up deficit after deficit, create a bigger and bigger debt, and then make people who don't even exist yet pay for it. Why is that political? Because, Mr. Chair, the people in the here and now can vote. Generations in the future, our grandkids who don't yet

exist, can't vote. And that's what makes the other approaches we've heard about immoral, wrong, political. We balance. We balance within 10 years.

Now let's contrast that a bit—our responsible approach—to what the Senate Democrats have done, for example. Next year alone, the Senate Democrats' budget increases spending by $162 billion above what we're spending today. Over 10 years it increases our debt by $7.3 trillion from today's levels, despite a massive tax hike that they have. And that tax hike adds $1.5 trillion in new taxes. So even after that, they still add to the debt—our kids' debt, our grandkids' debt—by $7.3 trillion.

Again, Mr. Chair, it never balances. After 4 years and $6 trillion in debt since a budget was even last passed, the Senate Democrats' vague proposal leaves America with even more debt and government that never stops growing. Amazingly, after 4 years, the Democrats were unable to identify any real reforms—no tax reform and no entitlement reform. It's simply not a serious proposal.

I stand, again, in support of the House budget because it's responsible, it's real, it balances in 10 years, and it's the last thing from political.

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

Do you know what's wrong, Mr. Chairman? What's wrong is to pretend to the American people that you can have it all ways. What's wrong is to pretend that you've got a budget that's in balance in 10 years and pretend that you're getting rid of all of the Affordable Care Act, all of ObamaCare. What's wrong is going around the country demagoguing $715 billion in Medicare savings, which we achieve by ending overpayments to private insurance companies and Medicare, and then using it to balance your budget and then saying, We didn't use it to balance our budget. That's what people don't like, is people trying to have it all ways.

We have taken an approach to steadily and rapidly reduce our deficits in a way that doesn't interfere and hurt economic and job growth right now. And we do it in a balanced way. And what I find astounding is to hear our Republican colleagues talk about the deficit and debt in one breath and then talk about all those tax breaks and expenditures that disproportionately benefit very wealthy people in the other breath and then say they won't close one single tax loophole for wealthy people for the purpose of reducing the deficit—not one dime in their budget for that purpose. And yet they're willing to hit Medicaid to the tune of $110 billion. They're willing to hit the food and nutrition program by over $100 billion. They're ready to hit transportation funding by over 15 percent in this budget window. And yet they're not willing to close one of those more than $4 trillion in tax loopholes to reduce the deficit. I think that's wrong.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, a member of the Budget Committee (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. The Federal budget is a statement of our priorities and our values as a Nation. The budget should be fiscally responsible and reduce the deficit, it should make investments to grow our economy, and it should meet our obligations to our seniors, to our families, and to our future. And the Republican budget fails all three. The Republican budget threatens our Nation by undermining our economic growth and by shifting the financial burden for the deficit and for deficit reduction to our seniors and the middle class.

Republicans have made their choices clear: end Medicare as we know it, adding costs to seniors today and ending the Medicare guarantee tomorrow; slash investments for economic competitiveness; and give millionaires an average of $400,000 in tax breaks. The Republican budget eliminates protections for millions of our sickest, frailest seniors who depend on nursing home and home health services. And the Republican budget will increase taxes for average middle class families by $3,000. Their choices will cost 2 million jobs next year alone and decrease economic growth by 1.7 percent.

In contrast, the Democratic alternative preserves the Medicare guarantee; makes key investments in education, innovation, and infrastructure necessary for job creation and economic growth; and protects the middle class from large tax increases. The Democratic alternative reduces the deficit in a fiscally responsible and balanced way, without causing harm today and without threatening our economic competitiveness for the future. It reduces the deficit while meeting our commitments to our seniors, our frailest elderly, and our children.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget that threatens our seniors, our middle class, and our economic growth, and to vote for the Democratic alternative that builds on our great strengths as a Nation—an innovative, entrepreneurial business sector with a skilled, hardworking middle class. Vote for the Democratic alternative that builds on hope, opportunity, and security for all Americans.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentlelady from Pennsylvania said that we're ending Medicare as we know it. I've got news for you: ObamaCare ended Medicare as we know it.

And what our budget does is it takes those statements from Medicare and makes sure it stays in Medicare, that it doesn't go fund another program. Stop the raid of Medicare, make sure that those savings, as the gentleman says, are necessary and worthwhile, and stay with Medicare to make it more solvent, to extend the life of the trust fund and not double-count it, to raid it to spend on ObamaCare.

□ 1710

Loopholes. I enjoy this conversation, because what we keep hearing is: close loopholes for the purpose of deficit reduction. What it really means is: take more money and spend it in Washington. We're saying: close loopholes to lower tax rates for everybody.

The problem with our Tax Code is it's not fair. If you have access, if you have good clout, you can get a loophole in the Code and pay lower taxes. If you're a family sitting home in Janesville, Wisconsin, you're paying whatever tax rate. We are saying the person or the business that has the same amount of income should pay the same kind of tax rate.

With that, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, every business, every family, and every person in America eventually has to balance a budget. I am a small business owner; I still own a business. I have owned and operated my business for 41 years, and I balance my budget every month—and in many cases every day. The government should be no different.

Now, until we balance our budget, we don't know the true fiscal condition of our country, or our company, or our family. Just like a business that is overleveraged or a family that has overborrowed, deficit spending can obscure the real picture; but eventually the truth comes out. Once the numbers line up, you get an exact view of your fiscal condition. We've gone far too long without knowing our country's financial condition.

In the last 4 years, we've had trillion-dollar deficits. In 2011, our Nation's credit rating was downgraded. This year, our publicly held debt is on track to exceed 76 percent of GDP in 2013. Yet we still spend more money that we don't have, pushing the country towards a debt-driven financial crisis. If the Federal Government didn't have the ability to print money, we'd have a negative net worth, and we'd be in a weak financial position.

A budget is a blueprint. A budget is a roadmap; it's a plan. Our Nation's budget doesn't need to have balance as its end goal; it needs to be our starting point. It's the only way to guarantee that the public debt will not outgrow the economy, which would certainly crowd out private investment, raise interest rates, and increase inflation.

Now, I'm proud to stand in support of the Path to Prosperity. It's a responsible, balanced budget that is right for America. This budget balances, cuts wasteful spending, and fixes our broken Tax Code—all without raising taxes.

I applaud Chairman RYAN and my colleagues on the House Budget Committee for their tremendous work in presenting the American people with what they want—a budget that works. With this plan, we will apply the same principles that families and businesses use every day.

I predict our country's best financial days will surely be ahead of us, because unlike our Democratic friends, we balance. It means jobs, it means prosperity, and it means opportunity. Small business and the people of America are begging for this budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out to my colleagues that the Affordable Care Act, with the reforms it made to Medicare, we extended the life of the Medicare trust fund as part of that effort going forward.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Does that mean that money is not going to fund ObamaCare, and does that mean there's a $716 billion hole in the funding of ObamaCare?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. That means, as in your budget, that we will help reduce the deficit by whatever amount it was. But what we do not do in our budget is fund tax breaks for folks at the very top by raising them on folks in the middle.

Listen, let me say just one other thing here, Mr. Chairman. We've had four balanced budgets in this country in the last 40 years. It wasn't under President Reagan. It wasn't under the first President Bush. It wasn't under the second President Bush. It was 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001. It was under President Clinton. And then President Bush came in and did a big tax cut in 2001, putting us out of balance for a long period of time.

During the period of time when the budget was in balance the last four times out of 40 years, the revenue that was coming in was higher than it is in any year in the Republican budget that's before us now. What that tells you is that their budget approach is trying to seek balance on the backs of everybody else by really cutting into those important investments that have helped power our economy by violating important commitments to seniors and, in the end, by raising taxes on middle-income people. Why else would they not have joined Democrats in sending a policy statement to the Ways and Means Committee that says: When you go about eliminating tax preferences, don't hit middle-income taxpayers in the process.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the mortgage interest deduction, for example, the mortgage interest deduction really helps middle-income people—homeowners. So in addition to saying: Ways and Means Committee, when you do tax reform, don't hit middle-income taxpayers, we specifically said: Don't take away the mortgage interest deduction for middle-income taxpayers. Again, all our Republican colleagues voted against that.

They've been talking about tax reform for 3 years now. We've never seen a piece of paper from them as to how they would do it, which is why we wanted to make sure that they don't do it in certain ways that help middle-income people. But no, can't do that.

So let's make sure that as we address our deficit issues, we do it in a way that calls for shared responsibilities, not another round of tax breaks for the wealthy on the backs of everybody else.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), one of our distinguished members of the Budget Committee.

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. Well, this is an austerity plan and an inequality plan, this Republican budget. I want people to behold the plunder of suckling babes—the young, elderly, the infirm, women, communities of color—by $810 billion cuts in Medicaid and $135 billion in SNAP. It is not humorous to me. I want you to beware of the claims that we're going to grow our economy by ending 750,000 jobs, by pillaring Pell Grants, and cutting off educational opportunity to students.

This is not a balanced budget. This is a budget blunder which plunders us into double-dip recession. I'll tell you, Ben Bernanke, our Fed chair, warns against these kinds of severe austerity cuts. If you don't believe him, take the word of Plato. He said: In a state which is desirous of being saved from the greatest of plagues, there should exist among the citizens neither extreme poverty, nor, again, excessive wealth, for both are productive of great evil.

So we plunge poor people into poverty and give $245,000 tax breaks to the wealthiest. I think that qualifies for not only an austerity plan that can harm us, but it is the greatest inequality plan that this body has seen.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think the reference to Plato reveals a mindset that the country ought to be run by a handful of philosopher kings instead of the people.

I yield myself 10 seconds to simply say this budget, this plundering, evil, cutting budget increases spending, on average, 3.4 percent a year instead of 5 percent a year.

With that, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, this debate over the budget reflects a great struggle between American families and their government over whether they or the government can best spend the money that they have earned. This budget bends that struggle slowly back in favor of those families by returning to them a little of the freedom to spend more of their own money and make more of their own decisions once again.

The prosperity of American families is directly affected by government spending. Government cannot put a dollar into the economy that it first hasn't taken out of the economy.

□ 1720

It's true we see the government job that's created when government puts that dollar back in. What we don't see as clearly is the job that's destroyed when government first pulls that dollar out. We see those lost jobs as chronic unemployment and a stagnating economy.

Every billion dollars spent in Washington means taking $9 from an average family, either in direct taxes or in tax-driven price increases as businesses pass along their costs to consumers. That means that $1 trillion of new taxes that the Senate has proposed means $9,000 per family. Now we're told, don't worry, that's all paid by businesses. But businesses don't pay business taxes, they only collect them. They pass them on to us as consumers through higher prices, to us as employees through lower wages, or to us as investors through lower earnings, usually on our 401(k)s. A trillion dollars of deficit, as we ran up last year, really means $9,000 of future taxes for every family, robbing our children of their futures.

It's about time we started thinking about these numbers in family-sized terms, because ultimately these numbers have a very real impact on families who are struggling to balance their own budgets, to set their own priorities and to look after their own needs.

Now, these days, we've passed more than one-third of the cost of government on to our children, and we financed the remainder through a tax system in which politicians pick winners and losers through an appallingly unfair and distorted Tax Code.

This budget calls for doing away with these tax distortions that reward some and punish others, distortions that shift capital away from economic expansion and into the service of political interests. This budget calls for flattening and lowering tax rates to assure that no American family pays more than one-quarter of its earnings to the Federal Government.

Those nations that have adopted similar reforms have been rewarded with explosive economic growth. That means fairness for every American taxpayer and an economy unshackled from the burdens and political favoritism of our current system.

In short, freedom works, and it's time that we put it back to work.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, just to be very clear on what the Senate Democratic plan does and what the House Democratic plan does with respect to revenue, again, we heard from Governor Romney and others last year that there are about $4 trillion in these distortions and preferences in the Tax Code that help very wealthy people. What we say is, we should get out some of that clutter, some of those preferences, and use some of that to help reduce the deficit. And we say at the

same time when you do tax reform, don't touch middle-income taxpayers, and when we asked our Republican colleagues to give us that assurance in the form of an amendment in the Budget Committee, they all voted ''no.''

So, yes, we think that you can eliminate some of the tax breaks and preferences that Mr. MCCLINTOCK just talked about, and you can use some of them to reduce the deficit. But the Republican budget won't use one dime of those to help reduce the deficit.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State who is both on the Budget Committee and on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCDERMOTT.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, you've got to ask yourself what we're doing here today. We're fearmongering again. We spent last week, we spent the last campaign, we spent the last number of years really presenting to Americans that we're in imminent doom, and gloom is coming to America. We're going to be the next Spain, we're going to be the next Italy, the next Greece and probably tomorrow the next Cyprus.

Our debt is so bad, we're told, that we have to take food out of the mouths of children through the nutrition program and send seniors out with vouchers to take care of their Medicare. And then this weekend, an epiphany occurred. Speaker BOEHNER came on television and told the American people, ''we do not—we do not have an immediate debt crisis.'' And Mr. RYAN, the chairman, was asked, and he agreed.

They finally told the truth. This is not about debt. If the Speaker and Mr. RYAN are right, why are they feeding us this Austerity Kool-Aid all the time? Why are they sabotaging the economy by throwing hundreds of thousands of jobs away in the sequestration? Why are they stunting our future by cutting the legs off our R&D programs and the National Institutes of Health? Why are they asking seniors, kids, the sick and the poor to go without health care and food security to pay for a fantasy crisis?

Why? Because they have needed an excuse to do what they've been attempting for generations to do, and that is disable the safety net; to get rid of Social Security, to get rid of Medicare, to get rid of unemployment, and to get rid of everything that makes a social safety net in a civil society. This charade is built on the fundamental deception that we are on the brink of an economic apocalypse so that politicians can wipe out the programs that people need so that they can give tax breaks to the people at the top.

The Speaker knows it, Mr. RYAN knows it, and it's about time the American people know it. You need not be afraid. Vote ''no.''

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that was pretty good scaremongering if I ever heard any.

Like I said, the whole purpose of balancing the budget is to prevent a crisis from happening in the first place. What happened to Europe? They kicked the can down the road. They spent more than they could take in. They borrowed until they couldn't borrow at affordable rates, and then a crisis hit. We know that's where we're headed.

Look, the federal budget is growing at about 5 percent a year, and the family budget is growing at about 2½ percent a year. We want to get the family budget on course with the federal budget or vice versa.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee, a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, Mrs. BLACK.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, nearly 23 million Americans are still struggling to find work, and millions more low- and middle-income Americans are struggling with the reality of depressed wages, higher food and gas prices, and rising health care costs.

It is clear that the President's tax-and-spend policies are putting the American Dream further and further out of reach of more and more Americans. It's hard to get ahead in America when you can barely get by—paying your rent, putting food on the table and getting to and from work.

I believe the status quo is not working, and I believe that the American people deserve better than the chronically high unemployment, record levels of debt, unrealized dreams and a diminished future.

That is why I stand here today to urge my colleagues to support the House Republicans' Path to Prosperity budget. The Path to Prosperity budget funds America's priorities. It protects important entitlement programs, it saves our social net, it repeals the President's budget-busting health care law, reforms our broken code and balances within a decade.

President Obama and the congressional Democrats say that they want to get America back to work and support a ''balanced approach'' to our fiscal problems. But they also support record deficits and budgets that never ever balance. Instead of government living within its means, the Democrats' budgets raise taxes to fuel more spending, and in turn, millions of Americans remain out of work. The only place that these failed policies will lead is to higher unemployment, depressed wages and a crushing debt crisis.

The majority of Americans are not satisfied with the current state of our economy, and they're not hopeful about the future. And who can blame them? I believe the American people deserve better than the status quo, and I believe the American people deserve leaders here in Washington who are honest with themselves and their constituents about the challenges facing our Nation and what it's going to take to get this Nation back on track.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Mrs. BLACK. I urge the House to pass the Path to Prosperity budget and for the President to work with the congressional Republicans to balance the budget so that we can start to create the conditions for economic growth, job creation and more opportunities for current and future generations of Americans.

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

We heard earlier about the United States becoming Spain and others have compared it to Greece. The reality is that right now the danger is that we follow the European austerity measures that we've seen do damage to economies like that in the U.K., and that's what our Republican colleagues are calling for in their budget.

□ 1730

Yes, we need to reduce our long-term deficits, but we also need to make sure we keep the facts straight. And in the Republican budget pamphlet this year, they show this big tidal wave of red ink, which I believe the chairman showed earlier today, that's based on an outdated Congressional Budget Office analysis that doesn't take into account much of the deficit reduction we've done over the last couple of years, including the revenue in the fiscal cliff agreement. That's why the organization FactCheck.org said that the Republican budget proposal exaggerates future growth of the Federal debt in a chart contained in their newly released budget plan.

So we need to keep this in perspective, and that's what we do in our budget: we focus on economic growth now and economic growth in the future. And, yes, because of the reduction in the rate of increase in health care costs and using, actually, an assumption that the discretionary parts of our budget and mandatory we assume grow faster than the chairman asked the CBO to project, our budget comes into balance the same year as the Republican budget last year came into balance, but we do it without balancing it on the backs of other essential priorities that are important to the American people.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a terrific new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. I rise today to join my Democratic colleagues on the House Budget Committee to staunchly oppose the budget proposal we have considered last week in committee.

Mr. Chairman, I was not in Congress last year when the budget was considered in the House, but it sure seems like my Republican colleagues want to make sure I didn't miss a thing since

the proposal before us today represents little more than the same recycled, unrealistic policies that have been rejected by both the Congress and the American people.

This is a budget based on bad math and unrealistic assumptions. It keeps the savings and revenue from the Affordable Care Act, but it repeals its benefits to the people. It cuts taxes for the wealthiest without identifying how they'll pay for the trillions, and it takes almost a trillion dollars in unspecified cuts that will likely target programs for the needy and disadvantaged. With all those unrealistic assumptions, I am surprised there's not a provision that requires leprechauns to steal the pots of gold at the end of rainbows and then to count that as revenue. Mr. Chairman, that could have been a trillion dollars and you'd have a surplus now.

Mr. Chairman, while the math may be bogus, the budget will have real and serious effects on the people of Wisconsin. It keeps the sequester in place, which costs the people of Wisconsin 36,000 jobs; and across America, that's 2 million jobs. It will turn Medicare into a voucher program, forcing 850,000 Wisconsin seniors out of traditional Medicare, eventually, people like my mother. And it will raise taxes on middle class families by more than $3,000 while giving the richest a $245,000 tax break.

We need to balance the budget responsibly by getting people back to work. That's the best way to reduce our deficit. We need to create jobs. Economists of both stripes say we should do it and the CBO says we should do it. We need to get it done.

I urge my colleagues to reject the backward-looking plan from our friends on the other side of the aisle and, instead, embrace a forward-looking plan on job growth.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to say I simply dispute my friend from Wisconsin's interpretation.

This is the chart the gentleman from Maryland was talking about. Guess where we got this chart from? The Congressional Budget Office. It's the most recent numbers they've given us. Will they give us new numbers this summer? Yes. And guess what? It's still going to show a whole bunch of red ink. We can't wish away this debt problem. One year of spending and $3 for every $2 that you're taking in, you've got a problem. We've got to deal with that.

We know we're giving the next generation an inferior standard of living. If we keep down this path, we will have a crisis, yes. That's not fearmongering. The gentleman was talking about the fiscal commission. Erskine Bowles, President Clinton's chief of staff, says this debt is a cancer on society, that we will have a crisis. The problem is: there are Democrats who agree with the facts; it's not the Democrats who are writing these budgets, though. That's our problem.

Mr. Chairman, we're going to have to come together sooner or later to deal with this. That's why I want to yield 4 minutes to the vice chair of the Budget Committee, a gentleman who's offered lots of wisdom on this committee, the doctor from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. RYAN for his remarkable leadership on this and many other areas.

Mr. Chairman, it is no wonder that folks are confused out there. I tell you, there is so much misinformation that is coming, and the fearmongering that is coming from the other side is truly remarkable. So let's try to set the record and the motive straight.

Republicans care about seniors staring at devastating reductions in Medicare under current law. Republicans care about workers and middle class folks fighting to make ends meet with increased gas prices and increased food prices and on and on. Republicans care about young people struggling to get started in careers and being crushed by government rules and regulations. Republicans care about students getting out of school and not being able to get a job in their field. Because we care about seniors and workers and single moms and young people and students, because we care about all Americans, we present this responsible, balanced budget.

Budgets, Mr. Chairman, are about priorities. Priorities that the American people overwhelmingly support include getting Federal spending under control—poll after poll tells you that—getting our economy moving again so we can get folks back to work, and getting our debt crisis under control so that we may preserve the American Dream for future generations. These are precisely the priorities of our House Republican budget, the Path to Prosperity.

This Path to Prosperity is the way to responsibly balance our budget. American families all across this great land know that the Federal Government shouldn't spend more than we take in, and we agree.

Let's look at a couple of specific items.

Our friends talked on the other side about loopholes. We're interested in closing loopholes, you bet. The gentleman from Maryland says not one dime of closing loopholes will go to reduce the deficit on our side. He's absolutely wrong, Mr. Chairman. He's just wrong. I've had this discussion with him. He is simply wrong. It's really sad that he perpetuates that misinformation.

Second, taxes. The gentlelady from Pennsylvania said that we were interested in raising taxes by some remarkable amount. I can't even remember what it was. In fact, we don't. We actually balance the budget without raising taxes.

Mr. Chairman, they can't have it both ways. They can't say that our plan is not specific enough on taxes and then say it's so specific that we increase taxes by a specific amount. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, as you know and our friends on the other side of the aisle know, it's the Ways and Means Committee that develops the tax plan. That's why the Budget Committee doesn't address it.

As a physician, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that taking $716 billion from Medicare and spending it on something else means that seniors are not going to have the kind of quality health care that they need, and that's why we go get that $716 billion. We'll bring it right back to the Medicare program. It's imperative to do that to keep quality health care in this country.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Then, finally, they talk about slashing and severe cuts to spending. Mr. Chairman, our budget increases spending by 3.4 percent every single year, on average, and we do that because that's the number that you need in order to bend the curve down so that we do indeed get to balance.

Mr. Chairman, the Path to Prosperity ensures that we're honoring America's most important priorities. Our budget saves and strengthens and secures Medicare. We protect national security. It cares for the poor and the sick by repairing America's safety net programs. And we expand economic opportunities for all.

We believe in the industriousness and the ingenuity and the dreams of the American people. It's time that we have a government that is worthy of the people that we represent.

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

Let's start with taxes. What the Republican budget does is provide a windfall tax break for folks at the very top. People listening can do the math. You're dropping the top tax rate from 39 percent to 25 percent right off the bat. That's about a cut of one-third in the top rate for millionaires. That's a huge loss of revenue.

How do they make up that revenue? Well, if you're going to really make sure you don't increase the deficit, math tells you you're going to increase taxes on middle-income people to help pay for those tax breaks, which is exactly why we offered an amendment in committee saying, okay, Ways and Means Committee, when you do tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle income folks. They voted against that. There are lots of other provisions in the Republican budget that provide guidance to other committees, but they didn't want to provide them that guidance.

□ 1740

So the point is that they provide tax breaks to the folks at the very top while leaving middle-income folks vulnerable; but on net, they do not close one tax loophole out of those four trillions to reduce the deficit. Do you

know how we know that, Mr. Chairman? Because their revenue line is constant with the baseline. So Mr. PRICE is just dead wrong when he says they close tax loopholes to increase revenue for the purpose of reducing the deficit. It's not in there. It's just dead wrong.

Now let's get the record straight about what the Republican budget does to different groups that Mr. PRICE referenced:

Seniors. Here is what the AARP, the largest organization representing seniors, says about what the Republican plan will do:

> The chairman's proposal fails to address the high costs of health care and, instead, shifts costs on to seniors and future retirees. Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable coverage seniors have contributed to through a lifetime of hard work is not the answer.

That's the AARP.

The Medicaid cuts. There are $810 billion in cuts. Again, I'll remind people that two-thirds of that goes to seniors and people with disabilities. Here is what the nonpartisan, independent Congressional Budget Office said would be the impact of those kinds of cuts:

> It means, because they block-grant the program to States with a lot less money, States would need to increase their spending on these programs, make considerable cutbacks in them or both. Cutbacks might involve the reduced eligibility for Medicaid and CHIP—that's children's health—the coverage of fewer services, lower payments to providers, or increased cost sharing by beneficiaries, all of which would reduce access to care.

So whether it's in Medicare or in Medicaid, we violate commitments to seniors in this budget.

He talked about kids and education. Their budget would allow in July the doubling of the student loan interest rate from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, making college less affordable. Our budget makes sure there is not that doubling.

Also, we had an earlier conversation with Ms. MOORE about the impact of people in poverty. I'll just give you one example:

In the category of the budget that helps with the Women, Infants, and Children program—this is the program that helps pregnant women and women with very young children get nutrition assistance—they double the sequester cut. Then they tell us it's not going to have any impact—not on that and not on doubling the sequester cut on the National Institutes of Health and the research they do. Somehow, magically, all that will be funded even though you double the sequester cut—more than double it—in that category of the budget.

So their budget, while providing these windfall tax breaks to the folks at the very top, and their budget, while slowing down economic growth in the economy right now, also means we undermine other important priorities in our country.

I would now like to yield 2 minutes to a new, distinguished member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. I rise to oppose the Republican budget for a very fundamental reason: it would be devastating to the health and well-being of America's seniors.

This budget raises seniors' costs for preventive services; it reduces access to nursing home care; and it reopens the Medicare prescription drug doughnut hole, which means that, for seniors with high prescription drug costs, they could end up paying on average $13,000 more over the next 10 years. The Republican budget also tries, once again, to end the guarantee of affordable coverage under Medicare by converting that program into a private sector voucher that will not keep up with costs; and that's going to leave seniors, who are on fixed incomes, holding the bag.

The Republican study group budget is even worse. It forces chained CPI on Social Security. What ''chained CPI'' means is, quite simply, reduced benefits for seniors who've paid into the system, earned those benefits, need them, and are counting on them.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for a budget that protects billions of dollars in special interest tax breaks for the wealthy and for the most powerful corporate interests while reducing benefits for seniors and shredding the social safety net.

My 83-year-old mom is like millions of seniors around this country. She did her part by working hard all her life, paying into the system, paying her taxes; and when she retired, she counted on a guarantee that her government would honor its end of the bargain. I intend to make sure that it does. We can reduce the deficit without forcing extra costs on the middle class, seniors and the most vulnerable in our society, and that's why I'm supporting the Democratic budget alternatives, which do four essential things:

One, they honor our commitment to seniors; two, they focus on jobs and economic growth, which is a far better way to balance our budget; three, they maintain our safety net; finally, fourth, they keep us on the path of health care reform, which is going to bend the costs that are creating these problems.

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

Mr. Chairman, another chart. The red line shows where spending is going. These are Congressional Budget Office numbers. The green line shows our historic revenues. The blue line shows the additional revenues that President Obama has called for. He has already gotten a big chunk of this—he just got $617 billion—but even if we got all the tax increases that President Obama and his allies in Congress are calling for, it wouldn't even pay for a fifth of all the deficit spending that's coming.

This is where spending is going. We are spending ourselves into a debt crisis. We will never, ever balance the budget if we keep spending growing at the pace it's growing right now. We have to do something about this because, if we don't, our families will receive a bankrupt country; economic growth will slow; and our kids will be guaranteed a diminished future. We owe it to our countrymen, to our economy, to our kids to get this under control.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, also a member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I do want to thank Mr. RYAN for his leadership on this budget.

Mr. Chairman, we've talked a lot about the big picture. I want to make it personal.

In the early 1990s, I lost my job in a corporate merger. For about 48 hours, I moped around, feeling sorry for myself; but then, one morning, my wife and I got up. We made a pot of coffee, and we got out a sheet of notebook paper, and right down the middle of the page we drew a line. On one side, we wrote down: this is what we have coming in. On the other side, we wrote down: this is how we're going to spend it. We shed some tears that morning as we made difficult decisions. The reason I tell that very personal story is that there is no question in my mind that, today, there are Americans sitting at their kitchen tables—with that same piece of paper, shedding those same tears.

Before I got here, I served in the State senate. I chaired the Appropriations Committee, and I worked with the Democrat chairman in the State house as we made difficult decisions in balancing our State budget. Families, State legislatures, small businesses around this Nation are making those difficult decisions. They have every reason to expect their policymakers in Washington to do the same thing.

I support this budget proposal because it does make tough decisions and balances our budget. I support this proposal on behalf of my mom and dad, who worked all of their lives and paid into a system, and their government made them a promise that said when you get to age 65, we're going to provide you with health care. Yet the actuaries for that system say that their government is in danger of not being able to honor its promise.

I support this budget on behalf of my parents because this budget says we repeal a system of unelected bureaucrats that will make health care decisions for them. I support this budget on behalf of my children and their peers who are entering the workforce, yet are facing job creators with an uncertainty of what's coming out of Washington. I support this budget on behalf of my two grandchildren, to whom I will not be part of passing on a debt that will jeopardize their future.

We hear our friends on the other side of the aisle say, Well, what we need to

do is raise taxes so that we can spend more. We're going to tax this current generation $1.5 trillion more. We're going to tax future generations so that we can spend more.

That is not the right approach. That's why I support this budget.

□ 1750

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, just to be clear in terms of the Democratic proposals, if you take our budget proposal here together with the work that we have done over the last couple of years, which reduces spending by over $1.5 trillion, $700 billion in revenue, take that all together, means $4 trillion in deficit reduction over that amount, over the period of the window, and we do it in a balanced way. We don't do it the same time we are providing windfall tax breaks to folks at the very top. We don't do it on the backs of other important priorities. We do it by growing the economy and asking for shared responsibility, so we have shared prosperity in this country.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the so-called Ryan budget Path to Prosperity, which really should be called the Ryan budget ''Mainline to Misery for the Middle Class.'' Budgets are a reflection of our Nation's values, and it is clear that the House Republicans chose to favor the ultrawealthy over the weak, the sick, the poor, and the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, this is just more of the same old, same old: more tax breaks for the wealthy, an end to Medicare as we know it—they don't care anything about Medicare—broken promises to our seniors, and higher taxes on the middle class.

For the middle class, this Ryan budget is a road to ruin. For the middle class, this Ryan budget is a shortcut to suffering. Issuing vouchers for health care and gutting programs for low- and middle-income Americans at the expense of budget-busting tax cuts for the wealthy is not the best way forward for our Nation.

I look forward to supporting the Democratic budget, which reduces the deficit in a balanced way while strengthening the economy, bolstering the middle class, and investing in our future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. There are too many points to refute, so I won't bother trying.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. RIBBLE.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

It has been quite an afternoon already: slash, cut, tone deaf, burn, plunder, shred, eviscerate, end Medicare as we know it, balance the budget on the backs of our seniors, and then my favorite, austerity Kool-Aid. There has been enough hyperbole in this room today, I should have brought my boots.

Let's talk about austerity. We talk a lot about the least fortunate about us, the concern for seniors and for veterans and the most needy. This is what the budget actually does. These are the real numbers. I have read the real budget—not somebody's report on the budget, but the real budget.

This is what we do for veterans. We increase from $145 billion to $187 billion. That's a 20 percent increase, a 20 percent increase over a decade. That is a $1.675 trillion commitment to our veterans.

Then I heard we are going to end Medicare as we know it. Well, $509 billion to $864 billion in Medicare over a decade, if this is austerity Kool-Aid, I don't know how you can define $6.656 trillion as austerity Kool-Aid.

I have heard a lot of people say I'm concerned about my mom. My colleagues have said it on both sides of the aisle. I want you to know, moms, we have got your back to the tune of $6.656 trillion. We are here for you.

Let's look at Social Security. We hear that Social Security is going to be in trouble. Well, this budget goes from $854 billion to $1.423 trillion. So what does that come out to? Well, it is just a meager $11.15 trillion over the next decade on Social Security alone.

So what does that do for these three programs? Three programs, Mr. Chairman, this is our austerity Kool-Aid: $19,481,692,000,000 on three programs, nearly $3 billion more than the accumulated national debt in the last two centuries. If this is leaving our seniors behind, if this is leaving the most fortunate behind, I don't even know what we can do to make it right other than this.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the budget you have put together, and you achieve balance, including meeting these demands for the least fortunate in our society.

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

I think Mr. RIBBLE made some very, very important points for all of us in this debate, and that is: the reason you see spending rising in both budgets is primarily because we have so many more baby boomers becoming eligible for Medicare and Social Security. In fact, what this chart shows is that, over the 10-year window, you are going to see about a 33 percent increase in the number of people eligible for Medicare and about a 30 percent increase in the number of people who are eligible for Social Security.

So what we say in our budget is that, if we are going to meet our commitments to these seniors but also reduce our budget deficit, we have to do it in a balanced way. Because if we meet these commitments and at the same time are trying to reduce our deficit, one way to do it is the way the Republican budget does: to more than double the sequester cut in all the areas that are important to growing our economy, our infrastructure investment, our kids' education, science and research. They also cut Medicaid, which affects a lot of those seniors on Medicare. About 20 percent of those seniors are also on Medicaid.

But it is at the end of that 10-year window that our Republican colleagues then move to their voucher plan, premium support—I don't care what you call it. The only way you are going to achieve any savings compared to the baseline number, CBO baseline that the chairman showed you, the only way you are going to do it is if you are capping the amount you are going to get so that seniors have to eat the costs and take the risks of rising health care.

There is a better way to address that issue, and that is the way we approach it in our budget. And that is to build on the kind of reforms that we made in the Affordable Care Act in ObamaCare, which have helped and contributed to reducing the rapid rise in per capita health care costs and which, as I pointed out earlier, our Republican colleagues included in their own budget.

So, yes, we have to deal with these drivers of costs, including health care. But the way we propose to do it is not by transferring or offloading those rising health care costs on the backs of the seniors, but by moving Medicare away from a strictly fee-for-service system toward one where we reward the value of care over the volume of care. And that has achieved significant savings, and it has done so without any negative impact to Medicare beneficiaries. So very different approaches to this issue.

Mr. RIBBLE pointed out there is spending going up that is to meet these commitments. But if you don't take a balanced approach like we do, you can only address those issues by undermining other very important national priorities, priorities that have always had bipartisan support in the past.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. GREEN.

□ 1800

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for the time.

Mr. Chairman, depending on your point of view, there is something in this budget for you to like and to love. If you like repealing the Affordable Care Act and replacing it with nothing, then you love this budget.

If you like having senior citizens pay more for their pharmaceuticals in the twilight of life, then you love this budget.

If you like having 26-year-olds and under come off of the insurance policies that they're currently on with their parents, then you love this budget.

If you like the notion that health care should become wealth care in the

richest country in the world, where one out of every 100 persons is a millionaire, then you love this budget.

If you like the whole concept of having voucher care, as opposed to Medicare, then you really love this budget.

My dear friends, I neither love it nor like it. I'm against it, and I won't vote for it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That was very entertaining.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

There are two ways to deal with Medicare essentially. And I think most people would agree, Medicare has a big problem. It's going bankrupt. And the gentleman from Maryland talked about demographics and health inflation.

ObamaCare changed Medicare as we know it. ObamaCare puts a board of 15 unelected bureaucrats in charge of Medicare. These bureaucrats, by law, are given the assignment to require Medicare cuts each and every year to hit the targets that will lead to denied care for current seniors.

We disagree with that. We think patients and their doctors should be in charge of their health care. We believe in choice and competition so that seniors have guaranteed coverage options to make sure that they can have a plan that best meets their needs.

Now, is this some pie in the sky theory?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Let me show you a chart.

By the way, a voucher is, you get a check and then you go buy something. No one's proposing that. It's a good poll-tested word.

Premium support is a bipartisan solution, the only bipartisan idea offered on how to save Medicare. It's how the prescription drug law works today.

When the prescription drug law was passed, it was expected to cost about $100 billion when we began, on an annual basis. What happened to the actual cost?

It came down 41 percent below cost projections. Let me say that again. The prescription drug law came in 41 percent below cost projections. Name me a government program that comes in 41 percent below cost.

Why did this one do that?

I'll tell you why. Seniors got to choose the plan that meets their needs.

The plans, the drug-providing plans, had to compete against each other for the seniors' business. They compete, so they lowered their prices, they improved their quality. Customer satisfaction is at an all-time high. And lo and behold, costs went down.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I'll give myself 30 more seconds to say we believe in putting seniors in charge of their health care, not 15 bureaucrats. Our budget does not change the Medicare benefit for anybody in or near retirement.

But to guarantee that that promise can continue to be made for my mom and the other moms that we've been talking about, to guarantee that it's there for my generation and my kids' generation, you have to reform the program, and that's why we want this bipartisan idea that has proven to work, versus giving the control to 15 bureaucrats.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, balancing our budget goes way beyond taxes and spending. It will define who we are as a Nation and ensure prosperity and opportunity for all Americans going forward.

According to two prominent Stanford University economists, John Cogan and John Taylor, the Ryan budget would raise gross domestic product by 1 percentage point by 2014.

Well, just what does that mean?

They explained it. It's equal to about $1,500 for every household in the United States—$1,500 for every household in the United States. By 2024, they estimated GDP would increase by 3 percentage points, to $4,000 per household. That growth, that kind of growth can't be ignored.

Putting our budget, moreover, our economy, on a sustainable budget, is a moral imperative, and we owe it to the men and women retiring tomorrow, as well as my newest granddaughter, who will be born in April.

The Ryan budget also recognizes that our current tax structure is holding our Nation's prosperity back. I applaud the goal of collapsing our Tax Code to just two lower rates of 10 and 25 percent.

We need pro-growth policies that will grow our economy and create jobs. Tax reform is the answer. At the end of the day, we don't need more taxes; we need more taxpayers, and new jobs will do just that.

Containing the size, scope, and cost of government has got to be a priority here. The more money siphoned from the economy to support government programs means less money in the economy to support private investment, innovation, job creation and wealth for all Americans. We've done this before and we can do it again.

I listened with a little bit of incredibility as I listened to the gentleman from Maryland do a little bit of revisionist history. He talked about the late nineties, and gave the credit to the President for balancing the budget.

Well, I was here in the Republican House of Representatives, the first Republican House of Representatives in 40 years, and I like to take a little bit of credit for that too. I think that the Republican Congress got the ball rolling.

But at the end of the day, I don't care if the President takes the credit for that. In fact, after we passed welfare reform three times, finally, the President kind of came along, kicking and screaming, and he signed welfare reform into law. And 50 percent fewer families in America have to rely on welfare. They have jobs.

I'd like to see us balance the budget, not just for my children, but for my grandchildren. And I'll tell you what: if President Obama's willing to do that with us, like President Clinton reached across the aisle to a Republican Congress, I will be happy to be the first in line to give him credit for that because I believe all America will benefit.

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

I just want to respond to a few of the comments from the chairman with respect to Medicare and health care costs.

As we indicated earlier, we've seen a dramatic slowing in the per capita interest in health care cost. That's a good thing. That's, in part, we believe, a result of changes in the Affordable Care Act and, as a result of that, the so-called Independent Advisory Board that our colleagues misleadingly refer to as a bunch of bureaucrats won't even have any job to do for at least 10 years, probably longer.

Now, if health care costs per capita start rising more quickly, then their task—and this is a group of health experts and others—their task is to propose a way to reduce those health care costs, and they're specifically instructed not to have a negative impact on beneficiaries.

And by the way, it specifically says, if Congress has a better way to do it, go for it. That's what the law says. We think that that's a better approach than handing everything over to insurance companies.

And the Republican plan to give seniors a voucher, premium support—I don't care what you call it, it's bad news because seniors will be getting this thing, but the value of that thing doesn't keep up with the rising health care costs.

Now, the chairman mentioned prescription drug part D. It came in under projected cost. One reason was you had more generic drugs on the entire market, not just the Medicare market. But the other, major reason was, guess what? There were 25 percent fewer people enrolled in part D. So you had fewer participants and so, obviously, it costs less. Twenty-five percent.

Now, it's simply wrong to say that the Republican voucher plan for Medicare is like part D prescription drug, or like the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, which we've heard about many times before, because the difference is, and it goes to the core of this issue, both those plans, part D and the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, have provisions that ensure that the premium that is provided by the government, or Medicare, keeps up on a percentage basis with rising health care costs. That's why it's called premium support, and that's why the Republican plan is not premium support because it does not keep up with rising health care costs, if they're going to claim the savings it makes.

And here's a chart that illustrates this. This is current Medicare. Seniors are putting in a certain amount, and they're guaranteed a certain percentage of support from Medicare.

□ 1810

Here's the plan for Federal employees and Members of Congress: Members of Congress and Federal employees put in around 25 percent and the program picks up the other 75 percent. And as costs go up, the Federal Government still picks up 75 percent. Here's what happens with a voucher program where the value of what you get doesn't keep up with the percentage rise in health care costs. You, the beneficiary, the senior, pay more and more. And that's the only way it can work if you're at the same time going to show that congressional budget chart that shows all that spending out into the future. The only way you can bring that down under the plan is to cap the value of premiums. And that's not premium support; that's a voucher. And that's the end of the Medicare guarantee.

I now yield 2 minutes to a great new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the ranking member for yielding and thank him for his extraordinary leadership.

Mr. Chairman, budgets should reflect our priorities and our values. It should protect American families by investing in education, infrastructure, science and research, clean energy, and housing. Budgets should be designed to grow our economy and get people back to work.

This Republican budget does not reflect the values of our great Nation. It will hurt our economy and it will hurt the American people. As Yogi Berra said, ''It's déjà vu all over again.'' More of the same. More tax cuts for the richest Americans, billions in subsidies for Big Oil, tax policies that benefit companies that ship American jobs overseas at the expense of the middle class and the working poor.

As a reflection of our Nation's values, our Federal budget should honor the commitment we've made to our seniors; but this Republican proposal would end the guarantee as we know it, shifting rising health care costs to seniors. We should be educating our next generation of leaders to enter the workplace successfully, and we should be making meaningful and serious investments in rebuilding our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, our bridges, roads, and schools so it will put people back to work in well-paying middle class jobs that help support a family.

But this budget makes deep cuts in rebuilding America and in education. According to the Center for American Progress, the Republican budget proposal on the floor today would cut $1.2 trillion from investments in education, science, and infrastructure, hurting our economy. And some have projected that it would result in the loss of 2 million jobs.

The budget before us today does not reflect our values as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to vote against it and to support the Democratic alternative. It's a budget that really speaks to the highest ideals of America—the kind of America that will provide the best education for our kids, that will discover new cures for disease, that will develop new, clean energy sources, that is committed to rebuilding our crumbling roads, bridges, and ports, and an America that honors our promise to our seniors and to our veterans.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative and vote against the Republican Ryan budget.

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

I enjoy the back-and-forth on Medicare. Let's not forget that under our proposal there's no cap on Medicare growth for current seniors. We don't have the cap like ObamaCare does. ObamaCare caps Medicare and then has this board of 15 bureaucrats decide how to affect current seniors to make it live within its cap to its price controls. We don't do that. We say leave Medicare alone. People like my mom organized their lives around this program and retired on it. Don't change a thing. Don't put some cap with bureaucrats price-controlling it. The premium support we're talking about, that's for future seniors. And if you're poor, if you're sick, if you're middle income, you get a lot more subsidy—total coverage for poor people—than the wealthy.

I keep hearing all this talk about wealthy. We say the wealthy should pay more for their own premiums than everybody else. That helps us save Medicare for the next generation. These are ideas that actually have bipartisan support—the only bipartisan idea on how to save Medicare versus the rationing from the IPAB board.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee, a member of the Budget Committee and a member of the Commerce Committee, Mrs. BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, our chairman, for the outstanding work that he has done, and to all of my colleagues on the House Budget Committee for how diligent we've been in bringing forward a budget that is responsible and is a credit to our citizens and to the American people.

I think it really is quite amazing when you listen to some of this rhetoric. Mr. Chairman, it is so evident from listening to this debate that we have friends across the aisle who just really believe that government can never get enough of the taxpayers' money. I don't think they can tell you how much is enough, because they're always going to find ways and reasons and new programs and new ventures or investments, as they like to call them, to spend that money on.

Every time we talk about accountability and responsibility of the House to manage the people's money in an accountable and responsible way, they start to talk like that money is theirs, and that we're talking about taking that money away from them. But it's the people's money. And what the American people have said is they want to see this government on a spending plan that is going to be accountable and is going to be responsible. And they want a budget that is going to balance and they want us to get this deficit spending and our national debt under control. Now, the document that we're bringing forward is something that is going to do that. And it's going to do it in the appropriate way because we meet our obligations and we honor the commitments and the promises that have been made.

I heard someone talk about shredding the social safety net. Well, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly, when our friends across the aisle brought forward ObamaCare, they're the ones that took a whack into that social safety net by making those spending cuts in Medicare and pushing that money over to stand up a new program. We don't stand for that because what we will do is preserve Medicare, as the chairman has said, for today's seniors and give younger workers an option that is going to honor the work that they are doing now in paying into that system.

I think it's important that we look at how this is going to affect our children and our grandchildren. I have two grandsons, Jack and Chase. They're here this week. I'm delighted they're here in budget week because the decisions that we make this week are going to be decisions that they're going to bear the burden of. Money we spend is money they will pay back. It's imperative that we be responsible to our children, to our grandchildren, to future generations and meet the obligations we have today.

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

It's extraordinary how many times we have to point out that the Republican budget before us today contains the Medicare savings that were first demagogued last fall during the Presidential campaign. We hear them attacked here on the floor of the House by our Republican colleagues, and yet they're in the Republican budget. In fact, they're in this Republican budget. And what's more, their budget wouldn't balance without them, which is why they cannot have it both ways and claim their budget is in balance and they're getting rid of ObamaCare.

Now, while they're keeping the savings, they are getting rid of all the important benefits in the Affordable Care Act that will provide more affordable health care, which will make sure people can't be denied coverage because of preexisting conditions, will make sure that kids can stay on their parents' insurance policy until they're age 26.

For 3 years in a row, we've had a bill from our Republican colleagues called

Repeal and Replace: repeal ObamaCare, but replace it with something else that provides affordable care. Three years. We've never seen replace. There is no replace. You can look through the Republican budget. There's no replace. Just like for 3 years they tell us they've got a tax reform plan that's going to magically provide these big tax cuts for people and not hit middle-income taxpayers. Not one piece of paper out of the Ways and Means Committee in 3 years.

So, Mr. Chairman, it's a little tiresome to continue to hear people criticize savings that we achieve without touching beneficiaries, which our colleagues include in their budget and which extended the life of the Medicare trust fund by more than 8 years.

I now yield 1½ minutes to somebody who knows a lot about the importance of Medicare and Social Security, the gentlelady from Illinois, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

□ 1820

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, the Ryan Republican budget reflects everything that the American people rejected in the last election: asking nothing from the wealthiest Americans and rich corporations that ship our jobs overseas, while turning Medicare into a voucher program and slashing investments that create real jobs.

Inequality is at its highest point since the Great Depression, and yet this budget would make it worse. Here's the top 1 percent. Since 1979, look at how their income has gone up—277.5 percent. This is the bottom 99 percent. You see a little bit of increase, but you see where the money has gone.

Well, households making more than $3.3 million would get an average tax cut of $1.2 million. Those who make less than $22,000 would get $40, and a third of them would get no tax cut at all. Meanwhile, critical support programs for seniors and the poor would be cut, including drastic cuts to Medicaid and the food stamp program.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Ryan Republican budget. It's pure March madness, and not in a good way.

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

The gentleman is correct in saying that the savings that are in the Affordable Care Act for Medicare we apply back to Medicare. That's correct. We think that money should stay in Medicare to extend its solvency and not be raided from Medicare to spend on ObamaCare.

He says we keep the savings but we don't keep any of the benefits. President Obama said that premiums would go down by $2,500 if we passed ObamaCare. They've gone up by $3,000, on average. I don't call that a benefit.

The costs of the bill have gone from $938 billion to $1.88 trillion. It's a budget buster. It doesn't pay for itself. I don't think that's a benefit.

Next year, young people are expected to see their premiums go up by 145 percent to 189 percent. I don't think that's a benefit either.

So, yes, we don't want these benefits. We don't think turning Medicare over to a board of 15 unelected bureaucrats to cut it in ways that will surely lead to denied care for current seniors is a benefit. That's why I want to yield 2 minutes—well, that's not why, but I also want to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a former member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support today of the balanced budget put forward by my friend and chairman, PAUL RYAN, and the reasonable and practical approach that this Budget Committee has taken while they budget hardworking taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this budget debate goes deeper than spreadsheets and focuses on the longevity of the American Dream.

Today, we are considering a Republican budget that actually balances in 10 years, calls for pro-growth, pro-job tax reform, and strengthens Medicare for our seniors and future generations, while in the Senate, HARRY REID and PATTY MURRAY are considering a budget that never balances. It increases taxes by $1 trillion and let's Medicare and Social Security race towards bankruptcy. And it turns Medicare into a program that rations benefits to seniors.

Make no mistake, Washington is approaching $17 trillion of debt and more than 12 million Americans are unable to find work. The decisions we make will either sink us deeper into debt or put us on a path that encourages job creation and restores the belief that, if we work hard and make tough choices, our kids will inherit a stronger country.

Mr. Chairman, the choice is clear. If Hoosier families balance their budgets, Washington doesn't have an excuse. It's time the President and the Senate offer real solutions for hardworking Hoosier families.

I commend Chairman RYAN and the House Budget Committee for their hard work, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to another terrific new member of the Budget Committee, the gentlelady from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget plan. This misguided and cruel plan abandons the economic recovery. It is a path to greater disparity, and it protects the affluent while further squeezing the middle class.

We cannot afford this Republican budget. According to the Economic Policy Institute, it will cost us 2 million jobs in 2014. This is on top of the 750,000 jobs we will lose this year due to sequestration.

The Republican budget attacks the various industries where the largest job growth should be occurring. We need to invest in critical infrastructure like the health care system as a key way to create jobs here at home and protect our most vulnerable.

According to a 2012 Bureau of Labor Statistics study, the health sector is going to be the leader in job growth throughout the rest of this decade. Unfortunately, the path once again chosen by Republicans in this Congress will put job growth in jeopardy.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that the budget plan under consideration cuts $2.5 trillion from health care by 2023. How? It turns Medicare into a voucher program and it block grants Medicaid to States. This will force health care providers to cut jobs and to reduce services to their patients.

With an aging population that will require greater care, we should be investing in critical infrastructure like health care and other programs like disease and care management, which have and will continue to reduce spending in Medicare.

So let's be clear: this budget wreaks havoc on health care systems in this country, it hurts patients, and it devastates future job growth in the health sector.

Lastly, this plan also chooses to arbitrarily balance the budget in 10 years, which is harmful to our fragile economy and middle class families. The notion that 10 years is the magic number to balance the budget is ludicrous. It is similar to telling mortgage holders who are responsibly paying their mortgage that, instead of having 30 years to pay it off, now they have 10. Would they be able to? Many of them would end up losing the house. That is exactly what the Ryan budget does and why, to the Nation's budget and to our economy, it puts us under water.

Instead, I would encourage all of my colleagues to support the Van Hollen substitute, which is a balanced approach that leads to job creation and is the right way forward.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the Budget Committee and also the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you, Mr. RYAN.

This is what principled, visionary, responsible leadership looks like. I commend Chairman RYAN and the entire team for this budget and for insisting on regular order. I also congratulate this body for finally forcing the Senate to do something—introduce a budget.

We owe it to our fellow Americans to be honest about the complex fiscal challenges and options before us. That's why today's debate is one of the most important we will have this year.

Nearly every day I hear from my hardworking constituents from southwestern Riverside County who have struggled tremendously over the last 5 years. Despite the challenges they face, they continue to make ends meet by

making tough fiscal decisions, whether it's for themselves, their families, or for their businesses.

Most Americans don't understand why their elected officials can't do the same. Instead, they see us jumping from one crisis to the next, putting their lives and their well-being on a constant roller coaster. Frankly, I don't understand it either.

You can't hide from the statistics. You don't have to be on the Budget Committee to understand our fiscal situation. A balanced budget is not a radical idea; it's a responsible one that the citizens of Riverside County and those around this country practice themselves.

Economists across the spectrum agree that our current path is leading us to a debt crisis should we fail to act. Make no mistake: we're on the warning track, and we should reverse course before we slam into the wall. All Americans should have real concern about what this means for the future prosperity of their own families and of our own Nation.

Under the Obama administration, U.S. public debt as a percentage of GDP is over 70 percent and growing.

□ 1830

As we've see with European nations, there appears to be a tipping point in the debt-to-GDP ratio, and at our current rate we are nearing dangerous territory. The reserve currency status of the dollar and our rank among world economies will only carry us for so long.

So what effect does this level of debt have on an economy and its citizens when things go south?

All you have to do is look at countries like Cyprus, Spain, and Greece. In the case of Greece, you see a depressed environment where the unemployment rate is over 26 percent; severe austerity cuts and overhauls have gutted worker benefits and the safety net system, harming seniors and the country's poorest populace; taxes on families and businesses have increased at a sharp rate; and divisive and violent social unrest has become commonplace. Most recently, we have seen a proposal to bail out Cyprus banks that would raid the savings accounts of its own population.

These are the realities of a debt-ridden country. These are the realities of liberal policies that tax too much, spend too much, borrow too much, and produce far too few jobs. We cannot afford the path that we're on.

Thankfully, we have time to change America's course, and the House Republican budget provides a 10-year plan. It puts the brakes on our unsustainable spending levels, lays out thoughtful program reforms to ensure essential government services are solvent for generations to come, prioritizes a comprehensive restructuring of our Tax Code to simplify the system, and improves our fiscal condition in a way that will allow our economy to grow providing opportunity to those that work hard no matter what station in life they start at.

Fortunately, after being prodded along, the Senate is joining the House in this conversation after a 4-year absence. I don't favor their approach to the task before us—a plan that never balances with more failed stimulus spending and additional tax hikes. I suspect the President's budget will be similar, once we finally we receive it. However, we welcome their proposals because we will have clear options laid before the American people, and we can have a comprehensive and honest discussion about future choices.

Vice President BIDEN famously said: Show me your budget and I'll tell you what you value. Well, with no budget submitted, we're all forced to conclude that the White House values delay and obfuscation.

Even given this nonfeasance, as an optimist I know this process will allow us to find common ground. Addressing issues of this magnitude is never easy or pretty, but it is a process worth taking. House Republicans continue to stand ready to work with the President and our Democratic colleagues in Congress to meet the complex challenges before us so that we can get our Nation back to a path to prosperity. Thankfully, the House Republican budget does exactly that.

With that, I urge a ''yes'' vote on H. Con. Res. 25.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont, who's been very focused on these budget issues, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman, and I thank Mr. RYAN.

The focus and goal of this budget, as I understand it, is to eliminate the debt. That's a worthy goal. In fact, we all share it. But this budget, in my view, lacks ambition for other challenges. What about stagnant wages? Middle class declining? Lack of jobs? These are all fundamental issues that face the American economy.

The middle class is shrinking. Wages now are what they were as a level of our economy as they were in 1966. Just a week ago, when we voted for the sequester, it was a day when American profits were at a record higher than they had been since the 1950s, but American wages were back at 1966 levels.

There is an assertion here that we lack credibility and that we're taxers and spenders. I reject that. But let me remind the folks on the other side that a lot of the policies got us to this debt: a war in Iraq on the credit card, Afghanistan on the credit card, two tax cuts for the wealthy promising benefits to everybody else never paid for, and Medicare part D on the credit card. Then we had the collapse of the economy. Those were not our policies. Those were the policies of a previous President who erased a record surplus.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. WELCH. These are credibility questions, but there's also an economic policy question. There are two assumptions in this budget. One is that austerity will lead to prosperity, that getting the debt down by any means possible and any cuts possible will get us to the Promised Land; it's the pot of gold at the end of the Tea Party rainbow. There is no evidence for that whatsoever.

The second is a faith-based conviction that if you give tax cuts to wealthy people that will trickle down to the rest of us. No experience has shown that that can be successful.

We should be cleaning up the Tax Code. We should be fighting waste, fraud, and abuse. Whether it's in the Pentagon or in the health care system, we should be doing that together. This budget does not give us that chance.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself just 30 seconds to say that austerity is what we're trying to prevent from happening. That's the irony of this debate.

Austerity is what happens after the debt crisis hits. Austerity is what is happening in Europe. Austerity is cranking up taxes, slowing down your economy and cutting benefits on senior citizens after they've retired. That's what austerity is. That's what they call it.

We're preventing that. We're preempting that. The goal of this budget is a reasonable plan to balance the budget, to grow the economy, and to create more take-home pay so families can prosper.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to a new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm honored to serve on the House Budget Committee. I'm honored to advocate on behalf of this budget.

There's one thing for sure: we can't keep going the way we are. If you look around the world, if you look at countries like Cyprus, Spain, Portugal and Greece, you will see the consequence of unrestrained spending.

The Republican plan balances in 10 years. The plan offered by the Senate never balances. And when we say ''balance,'' we mean matching revenue to spending, not spending more than you take in. When our colleagues across the aisle talk about balance, they use it as a code word for a tax increase.

The Republican plan offers protections across the spectrum of American life. It offers our seniors the protection of making our promises good in Social Security and Medicare. No one will deny—OMB will tell you and the CBO will tell you—the Medicare trust fund is going broke. It will expire in 11 short years; and the longer we wait to deal with that, the worse the problem becomes.

It protects our middle class through tax reform and through repealing the

ObamaCare law with its onerous regulations and taxes. It will structure our system for economic growth. We will stop hemorrhaging American jobs overseas, and we will bring American jobs back to these shores. It's one thing if we lose jobs because of low wages overseas. We don't ever want to compete in that arena. It's another if we lose jobs because our government is inefficient, bloated, and expensive.

Finally, it protects our most vulnerable. It protects our young people. I agree with then-Senator Obama when he said it was immoral to continue to incur these massive debts. Of course, since he said it, our debt is multiples of what he was decrying at that time.

We are piling mountains and mountains of debt on our children and our grandchildren to fuel our addiction to spending. It's got to stop, and it's got to stop now.

I'm proud to stand for this Republican budget, and I urge its passage.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, under our budget proposal, the deficit is dropping rapidly, but we also address the jobs deficit so that we make sure more people get back to work. With respect to the Medicare trust fund, I would just point out the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, extended the life of the hospital trust fund by 8 years. And if Republicans did what they said they want to do, which is repeal it, they would shorten the life of the trust fund to 2016. But even though they don't want to tell us, they apparently have kept that in.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut who has worked so hard to make sure that college is affordable to students in this country, Mr. COURTNEY.

□ 1840

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, as we talk about the issue of young people and debt, one thing is very clear: for 7½ million young Americans who receive subsidized Stafford student loans, in 103 days the interest rate on those subsidized student loans is going to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

We have before us now two budgets. One budget, the Democratic budget brought out by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, protects the lower rate. The other budget, by the majority party, allows that rate to double to 6.8 percent.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York came out with a study just a few days ago which shows, in fact, that the student loan debt for young Americans has tripled over the last 8 years.

We have one budget which protects Pell Grants, which reduces the need to borrow money to pay for college, and we have the other budget from the majority party which freezes Pell Grants at $5,665 a year. Any parent like myself who has kids in college, any student who is in college who believes that over the next 10 years that tuition is going to stay flat obviously has no understanding of what the trends are and have been over the last 20 years in terms of State withdrawal for higher education support, and what's actually happening out there in the real world.

We have one budget which speaks to the monumental challenge of young people who are trying to improve themselves and get ready for the workplace of the future; we have another budget which is blind to those challenges and which will reduce college to a system of haves and have-nots.

We must invest in young people in the future. The Democratic budget, which protects the lower interest rate and the subsidized Stafford Student Loan program, understands that. The majority budget, which allows those rates to skyrocket, which freezes Pell Grants so that young families from poor backgrounds will not be able to afford the cost of college, again leaves this country basically behind in the competition for high-value jobs, for jobs that require skills, whether it's in science, technology, engineering and math or other areas of curriculum.

The fact of the matter is for young people, there is only one budget which speaks to them and addresses their needs—that's the Democratic budget that is brought out by Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 30 seconds to say the interest rate cliff in student loans was put in law by the Democrats in the first place.

If we bring legislation to the floor that is paid for to deal with it like we did last year, I would assume we have every reason to believe that we'll pass it.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to a new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to hear my friends across the aisle talk about investing in our future and investing in our economy. But when they talk about that, I think we have to be clear that that's code for borrowing and spending more money.

We should truly talk about the cost of this debt. We all know today that we owe $17 trillion in debt, and if the Federal Reserve stopped printing money, the actual cost to service this debt, to pay the interest payments would be about $500 billion.

You go out 10 years and our debt is going to be $25 trillion. And minimally to service our interest payments on that debt 10 years from now, it's going to cost us $750 billion a year, or $7.5 trillion over 10 years.

If you talk about the cost of interest payments every year to service the debt, that's $750 billion that isn't going into education, it's not going into health care, it's not going into roads or schools or helping our poor. It's $750 billion that goes to interest payments.

When you talk about investing in our future, we're not doing that. We are mortgaging our children's future. But let's be clear. There is someone who is investing in their future—it's the Chinese. They're investing in their future by buying American debt. So when my little girls, my little 2-year-old Mari Vi and my 4-year-old Paloma, when they get to be our age, they're going to have this weight of interest and debt around their neck and they're going to pay those payments back to those Chinese preschoolers.

This is not responsible. And to hear my colleagues across the aisle stand up and talk about a balanced approach that continues this course of massive red, this is what our children inherit and say this is what we want to give to them?

Listen, if you ask moms around America, Is this what you want for your children? Is this what you want them to inherit? Is this how you want them to invest their tax dollars? They would resoundingly stand up and say, Heck no. Be responsible. Pay off the debt. We don't want them to have their massive tax dollars go to interest payments.

My friends across the aisle, they talk again about borrowing and spending and investing in our economy. When they use that language, it sounds eerily familiar to the same language they used 4 years ago. This is the same argument that was used to borrow a trillion dollars to help us grow our economy, create massive new jobs.

The bottom line is that that trillion-dollar stimulus failed. We want a responsible approach, balance the budget, grow our economy and put our hard-working middle class families back to work. The Republican budget actually does that.

I ask all my colleagues to actually support the Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to a couple of things that were just said.

The first is that when President Obama was sworn in—in fact, before he even put his hand on the Bible a little more than 4 years ago, we were losing over 700,000 jobs every month. The economy was actually spiraling downward at a faster rate than it was at the time of the Great Depression. And thanks to the resilience of the American people and the emergency actions taken by the President and others, we stopped the free fall, we turned the corner and there have been 36 consecutive months of private sector job growth, more than 6.4 million jobs created.

We didn't get any help from our Republican colleagues when we had to make tough decisions to prevent the total collapse of the economy. Now that we've seen some momentum in the job market, we have a Republican budget that's going to put the brakes on that growth. That's according to the Congressional Budget Office. By the way, their budget includes the assumption of those continued sequestration levels into the next year.

Let's talk about China for a minute. I got a letter the other day from the CEO of a major biotech company. Here's what he said. He said that over

the last couple of years because of the reduction in our national investment in science and research, he laid off 1,000 people. And because of the continuing sequester, they've imposed a hiring freeze right now. Those are jobs that now will not be created that would have been otherwise if we hadn't had the Republican approach to the sequester.

You know the real kick? I heard Mr. DUFFY talking about China. They're hiring people in China. Not because of lower Chinese wages, but because China has decided to make science and health care funding a national priority. In other words, the Chinese are copying the secrets to our success, things that help our economy grow, things that are slashed in the Republican budget. Did I say ''slashed''? Yeah. Because they cut that portion of the budget by more than two times the sequester. That's a fact.

If we're talking about competing with the Chinese or the Indians or the Europeans or anybody else who is out there, one of our global competitors, let's not allow them to borrow the secrets of our success while we're ignoring them here at home.

I now yield 2 minutes to a terrific new Member of the Budget Committee, someone who has been focused on and leading a lot of our anti-poverty efforts, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, let me thank our ranking member for your tremendous leadership and for yielding. And I also thank Chairman RYAN for a very spirited markup.

I rise in strong opposition to the Ryan budget. And let me just say as a new member of the Budget Committee, I've had the opportunity now to really get into the weeds of the budget, which really is full of choices, but those choices would undermine our Nation's future for the continued benefit of special interests and the wealthy.

The bottom line: that's what this budget does. It would dismantle government, it would increase inequality and leave the most vulnerable people on their own.

We should reject this warped vision of America, and we should call this budget for what it is. Republicans call it a ''path to prosperity,'' but it really is a path to poverty for the middle class, for working families, for children and for our seniors.

□ 1850

The fact of the matter is, you cannot pretend to fight poverty while you make brutal cuts to the very programs that lift millions of Americans out of poverty.

The Republican budget would make devastating cuts that will increase child hunger, cut off millions of seniors from access to health care, and throw struggling families off TANF during the middle of a jobs crisis. The Republican budget proposes yet another $6 trillion tax cut for the top 1 percent in our country while focusing 66 percent of their cuts on shredding our Nation's critical safety net for our children, our seniors, our disabled, and the poor. This budget would also cost 2 million jobs, and it would slash nutrition and food assistance programs for 8 million to 9 million people.

Mr. Chairman, block-granting Medicaid, turning Medicare into a voucher program, and gutting food assistance to our children and our seniors will not reduce poverty; it will make it much, much worse. Our Democratic budget will close special interest tax loopholes in order to raise the critical revenues that we need to invest in the American people.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlelady another 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Let me just conclude by saying that fully supporting our safety net programs, like Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, and Social Security, will reduce poverty, grow the middle class, and renew economic prosperity for all Americans.

Unlike Republicans, Democrats simply do not believe that gutting the very programs that support poor and low-income families would reduce poverty, programs such as the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit. The Van Hollen Democratic alternative budget creates 1.2 million jobs this year; it reduces the deficit by 2.4 percent; and it makes huge key investments in our future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me yield myself 1 minute.

Look, I very much appreciate the gentlelady from California and where she comes from on this issue. I believe her heart is in the right place. We, too, want to make sure that we get rid of poverty. We, too, want to make sure that people get on with their lives, get on that ladder of life so that they can get out of poverty and on to good lives. That's our aim here.

Now, here is what we see. We have spent trillions of dollars on this war on poverty. We're spending $1 trillion a year at all levels of government to fight poverty, and what have we gotten for this? We have 46 million people in poverty. The poverty rates in America are at a generational high. So rather than measure our poverty-fighting efforts by how much money we throw at programs, by inputs, why don't we start thinking about measuring it by outputs, by how many people we are helping to get out of poverty? By any measurement, this isn't working.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself another minute to say that we need to rethink our premise here. Are we simply perpetuating poverty by treating its symptoms; or shouldn't we look at what has worked in the past—what communities are doing to make a difference—and get behind those ideas?

Let's fight poverty by taking the root causes of poverty in order to break the cycle of poverty and to get people out of poverty. Those are the ideas that we are talking about here. This is not a numbers thing. This is not a budget-cutting exercise. This is taking those ideas that were so successful in reducing child poverty in the welfare reform and applying them to the other programs that have not been reformed.

Giving States more flexibility, having work requirements and job-training requirements and block grants and time limits, what did that do? All the predictions of doom and gloom were there, but we lowered child poverty. We helped get single moms back to job-training programs so they could get back to work. This is why we reform job-training programs. This is why we call for reforming our safety net—because our goal, like her goal, is to get people on with their lives so they can reach their potential.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I am honored—yea, I am thrilled—to stand and speak on this subject. It is the primary reason that I ran for Congress, and I think it is the defining issue and the most critical argument of our day.

We are at a crossroads in our history. I believe that this time is that important. What we do at this moment will determine the future of our Nation. It will determine the future of our children. It will determine the future or the death of the American Dream.

Stephen Covey, one of the great innovators and business leaders of our generation and a man who happens to be from my home State of Utah, popularized a time management concept called the ''urgent-important matrix.'' The point of this was to help us focus on those things that are both urgent and important and to let the other things go.

Frankly, as a Congress, we do a terrible job at that. We often legislate based on the crisis of the moment, lurching from one manmade crisis to another, and the budget is a great example of that. For years, we have treated this as if it is neither urgent nor important, as if it could go on forever; but we know that that's not true.

We also know now what this President believes. He doesn't think it's important to balance our books. He doesn't think it's important to cut our debt. He has no intention of cutting any spending. Not only does he not intend to balance our budget, but he derides and dismisses those of us who think that it's important to our future; but Americans understand this, and it's not that hard.

Please listen to me on this because this is so important: a Nation that is bankrupt cannot provide for the security of its citizens. A Nation that is bankrupt cannot provide for the poor and the needy among them.

I speak now primarily to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: if

you care about the poor—and I know that you do. By the way, I do as well—then care enough to help them in the long run, not just for the next few years. There is nothing compassionate about letting Medicaid or Medicare go into bankruptcy. There is nothing compassionate about letting Social Security fail, but that's what's going to happen if we don't have the courage to fix this thing. We have to fix it now. This is both important and urgent.

Many of us had hoped that the President would lead on this matter, but he has chosen not to. It's not in his nature; he is much more comfortable leading from behind. Since he won't lead, those of us in Congress will.

I admire Chairman RYAN. I thank him for his courage in tackling a challenge that has terrified Congress for years—reforming entitlements in a way that will save them for our children.

We have a window within which we can make a difference. We can save America. We can save the American Dream. Please, let us have the courage to do that. That is why I support Chairman RYAN's budget and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

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

The President has been crystal clear. His top priority is to grow the economy, to put more Americans back to work, to strengthen the middle class, to have rising middle class wages and upward mobility in this country. By attacking the jobs deficit, we can also bring down the budget deficit because we know from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office that more than half of our deficit this year is due to the fact that you still have a lot of people out of work who are looking for work, which is why it's so counterproductive to adopt the approach that our Republican colleagues do.

By not replacing the sequester, the Congressional Budget Office tells us we will lose hundreds of thousands of jobs just by the end of this calendar year, and those jobs are the most important things to be available to help strengthen the middle class and lift people out of poverty. But in lifting people out of poverty, it's also important to provide a little bit of support that they can stand on as they climb that ladder of opportunity. Unfortunately, this budget cuts into a lot of those legs on that stool of support, and nobody understands this issue better than our colleague.

So she may respond, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

□ 1900

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, first, let me just say that I appreciate the chairman, Mr. RYAN, saying that he knows my heart is in the right place. But I also want him to know that the facts speak for themselves.

We have this chart right here, and it demonstrates very clearly that 18 million more people would be living in poverty had it not been for those initiatives in this budget that you completely cut out: SNAP, the refundable tax credits, and the broad selection of other programs. Eighteen million more people would be in poverty.

Also let me just say that a budget is a moral document. They reflect the values of who we are as Americans.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Why would we want to impose 66 percent of the cuts in your budget on low-income individuals and the poor? That does not make any sense. That is just morally wrong.

Finally, I just have to say that the ranks of the poor began to grow under the Bush administration.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE of California. In 2005, I formed the Out of Poverty Caucus because I saw the Bush economic policies and what, in fact, they were beginning to do. We had probably 42 or 43 Members who joined that caucus. And so I just have to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this didn't just begin. The ranks of the poor began to grow as a direct result of the economic policies that this budget wants to return to.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, Federal spending rises each and every year by 3.4 percent under this budget instead of 5 percent.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your efforts to lead us to a Path to Prosperity. When I'm home in Missouri in the Fourth District, I hear people say things like:

I have to balance my budget, how come Washington doesn't?

And: It's time for our government to live within its means.

And they might say: At home, we're having to tighten our belts; Washington should, too.

Well, I have good news: I agree, and this budget reflects those concerns and those priorities.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I'm proud to support a responsible budget that promotes economic growth while reducing wasteful spending. Currently, the Federal Government borrows 36 cents out of every dollar that it spends, and that puts us at an astonishing $16 trillion in debt. This creates anxiety and uncertainty at a time when unemployment is at 8 percent and a lot of families are hurting. We must end the government's reckless borrow, tax, and spend policies. Our budget balances in 10 years, and we do it without ever increasing taxes.

Senate Democrats released a budget that actually increases taxes by $1 trillion, and never, ever balances. This is worst than the status quo. Washington must stop spending money it doesn't have. We must target the real problem this country faces, and that's uncontrollable spending. Instead of continuously taxing hardworking Americans more, we must pursue meaningful reforms and pro-growth initiatives. Our budget does that.

The keys to this budget are growth initiatives to create jobs and proactive steps to preserve and protect Medicare and Medicaid for the future. Colleagues across the aisle like to claim that this is a voucher system, which is false. The Path to Prosperity reforms Medicare for future beneficiaries by offering them the same kind of health care as current Federal workers and Members of Congress. Future seniors are provided guaranteed issue health coverage where no one will be denied coverage based on health status or preexisting conditions. They will be able to choose from a wide range of options, one of which will include traditional Medicare, if they choose to do that. The government will pay all or part of their premium.

Our updated Medicare plan would also give substantial help to the poor, who would qualify for greater premium relief than the wealthy. This will save the program from bankruptcy while fulfilling our commitment to health care security for seniors. The Democrat plan is to kick the can down the road and jeopardize this important program for our seniors. Our plan is right for senior citizens, and it's right for our future.

Additionally, we take steps to preserve Medicaid, and we send it back to the States in the form of a block grant to allow local and State control over this very important program to provide flexibility to help low-income individuals, rather than forcing States to fit into one-size-fits-all programs. It's important that we get people back to work, and our budget does that as well by consolidating and enhancing job-training programs and endorsing pro-growth tax reform.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. But one of the best parts is it gets our priorities right, and it provides for the common defense. There are only a few things that we should be doing here, and it provides that. It replaces and repeals the President's sequester and makes sure that our men and women in uniform have what they need.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this bill that gets our economy growing, has our priorities right, protects and preserves those programs for our seniors, and provides for the common defense.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, let's be very clear. If you give States one-third of the amount of money that

they are currently getting from Medicaid and ask them to do the same job, which is what this budget would do just 10 years from now, and increasingly down that path, you will, as the nonpartisan, independent Congressional Budget Office said ''reduce access to care.'' That's the bottom line.

With respect to the voucher program, premium support, again, I don't really care what label you attach to it; the impact is the same. If you want to achieve the out-year budget savings that our colleagues claim to achieve, you've got to put a cap on that amount, which is what their plan would do and which makes it entirely different than the plan we have for Members of Congress and Federal employees, and the plan that most people in the private sector have as well.

As this red line shows, the amount of support you would get would drop dramatically relative to rising health care costs, and that's why we don't call it premium support because it doesn't provide support.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his leadership, and I certainly thank the Budget Committee for the work that they have done.

I'd make the argument that clearly we have a dilemma in focus and commitment and direction. I call the other budget the budget that has a sense of lacking of what people truly need. The Democratic budget is a budget that speaks to what people need, and it cares about people. It also cares about family economic security. Under the budget that Mr. RYAN is offering, the Republican budget, 3 million Texas seniors will see Medicare end as they know it, 50 million seniors across America.

But frankly, this is the real key on how the GOP budget really works: $500 billion in their so-called balancing is taken from the Affordable Care Act in the fiscal cliff deal. That's how they say they reached budget, so that means they'll undermine millions of Americans who will not have health care. That's the budget that does not concern itself with family economic security.

Then if we want to look again at the idea of safety net programs, rather than giving Americans an opportunity to stand on their own feet, the Republican budget literally cuts the programs that help reduce poverty. So it is not one that cares about economic security for our families.

Then, Mr. Chairman, if you want to really see what works, it really works when we talk to the top 2 percent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. When you look at the tax rate under President Clinton, that was 39.6 percent, and we created 20.8 million jobs. The Republican budget is a jobs killer. Then you have where we had a 35 percent tax rate, and you lost 580,000 jobs under George Bush. Here's the Democratic budget, the Van Hollen budget. We focus on creating jobs. We replace the sequester, 750,000 jobs, reduce the jobs deficit by 450,000, and our total net is 1.2 million net jobs. Family economic security is the Van Hollen budget. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Democratic budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his continued leadership on the issue of the fiscal outlook for our country, on the issue of the moral obligation that we have to our children. And next, to address the growing mountain of debt that unfortunately they're facing.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that this debate that we're having is a debate of contrasts. When you look at the two budgets, in this Chamber and you look at the budget that is underway across the Capitol, ours is a budget that balances.

□ 1910

Just as people at home around their kitchen table at the end of the month have to do with their checkbook every month, we believe the same is true. We balance this budget within 10 years.

The other side calls for more taxes. The other budget that is being discussed in the other body, in fact, creates $1 trillion of new taxes.

And the question for the American people really is which budget do you think grows the economy, which budget do you think helps folks gain some certainty, helps folks get back to work, helps folks who are relying on some of the programs that this body knows, because its budget office is telling us are going to go away unless we act? It is clear, the choice is clear, and the contrast couldn't be clearer.

I would like to respond, Mr. Chairman, to some of the suggestions by Members on the other side of the aisle that somehow our budget doesn't address the needs of those who are most in need. In fact, the opposite is the truth. Our budget protects the social safety net programs. The other budget on the other side of the aisle does nothing to respond to the alarms that have been issued by our budget counters and CBO and others year in and year out. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—all are on life support if we don't act.

Our budget, and the chairman of our Budget Committee, has been a champion to say, let's be responsible, let's help those who are in need, let's preserve the social safety net, the programs that make America who she is. It is our budget that helps those in need, Mr. Chairman, not the other side of the aisle.

Let's look at the question of tax reform. The people of this country have spoken out on this issue. They want a fairer and simpler Code. What Chairman RYAN has done in this budget is provided a prescription for doing just that: a broadening of the base, a lowering of the rates, and, yes, Mr. Chairman, an insurance in our budget that we are going to get rid of the special interest loopholes that have put Washington in the business of choosing favorites.

I think all of our constituents know that is not what they elect us to do. They want to see an even playing field for all. They want everyone—everyone—in this country to have a fair shot.

If you compare tax reform in the position that we take in our budget to that which the other side is proposing in this body and in the one across the Capitol, I think it is very clear: higher taxes without the reforms necessary versus what we are trying to do, which is even the playing field, giving everybody a fair shot to go and earn success.

The choice is very clear, Mr. Chairman, that our budget provides some certainty for the future for the moms and dads out there who are desperate to know that we are doing our job in Washington on their behalf; that we are going to address this fiscal situation so that they can get on about their lives; so that they can see their kids have a better education; so that they can access the health care that they have come to know, and for those who don't have the health care, can actually have a system that will lower costs and provide real prospects for quality health care, not the kind of health care designed by this Affordable Care Act that we are going to see come into effect.

So, again, I want to thank Chairman RYAN of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for his dogged attention to this very, very alarming question of how we are going to grow our economy and doing it in a way that is thoughtful, that is well put, and has the specifics to go and do the job.

Mr. Chairman, that is something that we have not seen from the other side. We have certainly not seen that from the White House. They haven't even presented the budget yet. And that is unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to support the budget coming out of our Budget Committee under the leadership of Chairman RYAN.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, let me just say a word about the health care provided in the Affordable Care Act. That means that you can stay on your parents' policy until you are 26, so if you have a terrible accident the family is not bankrupted. That means that if you have preexisting conditions, you are not denied coverage by the insurance companies.

We keep hearing, ''repeal all those benefits and some day we will get around replacing them.'' We have heard that for 3 years. There is nothing in this budget about replacing.

I think the majority leader asked the right question: Which budget grows the economy? And I would just like to read from what the majority leader said on the floor of this House last year about the sequester. Here is what Mr. CANTOR said:

> Under the sequester, unemployment would soar from its current level up to 9 percent, setting back any progress the economy has made.

Then he cites a study showing that 200,000 Virginian jobs are on the line.

Well, guess what? The Republican plan leaves in place the deep sequester cuts. That is why by the end of this year we will see 750,000 fewer jobs, including a lot fewer jobs in Virginia, as Mr. CANTOR acknowledged.

Why in the world we would want to do that when we have people struggling to find work, I don't know. Because in the Democratic budget, we replace the sequester so that we save those jobs. In fact, we invest more in jobs going forward.

On the tax issue—here is a headline from the other day in The Washington Post—a nonpartisan group did a study: ''GOP Tax Cuts Would Benefit Very Wealthy.'' And that is the bottom line. Tax breaks for the folks at the very top—all those loopholes we talked about closing—not one loophole closure to help reduce the deficit in a balanced way.

I would now like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, who has been working on these issues and working for working families, Mr. COHEN.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I appreciate the time.

The thing that disturbs me the most about this budget is its inability to understand what our priorities should be.

The Republican budget keeps the defense budget at $550 billion. There is no question we need a Defense Department, but I don't think the other side understands what the real enemy is. The enemy to my constituents and each of us is not lurking overseas. It is disease. And to each American who will suffer from or has a family member suffering from Alzheimer's or AIDS or cancer or heart disease, diabetes, Parkinson's, post-polio, or whatever, they want cures and treatments.

The National Institutes of Health are cut in this budget by at least $1.6 billion. It is a $30 billion budget. The Defense Department is $550 billion.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, our enemy is disease. The department of defense for the human being and the human body is the National Institutes of Health. It is someplace the two parties should be able to come together and agree that we need to fund research, which creates jobs and finds cures and treatments.

The other side talks about what this is going to do to children and grandchildren. I have heard people talk about their children and grandchildren and what their mothers would want. Their mothers want their children to live long lives and not to suffer from cancer and to get cures and to get treatments.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. COHEN. The cures and the treatments are going to benefit the next generation and the generation after that more than this generation. This is a place where spending dollars creates jobs, saves lives, and benefits future generations. Most research that has been done in this country that has come up with cures and treatments has been funded by the government or at least helped by the government, and that continues to this day.

People say we should be different than Cyprus and Greece and Spain and Portugal; and we are, because we funded those researches and we have come up with the cures and the treatments. That is why this is the greatest country on the face of the Earth. We need to see that the National Institutes of Health are funded at a greater level and not diminished.

The CHAIR. The Chair would remind the Committee that the gentleman from Wisconsin has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Maryland has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would just note for the record that funding on discretionary levels like that are set by the Appropriations Committee, not the Budget Committee, so those levels will be set later by the Appropriations Committee.

I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

□ 1920

Mr. PERRY. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

I deeply care about my mother, who's on Social Security and Medicare, and my two little girls, who are counting on their daddy to make sure that those programs are available when the time comes, and, of course, for the constituents that are counting on me to make sure that those programs are available for them. So I commend Chairman RYAN on his leadership in drafting a budget that responsibly addresses our national debt and ensures that my own children and all the residents of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania are not burdened with Washington's spending problem any longer.

This legislation balances our budget in 10 years. I know some folks are saying, Why 10 years? And I say, Why not ever in your budgets? Why not ever? It reduces spending and makes responsible reforms to mandatory spending programs.

For the past few weeks, I've heard from hundreds of constituents, including my very own mother, about how this budget will change Social Security for current beneficiaries, and I want to make clear that the Ryan budget does not do that. It does not cut Social Security. But I will remind everybody that the Social Security Disability Insurance fund will be insolvent by 2016. That's 3 years from now. So if you're 21 years old, when you're 24, it's insolvent. If you're 45 years old, when you're 48, it's insolvent.

The Medicare part A trust fund will be exhausted by 2024. This is not a long time away for young people or old people. I had to remind my mom that, if these programs were not reformed, there would be nothing left for her grandchildren, there would be nothing let for her son, and very likely there will be nothing left for her. This legislation makes those reforms responsible by allowing Medicare recipients the opportunity to choose options specific to their needs, and it repeals the President's plan to have a group of unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats to slash Medicare benefits for seniors, including my mom.

It also repeals the President's health care law, which has placed an undue burden on our job creators and their families. Penn Waste, a company in the district I represent, has told me that ObamaCare health care costs, the Affordable Health Care law, will cost their employees a minimum of $68 a week more right now. That's a meal out with your family. That's an extra tank of gas in your car.

This budget also ensures our servicemen and -women are protected by providing $560 billion for defense spending in fiscal year 2014, an amount consistent with America's military goals and strategies.

This budget is responsible. The Senate budget, the Democrat budget, each one starts at no less than a trillion dollars in new spending. I urge everybody to support the Ryan budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to a terrific new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for his leadership.

We are at a fork in the road and there are two stark choices. The Democratic plan promotes progress for the many; the Republican plan promotes prosperity for the few. The Democratic plan will put Americans back to work; the Republican plan will put Americans out of work. The Democratic plan takes a balanced approach to deficit reduction; the Republican plan will balance the budget on the backs of children and working families and seniors and the sick and the afflicted.

Whenever we make that observation, our friends on the other side say that we are trying to scare the American people by communicating misinformation. It's a very cute observation, but it has no factual basis. Let's just check the record.

The Republican plan cuts higher education spending by $168 billion. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

The Republican plan embraces $85 billion in random sequestration cuts

that will cost the economy 750,000 jobs. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

The Republican plan will cut spending on Medicaid by $810 billion—a program, by the way, that disproportionately benefits poor children, seniors, and the disabled. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

The Republican plan will turn Medicare into a voucher program, but because that voucher will not keep up with the cost of health care inflation, it will deny beneficiaries what they are receiving today. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

And that is why the Republican plan is designed to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable in our society, and it should be rejected. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. I thank the chairman for the hard work that he and the House Budget Committee have done on this incredible effort for a new plan to balance the budget in 10 years.

This proposal invites our friends across the aisle, President Obama, and the Senate to commit to the same commonsense goal. The 2014 House Republican budget sets a responsible precedent by ensuring our government lives within its means, just like millions of Americans across this country and just like my constituents back in North Carolina. I hear from them every day and they ask me: Why can't the Federal budget be balanced? Why can't Washington get its spending under control?

This proposal sets real, practical goals that will stop spending money we don't have, fix our broken Tax Code, protect and strengthen important priorities like Medicare and national security, reforms welfare programs like Medicaid so that it can deliver on the promises to deliver to those who are in most need. It also does repeal the President's health care plan and allows us to put in place real, sensible, patient-centered reforms for health care.

The House Republican budget reduces the deficit by $4.6 trillion over the next 10 years. This budget offers a plan to expand opportunity and creates jobs. While not sufficient by themselves, policy reforms at the Federal level can help foster an environment that promotes economic growth. This budget seeks to equip Americans with the skills to succeed in the 21st century economy and grow that economy.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and I believe the American people are looking for this leadership here in Washington, because they know that bureaucrats here in Washington do not know what they know back home.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a new Member of Congress, who is on the Veterans' Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

I rise to address the so-called Path to Prosperity that this body is now debating.

I'm struck by the beltway media bubble that calls this plan bold and its creator, Mr. RYAN, a serious policymaker who isn't afraid to make the tough decisions. My Republican colleagues call this proposal brave and necessary, but I could not disagree more. I don't believe it's brave to break the promises we made to our seniors. I think it's dangerous. I don't believe it's necessary to cut funding for police, firefighters, and programs for low-income citizens. I think that's foolish. I don't believe that it's wise to provide tax credits for private jets and luxury yachts.

My colleague, Mr. RYAN, seems to be living in an alternate reality. He thinks that we can fund the Federal Government at 19 percent of GDP with an aging population whose health care costs are at 18 percent of GDP. Even conservative idol President Reagan funded the Federal Government at 22 percent of GDP when there was no retiring baby boom generation and health care costs only amounted to 1 percent of GDP. Would Mr. RYAN accuse President Reagan's administration of ''wild government spending?'' I don't think so.

The GOP budget boils down to three steps: phase one, cut spending; phase two, I'm not sure what their plans are; phase three, prosperity.

There's a gaping hole in Mr. RYAN's logic. His thinking is incomplete. How is cutting funding for infrastructure, education, and health care a Path to Prosperity?

Mr. Chairman, a century of evidence shows that austerity will not lead to prosperity. Democrats offer alternative proposals that deal with the real crisis in America—the jobs crisis.

□ 1930

A plan to reach full employment is the true path to prosperity. I urge a ''no'' vote on the Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget proposal.

Before I came to Washington, D.C., I was the Appropriations Committee chairman of the Kansas State Legislature, where we were required each year to balance our State's budget. We were like a lot of Kansas families; we couldn't spend more money than we bring in—quite a novel concept.

As a Member of Congress, I have stood in disbelief, much like most Americans, at the wanton disregard for balancing the Federal budget. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is astonishing. In the last 50 years, we've only balanced the budget six times. That's why I'm so happy that we finally have a budget before us that balances. Not only does it balance, it pays off the national debt down to zero.

Now, I support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution to require Congress to do its job and make sure that we don't spend more than we take in. Opponents of that amendment often say we don't need the Constitution to require us to do our work, to balance the budget. We have all the tools to balance the budget now. Great. This is our opportunity to prove it. Let's come together and do our jobs.

Americans are sick and tired of the standard lame Washington excuses of why we couldn't do our jobs and balance the budget. How can you keep going home and blaming others, blaming the other side for the fiscal state of our Nation?

The facts are, Mr. Chairman, besides the RSC budget, this is the only budget being presented that balances and pays the debt down to zero. So we are hearing speech after speech today that criticizes this balanced budget without offering a balanced alternative.

Mr. Chairman, each day, hard-working Americans get up to do their jobs. They work long, hard hours. They put food on the table. They raise their families, and they pay lots of taxes. Is it too much for them to ask for us to balance our books, to spend their tax dollars wisely?

Let's chart a debt-free future for this country. Let's rebuild our economy. Let's honor the work and commitment of the American taxpayers, and let's stand together for a balanced budget.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes remaining.

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

We've had a good and healthy debate today. I want to go back to the question that was posed by the Republican leader, Mr. CANTOR: Which of these budgets does more to help the economy? Which budget helps put more people back to work?

Well, we know that the austerity approach taken in the Republican budget will result in 750,000 fewer Americans working by the end of this year and 2 million fewer Americans working next year, compared to the alternative that the Democrats are proposing, which would replace the sequester. So you achieve the same amount of deficit reduction, but you don't do it in a way that results in slowing down economic growth in this country this year, next year, or the year beyond. We tackle the budget deficit by dealing with the jobs deficit right now and then taking a balanced approach into the future.

Let's talk about taxes. The Republican budget will give another windfall tax break to the very wealthiest people in this country. In order to make up

the revenue lost, they will inevitably have to increase the tax burden on middle-income taxpayers unless they're going to put their budget out of balance. Now, just to safeguard against that, we offered an amendment that said, when you do tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle-income families. Every Republican on the Budget Committee voted against that.

We can address our priorities and reduce the deficit in a smart, consistent way without violating our commitments to seniors, without reopening the prescription drug doughnut hole so people with high drug costs will have to shell out lots more—thousands over the period of this budget. We can do it without making the interest rate on student loans double this July. We can do it without cutting our investment in transportation by 15 percent when we have all these unmet needs and 15 percent employment in the construction industry. We know we can do all those things and reduce our deficit the smart way because we do it in the House Democratic budget, which dramatically drops the deficit so that it's growing much slower than the economy, stabilizes the debt at 70 percent of GDP, and, yes, balances the budget the same time the Republican budget last year balanced. What a conversion to hit this political target this year after all the talk last year. And the reason—and the fundamental difference here—is that, by trying to drive to that political target, they end up balancing the budget on the backs of everybody else—commitments to seniors, investment in our economy, investment in the future.

At the end of the day—and we showed the numbers earlier, Mr. Chairman. They can't have it both ways. They can't say their budget balances in 10 years and at the same time they repeal ObamaCare, because the $715 million in savings from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare, is embedded right in their budget.

The trillion dollars in revenue from that they say they're going to pull out of the air. But if we repealed ObamaCare today, it would be out of balance by over $500 billion. So let's focus on the task at hand, put people back to work. Let's have a Tax Code that makes sense for the middle class. And let's keep our commitment to seniors and grow this economy.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that people reject the lopsided Republican plan and adopt the balanced approach presented by the Democratic Caucus.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 4 minutes.

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

I also want to thank my friend from Maryland for a lively debate. He and I have done this so much we can probably finish each other's sentences.

Washington is arrogant. There is an arrogance here in the Federal Government. It's an arrogance that says we know how to run things better in Washington; we should run everything here. We reject that.

We believe in the principle of federalism, which is contained in our Constitution. We think that people who are closer to the problems can probably do a better job of fixing problems.

I have a letter from the Governor of Utah, a letter from the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Iowa:

> This budget will replace the rigid, one-size-fits-all Federal programs and instead offers the States the flexibility they need to make these programs work for the people they serve.
>
> This budget gives States maximum flexibility in areas like Medicaid, food stamps, TANF so States can determine the optimal way to provide services to these unique populations.

We want to empower people closer to the problem to help solve these problems because you know what? We're not fixing these problems.

The other measure of arrogance in Washington is only in Washington is reducing the increase of spending a huge cut. Only in Washington is growing spending for the Federal Government at 3.4 percent a year instead of 5 percent a year a massive cut. You know what? Government's growing just fine. The Senate Democrat budget says let's grow spending at 4.7 percent a year instead of 5. That's supposed to be progress.

The family budget is growing at less than 2.5 percent for the next 10 years. That's the best projection we've got, the most generous one. If the family budget is only growing 2.5 percent and the Federal Government is growing about 5 percent, this is imbalance. This is arrogance. We should ask our Federal Government to do just what our families do and balance the budget. That's the responsible thing to do.

Now, let's take a look at what our friends on the other side of the aisle are doing. The one consistent theme of all of these budgets that are being offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, by the other Democrats, by the Senate Democrats is tax more and spend more.

The Senate Democrat budget, that comes in the cheapest one of them all. Increase net spending—remember, we have a trillion-dollar deficit, a debt crisis in the future. What do they say? Let's net increase spending above where we are and let's raise taxes $923 billion.

The House Democratic budget, let's have a net spending increase of $476 billion and let's raise taxes $1.2 trillion.

□ 1940

The Congressional Black Caucus budget: let's raise spending $1.99 trillion and have a tax increase of $2.9 trillion. Or the Progressive Caucus budget—that one really takes the cake—let's have a $4.65 trillion spending increase only to be slightly outdone by a $5.683 trillion tax increase.

This is what they're saying: ignore the deficit, ignore the economy, all the answers lie in Washington, take more from hardworking small businesses, take more from families, spend it in Washington, and, oh, by the way, we don't have a crisis. That's just scaremongering.

Do you know what? Try telling that to our children and our grandchildren who are guaranteed to get a lower standard of living if we don't fix this mess. Try telling that to the struggling workers, the families, the people in poverty in America today who aren't cutting it in this economy.

Balancing the budget helps us promote a healthier economy to create jobs and get people back on their feet again, and that's exactly why we're proposing and passing this budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time has expired.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

During the annual debate on the budget resolution, the House assigns 1 hour to the Joint Economic Committee to assess current economic conditions and evaluate how the budget resolution, if implemented, would improve the outlook for America's economy. As chairman of the Joint Economic Committee during the 113th Congress, I'm pleased to lead this discussion.

For more than 2 years, the Joint Economic Committee has demonstrated that the current recovery we're in is the weakest of all recoveries lasting at least 1 year since World War II in terms of economic growth, in terms of jobs, and in personal income for families.

Let's examine the following three charts. In each, the red lines depict the current recovery where we're headed right now; the navy blue lines depict the average of all the other recoveries since World War II, and the sky-blue line depicts the average of these recoveries.

Since the recession ended 3½ years ago, our real economy, the real GDP, has grown by a mere 7.5 percent. That's this one. But during the comparable period, real economic growth averaged more than double that, 17.5 percent in other postwar recoveries. It is a huge gap between where we are today as a Nation and just the average, C-student, middle-of-the-road recovery of the past. We are lagging far behind. There is a serious growth gap.

President Obama often boasts that his recovery has generated 6.4 million jobs in the private sector since we hit a low in February 2010. But if you look at previous postwar recoveries, just apples to apples, the average increase in private jobs over the comparable time would have generated an equivalent of 10.4 million jobs. This is the comparison. These are the jobs of the current

recovery. This is just the average. And that blue-shaded area is the range between the very worst, the one we're in, and the very best, which is a lot more jobs. In fact, today, this recovery compared to the average, we're missing 4 million jobs in America. We're missing more than $1 trillion out of our economy because of the current recovery in this growth gap.

In fact, if this recovery had been merely average, middle-of-the-road, instead of having fewer jobs on Main Street than when the recession began, which is where we're at right now, fewer jobs on Main Street, private payroll employment would have been at an all-time high if this would have just been an average recovery.

Sluggish economic growth and job creation have also slowed personal income growth, the money that you earn as a family. In recoveries since 1960, disposable income, real disposable income, apples to apples, per person, grew by $3,500 over 43 months. But during the same period, this is where the average income for families has grown; but look where we are under the current recovery. During the same period, for the current recovery, personal income growth for a family, it isn't $3,500, it's about $416. So this current recovery is taking a real toll on families and taking a real toll on our economy and on jobs.

Now, think what is more worrisome than this economy's weak performance is the ability of our economy to grow and create private-sector jobs in the future. Economic evidence shows that it may have permanently fallen. In the most recent ''Budget and Economic Outlook,'' the Congressional Budget Office lowered its estimate for our long-term growth rate as a Nation, the potential GDP, from its average since 1950 of 3.3 percent. They lowered it and our future to 2.3 percent.

Now, one percentage point may not sound like much, but it has a huge effect on our economy, on our jobs, and on the ability of the Federal Government to pay its bills.

Think about it like this: at America's traditional 3.3 percent growth rate of the past half a century, our real economy doubles every 22 years. But at this new normal, this new slower rate of 2.3 percent, it takes almost 32 years to double in size. That's a decade longer; that's a decade slower.

A permanent growth gap of 1 percent translates into one-third slower growth for our young people seeking to find their first job and for families hoping to reach their American Dream. A permanent growth gap of 1 percent means our economy will be $20 trillion smaller in 2052. That's actually a growth gap for 1 year larger than the entire American economy today.

It also means it will be harder to balance the Federal budget since a permanent growth gap of 1 percent means the loss of a whopping $93 trillion from our Federal coffers, again, over the next four decades. Think about $93 trillion today. The unfunded liability for Social Security, Medicare, and our Federal pensions in today's dollars is only $87 billion. So the prospect of a ''new normal'' for America's economy in which our future growth permanently slows by one-third should be a red flag for all Americans.

We are told in school growing up that in Shakespeare's play, a soothsayer told Julius Caesar to beware the ides of March, the 15th. Ironically, this year, President Obama released his ''Economic Report of the President'' on that ominous date, and buried in this report are some startling admissions and some dire warnings for the American people. Unlike Caesar, this Congress should take heed.

First, the President's report acknowledges that the current recovery is indeed the weakest since World War II, as Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee have been saying now for more than 2 years. This growth gap is real, and it's widening. Second, our economy's ability to grow in the future, the growth rate of potential GDP, has decreased. The President admits that.

□ 1950

Unfortunately, President Obama then seeks to blame this new normal on everything other than his economic leadership. The report attributes two-thirds of the decrease to demographic factors, specifically an aging population and a slower rate of net immigration. The report attributes the remaining one-third to just about everything that's ever occurred in the last 5 years.

Demographic factors account for some of the new normal. But if you think about it, our potential economy for the future, it's a function of how many hours that are worked in America and the growth of the workers, how productive they are. In turn, what drives that productivity of the American worker is if businesses invest in new business, new equipment, new buildings, new software. That drives jobs along Main Street.

The policies of the Obama White House—higher taxes; the unwillingness to propose real solutions to save Social Security and Medicare for future generations; the prospects of higher costs and regulations due to the President's new ObamaCare law; how we regulate our local banks; global warming regulations; and suppression of energy production on Federal lands and waters, America's lands and waters—have generated so much uncertainty, and it's really squelched new business investment in America. Unlike real personal consumption, nonresidential investment from the business community still remains below what it was before the recession began.

Mr. Chairman, this new normal for America, the growth gap that we're in today, the prospect that America will grow slower in the future is unacceptable. Republican Members of this House are working to accelerate growth. A big step we can take forward tonight is to pass the House budget. It is a responsible, balanced budget.

By estimations, it will raise our economic growth by 1 percent in the next year. That's significant. It will add $1,500 in new purchasing power for households. And if you look over the long term, the next 10 years, the House budget could well add up to 3 percent to our economic growth and $4,000 per household in real income people don't have today, real gains that they don't have today.

The truth of the matter is the roadblocks to America's future are still in place: the prospect of higher taxes; the failure to reform and save our entitlements; ObamaCare with all the new taxes, new regulations; higher costs for families; and the fact that we're not pursuing tax reform, at least from this White House, with the Ways and Means Committee and House Republicans in this budget to move toward a fairer, simpler tax code that closes tax loopholes and does it not to fuel spending but rather to fuel lower rates for families and small businesses and make us competitive again as a Nation.

This budget resolution, this responsible and balanced budget developed by the Budget Committee chaired by PAUL RYAN, is the first step toward a brighter economic future for our children and grandchildren.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield myself such time as I may consume as I'm pleased to represent the Democratic point of view in this budget.

We now have before this Congress the choice of two profoundly different paths forward for the American economy. One based on severe austerity for the many and deep cuts in programs for the vulnerable that is offered by Chairman RYAN and our friends from across the aisle. No new revenues are included in Mr. RYAN's plan.

The other proposal, offered by the Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and the Democrats, is based on a balance of targeted spending cuts, the closing of loopholes and the elimination of costly tax expenditures that benefit the very few. It uses a balance of spending cuts and new revenue.

This is perhaps the most important choice that Congress will make this year. It will determine what kind of country we're going to be, what kind of economy our children will inherit and what kind of place we will make for ourselves in the world.

But before we examine our differences, let's look at the things we can all agree on: the long-term structural deficit needs to be addressed. On that there is no question; there is agreement. We need to spur economic growth, which is vital. Without it, there's no hope. More jobs and opportunities need to be created. The recovery

is leaving too many people behind. And wasteful spending needs to be eliminated and costs need to be controlled. On these things we can all agree. All these things need doing. This is not our argument.

Our disagreement is over how to do it and how long it should take. It's also helpful to remember how we got here and how far we've come under progress under the Obama administration.

As you can see from this chart—and I call it the ''V chart''—from December of 2007 through December of 2009, the economy lost a staggering 8.7 million jobs. That red section represents what was going on at the end of the Bush administration. The blue section shows what happened when President Obama took office. You can see there was quite a turnaround. Instead of going down, we started going up and gaining jobs. In fact, there have been 36 months of private jobs gained in 36 months.

During this last 3-year period here, the private sector has added nearly 6.4 million jobs. Just last month, the private sector added 246,000 jobs. So we've been moving in the right direction, from the deep red valley into the hope of moving forward, and that is where we are now.

The unemployment rate is down almost 2.5 percentage points from its peak in October of 2009. Our economy came very close to falling into the abyss, but since the depths of the Great Recession, as you can see from this chart, we are making progress.

As you can see from the next chart, the economy has recorded 14 consecutive quarters of GDP growth. Again, we are moving in the right direction. Key sectors such as manufacturing and construction have rebounded. In 2012, the Case-Shiller Home Price Indices rose by 7.3 percent. A recovery is clearly underway. But where do we go from here, and how do we speed things up?

Let's look first at the proposal from Representative RYAN and the Republicans. From what I see, there are only three things wrong with it: its priorities, its math, and its vision for America. The Ryan budget is based solely on massive cuts to domestic investments; cuts to programs that service and benefit the working millions and help the most vulnerable; and cuts in tax rates to benefit the fortunate few.

For many who are struggling now, the Ryan plan would lead to a slow economic death, death from a thousand cuts. It is absolutely impossible to cut your way to prosperity. The Ryan plan would make deep and painful cuts to vital domestic programs. It would change the food stamp program—a program that helps millions—into a block grant and cut its funding by $135 billion.

Medicare, as we know it, would come to an end. The Ryan plan includes a voucher system that would increase out-of-pocket health care costs by over $5,000 per senior. Here's what the AARP had to say about the Ryan budget and Medicare:

> Chairman Paul Ryan's proposed budget fails to address the high cost of health care and instead shifts costs onto seniors and future retirees. Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable health coverage seniors have contributed to through a lifetime of hard work is not the answer.

□ 2000

Cuts to Medicaid could affect as many as 60 million people annually. Half of these are children; and of the adults on Medicaid, more than two-thirds are women.

The Ryan plan repeals the Affordable Care Act, which would sharply cut the overall level of health care available to tens of millions. Yet, to make his budget balance, RYAN counts the $716 billion in Medicare savings from the Affordable Care Act. It's a hoax of epic proportions. Repealing the Affordable Care Act would return us to a time when insurance companies could charge women more—it's called ''gender rating''—just for being women. Repealing the Affordable Care Act would also eliminate the ban on discrimination against those with preexisting conditions, the ability to remain on parents' health plans until age 26, and the expansion of Medicaid. Then, while tens of millions of Americans would be struggling under the harsh new austerity measures, the Ryan plan would cut the tax bills for the most fortunate.

Last year, the Joint Economic Committee estimated that RYAN's tax plan would lower taxes for millionaires by about $300,000 while raising taxes for individual taxpayers earning between $50,000 and $100,000 by over $4,000. How fair is that?

At a time when income inequality is widely viewed as a very serious problem in our country, the Ryan plan would make it worse. The gap between the haves and the have-nots would grow larger under the Ryan plan. The Ryan plan would ask tens of millions to bear additional burdens—pay additional taxes—and face additional hardships while it cut taxes for the fortunate few and preserved loopholes for Big Oil and spent an additional half-trillion dollars on the military over the next 10 years.

Then, at the end of a decade of painful cuts, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, the Ryan budget would have managed to actually add $5.7 trillion to the deficit. A close look at the math makes it clear that the Ryan budget can't recoup the revenue lost from its tax cuts without imposing large tax increases on middle class families. The Tax Policy Center was unwilling to speculate on where the lost revenue would come from. In addition, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that the Ryan budget would kill 750,000 jobs this year, 2 million next year, and would decrease the gross domestic product by 1.7 percentage points.

The priorities of this budget are all wrong. It kills jobs, stifles growth and adds to the deficit, all while making life harder for seniors, women, children, and the most vulnerable in our society.

The math of the budget just does not add up. Simple arithmetic tells us that the only way to pay for Mr. RYAN's proposed tax cuts for the fortunate few is to eliminate many of the deductions that middle class families count on to pay for housing and health care and to save for their retirements. The Ryan tax plan would further burden those who are struggling by substantially lowering taxes for the most fortunate—and that's not spin. That's just plain math.

The vision this budget offers of America is totally at odds with who we claim to be. It's a vision of a country where the government is indifferent to the suffering of many while only paying attention to the demands of the few.

Then there is the other plan that is before us, the Democratic plan, with a balanced set of priorities—a better vision for the future found in the budget offered by House Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN. It takes a balanced approach with targeted spending and new revenues. It would cut waste, add jobs, and spur the economic growth of the economy.

It would reduce the deficit by an additional $1.8 trillion without jeopardizing the recovery or harming the middle class. It includes $1.2 trillion in new revenue obtained, not by tax increases, but by closing loopholes and eliminating wasteful spending that benefits the wealthiest Americans and the largest corporations. It eliminates $4 billion in annual tax breaks to the oil and gas industry, an industry that is making profits. They don't need a tax break. In fact, they are making enormous profits.

So why does the Ryan budget give them a government subsidy? The Democratic plan invests in infrastructure, education, job training, and innovation. It is designed, first and foremost, to help create jobs and to strengthen the economy. The House Democratic budget also makes critical investments in our future.

$200 billion is invested in infrastructure, education, job training, and innovation, helping to create jobs and strengthen the economy. These investments include $80 billion for an education jobs initiative, $50 billion for transportation needs, and $10 billion for an infrastructure jobs bank. As Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has said many times over the past few years, simply pursuing deep cuts in the short term will slow the rate of economic growth, bring down revenues and lead to less deficit reduction.

We have two paths before us. We can choose a path of austerity and indifference that will limit economic growth and increase inequality; or we can choose one of inspiration and inclusion that invests in our country and creates opportunities for everyone.

I choose opportunity over austerity. I urge my colleagues to reject the Ryan budget and to support the budget offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN and the House Democrats.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a key member of the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I want to shed a little light on what has been discussed on the floor tonight, Mr. Chairman. We are hearing a lot of conversation about Medicare.

We have to be clear that, in ObamaCare, this was the largest health care reform bill this country had ever seen. It's going to spend $2 trillion of deficit spending over the next 10 years. With that massive new health care reform bill, guess what? Medicare is going broke in 10 to 12 years. So with this great health care reform, they didn't have enough foresight to save our seniors' Medicare program, the program they've actually paid for over the course of their lifetimes. I think our seniors deserve better than what they've received in ObamaCare.

We hear a lot about what we've done with the $716 billion in ObamaCare. Let's be clear between the two plans.

My friends across the aisle want to take $716 billion of savings from Medicare—take that money out—and use it for a different set of people in ObamaCare. They want to use it for people who didn't pay for the program. On our side of the aisle, we want to take that savings and use it for our seniors—it's their money; they deserve to get it—and we use it to shore up the program. This makes sense.

You talk about facts and numbers, think back to what the President told us with regard to ObamaCare. He said, Listen, you're going to see your health care costs go down by $2,500 a year per family of four. The truth? What happened? Health care costs went up by $3,000 a year for a family of four. That's a $5,500 turnaround for a family of four in his health care reform bill. Listen, that's a lot of money for hardworking American families.

Let's talk about what else has been discussed by my friends across the aisle.

□ 2010

If you recall the stimulus bill, a trillion dollars in spending, remember, we were supposed to spend a trillion dollars and get an unemployment rate by 2013 of 5.2 percent. Well, the reality is we're sitting at 7.7 percent. But if you add back in everybody who has stopped looking for work because they can't find it because this has been one of the longest and lamest recoveries since the Great Depression, it's actually up at 10 percent. Listen, these policies and these promises haven't worked for the American people.

Let's talk about taxes. We have a plan that will reform the Tax Code. It will make it fairer, flatter, simpler, easier to use, and we root out the loopholes, take away the preferences and the exemptions. We get away from crony capitalism. A fairer code. You have a chance to vote for that kind of tax reform in our budget.

But let's compare that to what my friends across the aisle propose. Well, a trillion dollars in tax increases in ObamaCare, $600 billion of tax increases in the fiscal cliff.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. DUFFY. And another $1.2 trillion in this new proposal, for a total of $2.8 trillion of new taxes. Mr. Chairman, we've seen this before. This is tax-and-spend liberalism at its finest.

I think the American people understand what has happened in this very slow recovery. This is a chart that the chairman showed earlier, but you see the growth rate and the red line of what we've seen in this recovery, and you see the average growth rate of other recoveries from other recessions. And the difference is 4 million jobs between this recovery and the average recovery. Well, that's 4 million families that don't have work, that aren't paying for food on the table and a roof over their head. These are real people and real families in places like central and northern Wisconsin that have been impacted by this economy.

As Chairman RYAN talks about, we have a choice of two futures, and my Democratic colleagues across the aisle want this massive debt and deficit to be the future for our children. We think there's a better way. We look at being responsible and paying off our debt in a way that's going to work, not just for this generation, but for future generations.

What are we doing? We owe $17 trillion in debt. We borrow $1 trillion every year, and there's no end in sight, and we're printing money to buy our debts. And you say keep going, keep printing, keep borrowing, keep spending. This is going to end well, you tell us, or you tell our American families. Give me an example of where printing, borrowing, and spending ends in economic growth, prosperity, wealth, or sustainable jobs.

Let's go back to fiscal responsibility. Let's live within our means in this country, pay down our debt, do what's responsible, and leave our children a brighter future.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the Republican House budget merely shifts health care costs to families. It makes no attempt to bend the curve to lower health care costs, and the voucher program for Medicare will only mean that seniors will be paying more for health care, by some estimates as much as $5,900 per person, and that's why the AARP and other independent organizations that track health care benefits for seniors are so opposed to it.

I now yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Great State of Maryland, ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Over the past 3 years, nearly 6 million new jobs have been added to the American economy, and the unemployment rate has fallen to 7.7 percent. Although this is real progress from where we were during the financial crisis inherited by President Obama, we can do far more to boost economic growth and continue to create jobs.

The American people deserve a budget that supports economic growth, responsibly reduces long-term deficits, and ensures equal opportunity for all. Chairman RYAN's recent budget does not satisfy any of these goals. Instead, it will slow economic growth, increase the unemployment rate, cut critical investments in our Nation's future, and harm our seniors, all while protecting the interests of the wealthiest Americans.

The Ryan budget would lower the top tax rate for the rich while hitting middle-class families with thousands of dollars in additional taxes every year. Nearly 30 million middle-income Americans would lose their health insurance because of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and tens of millions of the poorest would lose coverage because of Ryan's plan to gut Medicaid. We can do better.

It would destroy the commitments we've made to our Nation's seniors by turning Medicare into a voucher program. It would shift the rising costs of health care onto those very Americans who have already suffered deep financial shocks in the recent fiscal crisis. Many of them have lost their homes, lost their health insurance, lost their jobs, lost equity in their homes, lost their savings, and now the Ryan budget would break another promise to them.

In a fairly cynical move, the Ryan budget would repeal those provisions of the Affordable Care Act that would expand access to care, while keeping in place all the revenue generated by the act.

The Ryan budget also guts investments in science, education, infrastructure—all critical to job creation and economic growth, as well as to the future of our children. If you don't believe it, go talk to the doctors at NIH, the ones who worry about whether they'll be able to complete the research that they're doing. One that I talked to just a few days ago was telling me just a few years ago there were certain types of cancers that were deadly, and now because of the research at NIH, they're chronic. I don't know how you put a price tag on somebody's life.

This budget would reduce non-defense discretionary spending, including core social services that middle-class families rely on, by an additional $700 billion over the next 10 years below the senseless cuts already required under the sequester.

And his plan, Mr. RYAN's plan, repeats past attacks on Federal employees by cutting the workforce by 10 percent over the next decade and requiring Federal workers to contribute an additional $132 billion to their retirement plans.

To justify these proposals, the majority continues to argue that policies that support austerity, such as sequestration, will solve our fiscal problems and magically create prosperity for all. In fact, these stale theories will do nothing but harm hardworking Americans and our seniors, and that is why the American people resoundingly rejected this theory just this past November, not very long ago.

Last week, the Joint Economic Committee convened a hearing to examine constructive measures to stabilize our economy and decrease our long-term Federal debt. Testifying before our committee was Alice Rivlin, very well respected, who served as the founding Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Federal Reserve Vice Chair. She explained that discretionary spending is not a driver of future deficits and that cutting discretionary spending would not slow projected increases in future Federal spending. Instead, Ms. Rivlin expressed concern that additional cuts at this time would have a restraining effect—those were her words—on our economic recovery, threatening to trigger a new recession. We can do better than that.

□ 2020

Similarly, the Federal Reserve Chairman, Ben Bernanke has warned many times over the past few years that pursuing deep cuts in the short-term will slow the rate of economic growth, bring down revenues, and actually lead to less deficit reduction overall. I didn't say that, Chairman Bernanke said that.

Certainly, I agree that Congress must act to put our fiscal house in order, but we must do this in a balanced manner that increases economic stability and certainty in the marketplace. To ensure economic growth, these policies must include a mixture of appropriate revenue increases and targeted spending cuts.

I don't think there's one Member of Congress that disagrees that we must cut spending, but we also must address our fiscal issues in a balanced way. And when we cut, we must cut as if we were the most skilled heart surgeon performing the most delicate operation on a critical patient so that the patient does not die.

To that end, Democrats have put forward a balanced approach to cut spending responsibly, increase revenues and create jobs, like Congressman VAN HOLLEN's plan and Senator MURRAY's plan, which achieve new significant savings by eliminating tax loopholes and cutting wasteful spending.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I grant the gentleman as much time as he may consume.

Mr. CUMMINGS. At the same time, they continue critical investments in infrastructure, education, job training, innovation, all of which will help to strengthen long-term economic growth.

The fastest and most effective way to stabilize the economy and reduce deficits is to put Americans back to work. That is why we need to strengthen the fiscal policies that will support growth, rather than adopting policies that will destroy jobs.

Finally, the only path forward is for Democrats and Republicans to work together to draft a reasonable budget that offers hope and prosperity for all Americans, rather than tax cuts for the rich and crumbs to the rest.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Ryan budget so that we can craft a budget that works for all Americans.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

You know, we did have an interesting hearing in the Joint Economic Committee about the growth gap in America, about the thought and prospect that America's future growth could shrink by as much as a third, the damage it would do for families, to our economy, to our ability to pay our bills as a Nation.

And when we asked the four witnesses, all from different backgrounds and different philosophies, we asked them a simple question.

One, do you believe higher tax increases, more tax increases, would help the American economy today? Not one of them said it would.

And we asked them, what do we need to reassure our investors and put America back on a firm financial path? They all said, you need to act now on reforming Social Security and Medicare for the long haul.

And I said, so when is now? And they generally agreed by June or July. I mean, now.

The Republican budget does that. The Democrat budget ignores our problems, ignores the advice of four distinguished economists.

Earlier tonight a claim was made that some of the budgets are indifferent to the suffering of many. I want to address the suffering of many in today's America, under today's recovery.

Take a look at this. Since the bottom of the recession, the President often likes to boast that he has created over 6 million jobs along Main Street in America. But what he doesn't talk about much is that, in that same period, this Nation has forced over 8 million families on to food stamps, simply to have food on their table, simply to keep hunger from their door.

You are more likely, as a family under this recovery, to be forced to apply for food stamps than to actually walk into the door of a company that's offering you a job. That's not the sign of a healthy recovery. That's the suffering that occurs under today's recovery that this President has led. That's the growth gap's impact on real people.

Let's take a look at families income, because that's so important to paying bills today, not just that you have a job, but, you know, are you getting ahead? Are you falling behind?

Look at this chart. This shows the growth gap and the impact on families. Up to this date, the worst economic recovery that we had since World War II, a family, by now, would have gained back almost $2,000 in disposable income, real income they can spend. Under the best recovery, they would have almost $5,000 in their pocket. Just average, middle-of-the-road, C-grade recovery, nothing to talk about, a family ought to have now over $3,500 more gained back in their paycheck.

But look what they have—$461, and that's all, in the last 3½ years. That's what they've gained back, $10 a month. So more families are being forced to go on food stamps. Those who have jobs are going nowhere in this recovery.

Let's look at Wall Street. The Federal Reserve is printing money right and left, buying our own debt, buying up credit, allocating, picking winners and losers around this country, continuing to pour money into the system.

So what's happened?

Let's put that family income against the Wall Street income. In this economic recovery, look at Wall Street. Look at the Standard & Poor's total return, look how high it is. It continues to grow.

But look at Main Street. Look at a per-person income, where it's gone over the last 3½ years. Again, almost nowhere.

If you like this economic recovery, if you like the fact that, as Wall Street roars, Main Street families are left behind, then don't change anything. Continue higher taxes, more stimulus spending, borrowing every dollar it seems that we spend.

You'll leave the President's health care law in place, put new regulations on Main Street, and this is what we'll get more of, families that continue to fall further and further behind, families who are looking for a job, and they either drop out completely and give up working, or they're forced onto food stamps, families that watch Wall Street grow wealthier as they gain what, $10 a month in their paycheck?

The Republican budget changes the course of not just our financial position as a country, it changes the course for our economy, adding immediately 1 percent growth, closing that growth gap here in this first year, adding more income, $1,500 to a family, and over the next 10 years, doing dramatically more, both for families and the economy.

That's what the Republicans' budget is about. It's about changing the growth gap, closing it, and giving our families a fighting chance again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY. I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from the

great State of Maryland, JOHN DELANEY, a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

And may I inquire how much time remains on our side?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman, prior to yielding the time, had 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague from New York for yielding me this time. And I also want to thank my friend and colleague from Texas for his leadership on the committee.

Too often, Mr. Chairman, we talk about our budget in absolute terms, and we don't talk to the American people about what budgets really are, which are choices. As we go through each line item of revenues and each line item of spending, we tend to characterize these things in very dramatic terms, as if any change, up or down, on any line of revenue or any line of spending, would have catastrophic implications.

We don't have an honest dialogue with the American people about what budgets really are, which are choices and statements of priorities, which is why, in my opinion, this Congress, and the administration, have failed to recognize the two dominant themes facing our country and our world right now.

□ 2030

The first is the fundamental need to change the fiscal trajectory of this country across the long term, and the second is the need to invest in our future and our children to prepare them for a world that is fundamentally changed because of globalization and technology.

We cannot do these two things—we cannot change the fiscal trajectory of this country and we cannot make investments in our future and our children—unless we do two things: first, reform the entitlement programs in this country; and, second, take actions to raise revenues.

Last year, 13 percent of the American population was over 65. In 2030, 20 percent of the American population will be over 65. This singular fact dominates our whole discussion around our fiscal future.

Just to put this into perspective, if we don't change the trajectory of our entitlement programs, in 10 years they will consume 70 percent of our spending and literally crowd out every other priority we have as a country. And just to put this in a sharper focus, right now, as a country, if you add up all the spending at the Federal, State, and local level on Americans over 65, that number is $27,000 a year. If you do the same math on Americans under 18, that number is $11,000 a year. That is a 2½ to 1 ratio of statements of priorities that we are making in our budget.

Just to be clear, I don't come here thinking we should spend less on the elderly. I don't come here thinking that we should be cutting taxes. I actually think we should be raising taxes. But we fundamentally have to change the trajectory of entitlement spending in this country if we want to invest in our future.

Prior to coming to Congress, I spent two decades in the private sector. I started and led two companies that became New York Stock Exchange listed companies and, in the process, created several thousand jobs. That experience taught me two important lessons: first, we have to look at the facts, always; and, second, we have to think about the future, and we have to plan for the future.

I have already talked about the facts. Now I want to talk a little bit about the future.

If we want to create good jobs and reverse some of the trends that the gentleman from Texas just talked about and demonstrated to us, we have to make investments in making this country more competitive. That is the fundamental issue facing our country right now, Mr. Chairman, is to make this country more competitive.

To do that we have to do several things:

First, we have to continue to invest and reform our educational system. There has never been a stronger correlation in our country's history between having a good education and getting a job.

Second, we need a national energy policy to ensure that we have clean and inexpensive energy across the long-term. If you look at the history of successful economies, the two most important numbers are the cost of money and the cost of energy.

Third, we have to reform our immigration system.

Fourth, we have to invest in our infrastructure.

To do these things requires investments. We will fundamentally not be able to make these investments unless we, as I said, reform our entitlement programs and raise revenues.

We are confronted with two choices in our budgets, and these are insufficient choices. The American people deserve better. On one hand, we have a choice where we don't recognize the reality of where the entitlement programs are going, and the other choice is we slash and cut the critical investments we need to make to have a future. We can do better.

Each party likes to take the high ground on a balanced approach, but what does that really mean? To me, a balanced approach means several things.

First, we need additional revenues through measures like the Buffett rule, by closing certain corporate tax loopholes while also lowering corporate tax rates. The Buffett rule levels the playing field, does not raise rates, but it makes sure that there is parity in terms of taxes that are paid; and it will do a significant amount towards closing the income inequality gap in this country, and it will produce more revenues. That is the first thing we have to do.

The second thing, we do need to reform on entitlement programs, and we should do four things. We should means test; we should raise the cap; we should change how the cost of living adjustment is calculated; and we should change the retirement age, not for people who do manual labor, but for everyone else. That is the second thing we need to do.

The third thing we need to do is we need to look at our discretionary spending and our defense spending, and we need to make these expressions of our priorities around our future. Some of that will require additions; some of that will require subtractions.

These are things we need to do to have a balanced approach. This is the choice that this Congress should have, an approach that invests in our future and changes the fundamental trajectory of our entitlement programs while taking care of those most vulnerable. That, to me, is a balanced approach.

I am proud to be a Democrat. I am proud to be a Democrat because of our historical fight for those left behind and because of our view that we have to invest in our future. I would like my party to lead on fundamental reform to these entitlement programs, and do it now, so we don't have to affect current beneficiaries or people who are close to being beneficiaries. I want to take those savings with additional tax revenues and invest it in our future, invest it in our children, invest it in making this country more competitive so that we can create jobs that have a good standard of living.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, so I would be glad to reserve at this time so the former chairman of the Joint Economic Committee may close.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget has its priorities in the right place. It puts people and jobs first. The Democratic budget makes the numbers work for everyone by taking a balanced approach that includes not only cuts, but badly needed revenue. And the Democratic budget has a vision for the future that aspires to have this country lead the world in education, energy, innovation, and quality of life. It makes investments, and that means it takes some risks. But it also is a budget that confidently proclaims we are still the country of big dreams, high ideals, and limitless opportunities for everyone who is willing to work hard, play by the rules, and do their fair share.

I support the Democratic budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the former chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, Congresswoman MALONEY, for her leadership, and continue to enjoy working with you on these economic issues.

Tonight, we have talked a lot about the growth gap and about the prospect

that America's future could be much dimmer. The truth is fiscal challenges facing our Nation are great, but they are not insurmountable if we are willing to take the necessary steps, if we are willing to be less popular, willing to do the right thing. As I said in my opening statement, the single most important thing we can do for families for America to start paying its bills as a government is to take the restrictor plate off our economy.

This recovery is substandard, the weakest since World War II. The growth gap is large and growing. The private sector jobs gap is large and growing. The gap in personal income for families is large and growing. We are adding more people to food stamps than we are getting jobs since the bottom of this recession.

That is no way to build a strong middle class. It is a formula for making people more dependent on the Federal Government. That may be some people's vision of America's future, but not ours.

So, if we are to change the future economic growth of America upside, if we are to increase economic growth in jobs and income growth, we need to restore the promise of economic opportunity in optimism. That is what the Republican budget does. It shrinks the Federal Government where it is fat and wasteful, and it grows the economy in ways that Americans can prosper. That is why the Republican budget is pro-growth and includes pro-growth tax reform, and it is key to a new era of American prosperity. It is a responsible balanced budget, which I strongly support.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Budget Resolution, which balances the budget in 10 years.

We must get our fiscal house in order, and that starts with a plan to reduce spending responsibly—allowing to grow at 3.4 percent instead of 5 percent.

This budget cuts $5.7 trillion in spending and reforms Medicare to save it for future generations while preserving the traditional model for those at or near retirement.

The Federal Government has to deal with the tough issues and make responsible decisions to restore balance.

I thank Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee for supporting key transportation initiatives in the resolution.

Transportation specific provisions:

House Budget Resolution supports MAP–21 funding levels until it expires at the end of 2014. MAP–21 reformed our Federal transportation programs by eliminating unneeded programs, streamlining the project approval process, and putting the highway trust fund on sound financial footing through 2014.

The budget resolution acknowledges that maintaining the long term solvency of the Highway Trust Fund and the tradition of the fund being user fee supported is a priority for the Congress as it begins to work on reauthorizing MAP–21.

Budget also contains language supporting the innovative financing mechanisms for transportation included in MAP–21 such as public private partnerships and the TIFIA program.

I look forward to working with Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee, as we move the Nation toward fiscal responsibility and a growing economy.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Path to Prosperity—our House plan to balance the budget in ten years, restore our economy and grow jobs. As Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, I am particularly gratified to see this plan provide for our men and women in uniform and our national security by replacing deeply harmful sequestration cuts to our national defense with other commonsense reforms.

Since 9/11 our military has been operating at a very high operational tempo around the world keeping this country's citizens safe from those who seek to do us harm—from deadly attacks by al-Qaeda to the sabre rattling of Iran and nuclear provocations of North Korea. But back home as our economy slowed and our deficit rose, this Administration began to question our role in the world and called for substantial reductions to our national defense. While we agreed that everything should have been on the table in order to address this Nation's deficit spending, defense has represented only 18% of our national budget, while our military has absorbed 50% of the cuts to date.

Which is why it is so important today that House Republicans stand unified, both fiscal and national security conservatives, on the goal of replacing arbitrary, automatic across-the-board cuts to our military. This House Republican budget, as does its counterpart from the Republican Study Committee, provides $560.2 billion in defense funding for fiscal year 2014. This is the amount my Committee called for in our views to Chairman RYAN, and an amount consistent with our military responsibilities. Over the next decade, we provide over $6 trillion to fund our nation's defense. While this is significantly less than the levels in previous budget resolutions passed by the House, it is $500 billion more than will be available under sequestration. It allows our military to execute the current national defense strategy and avoids the hollow force and unacceptable level of strategic and operational risk our commanders have warned us about in hearings before our Committee.

I want to thank Chairman RYAN for his unyielding dedication and belief in this country and in American exceptionalism. Absent his vision and absent this House budget, in just four short years, we will be paying more in interest on our debt than our national security. I urge members to support this budget and one of Congress's core constitutional responsibilities—to provide for our common defense.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DESANTIS) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, 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. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2040

COMPETING BUDGETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to address an empty House, but perhaps a few are watching C–SPAN.

We've just heard a fascinating 4-hour discussion on economic policy. A fundamental part of our work here in Congress is to set the economic policy for the United States. As we listened to that 4-hour debate and discussion, there were a lot of charts and a lot of economic theory on both sides: small government versus an active, investing government; the growth of taxes, or the lack thereof; a discussion about jobs and the like. I'd like to first start my discussion this evening on what we ought to be doing. That is the purpose of all of this.

I harken back to the 1930s, a period of time when the Nation was in a very serious Depression, unemployment was rampant, and there was a lot of pain and suffering throughout this Nation. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the President at the time. Today, we are in a somewhat better situation, but still there's a lot of pain, a lot of unemployment, and a lot of families in desperate situations. Back in the thirties, Franklin Delano Roosevelt put forth his New Deal. He articulated—at least a part of it—with what I call ''The Test.'' He said:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little.

That's a value statement. That's a statement about how he saw the role of government, and I agree with him.

Our task here today, as we debate tomorrow and the next 2 days what the economic policy of America will be, we ought to harken back to what Franklin D. Roosevelt said in the 1930s: ''The test of our progress.'' ''The test of our progress.''

What are we to do? Are we to follow policies that would enrich the wealthy even more? And we have one such proposal before us; it's the Ryan Republican budget. It would slash the top tax rate from 39 percent to 25 percent and add another quarter of a million dollars of income annually to those who are making over 400—or over $1 million a year. I think that goes counter to what Franklin Roosevelt said:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much.

The remaining portion of that proposal by Mr. RYAN would put a greater burden on the working men and women and the poor, and it's done in two ways. One way is to remove those tax write-offs that the middle-income, that the working men and women have, significantly reducing those and cutting off those programs that people without jobs depend upon—from unemployment insurance to food stamps and to other benefits that they have—so much so that their actual tax burden would rise by somewhere between $2,000 to $3,000 a year. Franklin Roosevelt said the test of our progress is ''whether we provide enough for those who have little.''

So if we are to believe that our role in government is to provide, to assist, to help, to bring up those who have little—the men and women who are unemployed, the families that have lost their homes, those who are searching for a well-paying job—if that is the test of our progress, if that is our value and our purpose, then I think we'd better think about a different economic policy than is presented to us by the Republicans. I would like to spend some time discussing that this evening.

First of all, there's an immediate situation in which the sequestration—which I have voted repeatedly to end, and many of my colleagues have also—is inherent in the Republican proposal. That sequestration will bring pink slips to 750,000 Americans in this year, the 2013 year; 750,000 Americans will lose their jobs. So if the test of our progress is to help those who have little, well, the Republican budget adds 750,000 people to those who will have very little. They would lose their job.

So why would we do this? Why would we do any economic policy that would add 750,000 people to the unemployment rolls? It makes no sense if you want to grow the economy. If you want to reduce your tax revenues and increase your deficit, I suppose this is one way to do it, but it's not a very good way.

I will tell you that in my district, at Travis Air Force Base, where men and women are going to lose their jobs, where 20 percent of their pay will be cut, it's a very serious problem for our Nation's defense. Because from that Air Force base, the big C–5As and the C–17s that carry men and women and equipment across this globe to fight our wars, to protect our Nation, they will be sitting on the ground. They will not be doing their training. They will not be prepared to carry out their task in defending this Nation.

Why would we do that? It makes no sense to me. Whether it has to do with the test of our progress or our values or our Nation's defense, why would we want to move a policy that would send 750,000 people through the unemployment lines? It makes no sense to me at all.

I was home in my district this last weekend and I was talking to some elderly people that attended one of my meetings. They were asking me, Is it true that you guys are going to cut Medi-Cal?—which is the Medicaid program in California. I said, No, not us guys; but, yes, there is a proposal in Congress to seriously cut Medicaid, and therefore Medi-Cal. They said, Don't they understand that that's how my husband is supported in the nursing home? What are we to do if those cuts force him out of the nursing home?

Well, the reality is that that could happen, because we have a budget on the floor that 435 of us will be voting on in the next couple of days that actually will reduce the Medicaid—and, therefore, Medi-Cal in California—by a third, a third cut. Therefore, that lady who was concerned about her husband's care in the nursing home will find a problem.

□ 2050

She and perhaps many, many others—not perhaps, definitely—many other senior citizens are going to find their opportunity to have care in a nursing home removed. It's a very serious issue because who are those people that are going to see their Medi-Cal, or across this Nation, Medicaid support significantly reduced by one-third? Well, here they are. Two-thirds of them are seniors and people with disabilities. We're not talking about welfare and all that goes with that. We're talking about seniors and men and women in this Nation that have such disabilities that they cannot care for themselves. These are the people that are going to be hurt. Another 20 percent of them are children.

Why? Why would this House vote for a budget that would harm seniors, the disabled and children? Why would we do that? Perhaps the argument that you heard over the last 4 hours is, well, we need to deal with the deficit. Yes, we do. But do we need to deal with it in this way, that we go after seniors, we go after people with disabilities that cannot care for themselves and children and take it to them? And at the very same time in the very same piece of legislation give the superwealthy an additional, extraordinarily large amount of money that the average worker in the United States would have to work 5 to 6 years to equal the tax reduction given to those who are earning a million dollars? And for those that are earning a billion dollars, it is add three to four more zeros to their tax reduction.

Why would we do that? It makes no sense. It is not the American value. It's not what FDR said should be the test of our progress—seniors, children and disabled. Why would we do that?

When you look at that budget and you look at that proposal a little more, what do you see? The seniors, not those who are in nursing homes without income, but seniors, the average senior. The average senior in the United States has a median annual income of $22,800—median. Half of the seniors in this Nation have an annual income of less than $22,800. Half of them have more than that.

So where are we with the proposal that we'll be voting on in the next couple of days from our Republican colleagues? It is a proposal that will end the Medicare program as we know it, and all Americans who are not yet 55 years of age will never see the Medicare guarantee that is available to those Americans that are now 65 and 55 years or older, the Medicare guarantee of a health care program that has, since its inception in 1964, taken nearly all of the seniors in this Nation out of poverty when together with Social Security.

Before there was Medicare in 1964, there was rampant poverty among seniors. I've said on this floor before, and I'll say it again tonight, one of the searing memories in my mind was a trip when my father took me to the county hospital in Calaveras County in the 1950s to visit my neighbor, a rancher, who could no longer take care of himself. He didn't have the money, he was poor, and he wound up in the county hospital. There was a ward, perhaps 20 seniors in the worst possible condition without adequate medical care, simply lined up bed to bed to die.

What are we doing here? What are we doing? Why would we set up a program to end one of the most important, valuable programs to every American citizen? That is the promise of Medicare, a comprehensive medical program for them to take care of their health in their senior years. Why would we end that and turn it over to the health insurance industry?

Now, I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years. I know the health insurance industry, and I know their number one purpose: it's profit. They continually will put profit before people, and yet the proposal that is given to us by the Republican majority is to take every American under the age of 55 and give them a voucher so that they can go to those rapacious health insurance companies and try to get an adequate health insurance policy.

The guarantees that are in the Affordable Care Act would be wiped out by their legislation. The guarantees of an adequate insurance program, the end of discrimination based upon age and preexisting conditions, gone, wiped out. What are they thinking? What are they thinking? Do they understand what the American senior is going through? I think not. I think not. When you consider who those seniors are, I don't understand. I do not understand.

Now, there's an alternative, there's an alternative put forward by our Democrats on this side. You've heard it discussed here in the previous 4 hours. It is an equivalent that is a reflection of the basic American value of taking care of each other, of helping each other, the value of a community, a small community perhaps like I live in in California, the community of Walnut Grove, or the large community of all of us, over 300 million Americans, where we care for each other, where we

test our progress by making sure that all of us are lifted up, not just the superwealthy, not just those who have everything they could possibly need—I understand they may want more—but rather to provide the basic needs of these who have nothing or little—health care, food, shelter, and clothing.

That's where we're coming from. We do it in a way that actually reduces the deficit over time, brings back into a reasonable balance the annual appropriations and the revenues of this government, does it in a way that meets the needs of this generation and future generations, does it in a way that makes the critical investments that grow the economy, rather than stifle the economy by pulling out of the economy, as our Republican colleagues would, the essential elements of economic growth.

There are five of them. I've talked about this for more than 25 years in California and beyond. Those critical investments in present and future economic growth are simple, but they are powerful, and they are absolutely necessary. They are education, research, infrastructure, manufacturing—making things here in America—and change. Those are the five elements. And now that we're here at the Federal level, we must add to that our Nation's security, defense and others.

Let me put a couple of things up here. Growing the economy: growing the economy requires that we invest in infrastructure. This is both immediate and long term.

□ 2100

When we invest in infrastructure, we put people to work now. We can do this. Men and women and companies and contractors are ready to go to work. The skilled labor force is there. All they need is for this government to fund a substantial infrastructure program, and that's precisely what the Democratic budget does. It adds $50 billion now to the appropriations for this year and creates an infrastructure bank so that we can have a public-private partnership to build those infrastructure programs that have a cash flow: sanitation projects, water projects, toll bridges, toll roads, airports. Many of the infrastructure programs that this Nation desperately needs can be financed with an infrastructure bank. For those that cannot be financed with a public-private partnership, we can and we must use our general fund revenue to build the infrastructure.

For every dollar we invest in infrastructure, we immediately return to the economy $1.57. Don't take my word for it. Take Mark Zandi's word, an economist for Moody's Analytics.

Nobody has debated that point. So why don't we invest in the infrastructure? When we do so, we will be safer. We'll have safer airports; our roads will be safer, they'll be paved; and the potholes, not all will disappear, but over time. We will improve our highway system. And our bridges, many of which are deemed to be insufficient and unsafe, can be repaired and rebuilt. And in the process, we've laid the foundation for future economic growth.

On the education side, it is exactly the same. On the education side, if we educate our children, if we have the best education program in the world, something very good will happen to this Nation. First, we will be competitive.

If we fail to educate our workforce, there is no way that we can be competitive. Yet, the budget being proposed by our Republican majority slashes the education programs in this Nation. And for those who are in college or have graduated, they would double the interest rates on student loans. What are they thinking?

On the other hand, our Democratic budget would actually increase funding this year for education, keeping teachers in the classroom, giving schools the opportunity to improve. In the infrastructure program, there are facilities and the opportunity in higher education to continue to keep students in school.

For those who need additional training in the work programs, the Workforce Investment program would be augmented, and we would be able to provide the upgrade in skills and education for those who are unemployed so that they would have a chance to get a job in a growing economy. We envision a growing economy where jobs are created. We know that this year the difference between the budget that we're proposing and the budget that our Republican colleagues are proposing is a difference of 1.2 million jobs.

With the continuation of the sequestration, 750,000 jobs will be lost. We end that. That's 750,000 on the plus side. And with the investments in education and infrastructure, we would add another 400,000 to 500,000 jobs. That's 1.2 million jobs. There's a big difference here: Americans going back to work and Americans being laid off.

We also know that the future economy demands that this Nation become and continue to be the most aggressive, robust research Nation in the world. We are today. No one, no other country, no other university in any other country can match the research that's done in the United States. It is that research that has kept this economy ahead, has kept us moving forward, yet here again we see a departure in how to grow this economy, how to create jobs.

Our budget, our proposal would continue to fund the research programs and, in fact, augment them more than what is currently available in today's appropriations. On the other hand, there are slashes to the research budget.

Today, farmers from my district, today researchers at the University of California at Davis, today the head of the Northern California Resource Conservation District organization came to my office and said, We need your help. We need your help to deal with a very real problem in California. Over the years for a variety of reasons, the aquifers, the underground water tables of California have been contaminated with nitrates, nitrates from the farm, nitrates from fertilizer, dairies and the rest.

There is a requirement, in fact a necessity, to reduce that contamination and, in fact, to eliminate it. However, in order to do so, fundamental research in the way in which plants take up nitrogen needs to be undertaken so that the nitrogen fertilizer that is applied to the fields matches the amount of nitrogen that the plants actually need. And that varies from soil condition to soil condition. Yet, in the budget that's been proposed by our Republican colleagues, there is a $45 million diminution, reduction in the available research money at the University of California at Davis, critical research needed by farmers so that they don't unnecessarily fertilize their fields, so that they accurately match the needs of their plants to the amount of fertilizer they apply. In so doing, they reduce the contamination that is a serious health problem in many parts of California.

Which path do we go on? Do we invest in energy research critical to this Nation? It was, in fact, past research conducted by the United States Government, the U.S. Geological Survey and the Department of Energy that created the knowledge and the techniques for fracking, which has opened up a vast resource through this Nation, a gas resource, natural gas resources, as well as oil.

Research is fundamental: energy research, agricultural research, research in health care, research in the way in which we conduct our communications system. All of these things are fundamental, yet a choice will be made in the next few days which path we go on.

The fourth point I wanted to make is this: Manufacturing. Manufacturing matters. Manufacturing is where the middle class is. Manufacturing is where we built the great American middle class, making things, cars, refrigerators and the more advanced things such as high-speed trains and the like. We need to return this Nation to a manufacturing Nation. This is the creation of wealth. Using research, new products, new technologies, new ways in which we can make things, advanced manufacturing technology, we can rebuild the great American manufacturing sector.

We lost 9 million manufacturing jobs in the last 20 to 25 years. America can't afford that. We need tax policies. We need policies that encourage manufacturing in the United States. It was 2½ years ago that we passed legislation that eliminated many of the tax breaks that corporations had to offshore jobs. We need to finish that job. The President said clearly in his State of the Union message we need to provide tax breaks for on-shoring, bringing those

jobs back to America, and end the remaining tax breaks that corporations get for off-shoring. In so doing, we build our economy and we help to balance the budget by bringing tax revenues back to this Nation.

□ 2110

Manufacturing matters. Billions of dollars of our tax money are spent every year on goods and services, many of which are not made in America.

Why in the world would we spend our tax dollars on steel that's manufactured in China to build the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge? This is 43 million tons of steel, maybe 3,000 to 6,000 jobs in China, not in the United States—American tax money spent. It goes on and on. We need a strong Make It in America, Buy It in America policy so that our tax money is spent on American-made products and services, not on foreign made. Now, if you want to spend your own money out there, fine—buy whatever you want to buy—but if you're going to spend American taxpayer money, then we should spend that money on American-made equipment.

That is precisely the policy that we are offering here in the United States as we move our infrastructure programs forward and as we move forward with our energy development—our solar and our wind and other advanced energy systems. It is to use our tax money to build American manufacturing, once again, here in our Nation. So manufacturing matters, and we will Make It in America when, once again, it is made in America. It is very fundamental.

So these are the things: education, infrastructure, research, manufacturing, and change. We have to be willing to change in many, many of our policies.

How can we pay for this? Here is one novel idea. We can end those tax breaks that are given to individuals and to corporations that are no longer necessary.

The oil industry over the last decade earned $1 trillion in profit. This is the Big Five. It's not all the small ones. It would be much higher if you added the small ones. We are in the midst of an energy boom right now—oil, natural gas. We are producing more energy of natural gas and oil than we have in the last two or three decades. Also, the oil companies are doing pretty well, yet they continue to receive billions of dollars a year—perhaps as much as $5 billion, $4 billion for the Big Five in the oil industry—of your tax money to support them as their profits have added up to over $1 trillion. This is just the Big Five in the last decade.

Why would we do that? Why would we continue to use our tax money to support the oil industry? They get enough at the pump from us. They don't need a tax break. Let's take that tax break, turn it around and put it into tomorrow's energy systems, into supporting the green technologies—the solar, the wind, the conservation programs, the electric car systems, the batteries that will power those systems in the future—as we transition our economy from where we were to where we must be in the future. That's just one example of the tax breaks that are not necessary, and there are numerous other ones.

Why would we give Wall Street hedge fund billionaires an additional tax break where their real income—I mean, not capital gains, but their earned income—is taxed at capital gains rates rather than at an income tax rate? Why would we do that? We should end those kinds of tax breaks that are not necessary for economic growth and shift that money into deficit reduction or into assisting those future industries that we need to have or, perhaps, into research or education.

These are all strategies for the future, and they affect my communities that I represent. The infrastructure programs are crucial to my communities. I represent 200 miles of the Sacramento River. The second-most flood prone part of this Nation, the second-most at-risk cities in this Nation are in my district.

One proposal would reduce the infrastructure money needed to upgrade the levees to provide the protection for human life and property. Another proposal is to invest in infrastructure. One proposal is to cause layoffs and to take out those civil servants who are working in the Army Corps of Engineers and to say, For 20 percent of the time, you're going to be furloughed; you're not going to work. So the Army Corps of Engineers' work necessary to design, to oversee and to push forward the projects that I need in my district in order to protect my citizens will be delayed. It will be delayed through the next storm season.

We pray we won't have a flood, but why should we even have to pray when our proposal on the Democratic side would fully fund those civilians in the Army Corps of Engineers who are necessary to push forward the projects to protect Sacramento, to protect Marysville, to protect Yuba City, and to provide the money—the Federal share of the cost—of rebuilding and upgrading those levees? I'm not the only place in this Nation that is faced with that. We saw recently Superstorm Sandy, and we know the horrible impact that that had on New Jersey, New York, and the surrounding areas. We need to rebuild. We need to put that infrastructure in place because we know there will be additional superstorms in the future.

We are looking at a fundamental policy here, a fundamental question of our values as Americans. Are we going to have an investment strategy that grows the American economy and puts people back to work and protects Americans? Whether they are poor or impoverished, whether they are children or seniors, are we going to put in place policies that meet their basic needs? And for those future seniors, will they have the promise of Medicare? That is a question before the House of Representatives that in the next 3 days will be answered.

I pray and I work with my colleagues to see to it that we have a growth agenda, that we have an agenda of jobs, that we have an agenda to care for those who have little, and that we honor this value:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my remaining time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business traveling with the President to Israel.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and March 18 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. HARPER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a home emergency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 20, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

751. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

752. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting results of a meeting of the Economic Adjustment Committee to consider additional funding sources for the Defense Access Roads program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

753. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General George J. Flynn, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

754. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Ex Parte Cease and Desist and Summary Seizure Orders-Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements (RIN: 1210-AB48) received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

755. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Filings Required of Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements and Certain Other Related Entities (RIN: 1210-AB51) received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

756. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran'', pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 68513(a) Public Law 112-81, section 1245(d)(4); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

757. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2012 Actuarial Report on the Financial Outlook for Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

758. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0700; FRL-9788-6] received March 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

759. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; 110(a)(1) and (2) Infrastructure Requirement for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0237; FRL-9787-6] received March 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

760. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Energy Labeling Rule (RIN: 3084-AB15) received March 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

761. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List [Docket No.: 121219726-2726-01] (RIN: 0694-AF85) received March 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

762. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for Fiscal Year 2012 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.

763. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Audit of the District's Workforce Development Programs''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

764. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Audit of the Department of Small and Local Business Development's Fiscal Year 2011 Performance Accountability Report''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

765. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2011, 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.

766. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report for Calendar Year 2012, 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.

767. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Residential, Business, and Wind and Solar Resource Leases on Indian Land (RIN: 1076-AE73) received March 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

768. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs & Collaborative Action, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Courts of Indian Offenses [Docket ID: BIA-2013-0001] (RIN: 1076-AF16) received March 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

769. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the Standards of Identity for Distilled Spirits [Docket No.: TTB-2012-0002; T.D. TTB-112; Ref: Notice No. 127] (RIN: 1513-AB33) received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

770. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Work Opportunity Tax Credit Transition Relief [Notice 2013-14] received March 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 127. Resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth District of Texas (Rept. 113–22). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. COTTON):

H.R. 1244. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to provide flexibility to school food authorities in meeting certain nutritional requirements for the school lunch and breakfast programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1245. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require that individuals seeking training in the operation of certain aircraft be checked against the terrorist watchlist to ensure that such individuals are non-threats to aviation; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1246. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to provide that the District of Columbia Treasurer or one of the Deputy Chief Financial Officers of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia may perform the functions and duties of the Office in an acting capacity if there is a vacancy in the Office; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1247. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to support crop insurance for specialty crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARPER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. JONES, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. YODER, Mr. BARR, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 1248. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 1249. A bill to amend section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants, similar retail food establishments, and vending machines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FARR, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LONG, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1250. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve operations of recovery auditors under the Medicare integrity program, to increase transparency and accuracy in audits conducted by contractors, and for other purposes; 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 Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD (for herself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1251. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants with minority serving institutions for the purpose of establishing verified delivery systems to address social and academic problems facing veterans enrolled at such institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 1252. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1253. A bill to prohibit foreign assistance to Pakistan until the tuition assistance program of the Department of Defense is fully funded; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself and Mr. PITTENGER):

H.R. 1254. A bill to repeal a requirement that new employees of certain employers be automatically enrolled in the employer's health benefits plan; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 1255. A bill to enable Federal and State chartered banks and thrifts to meet the credit needs of the Nation's home builders, and to provide liquidity and ensure stable credit for meeting the Nation's need for new homes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 1256. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to jointly adopt rules setting forth the application to cross-border swaps transactions of certain provisions relating to swaps that were enacted as part of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; 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 Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 1257. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the occurrence of diabetes in Medicare beneficiaries by extending coverage under Medicare for medical nutrition therapy services to such beneficiaries with pre-diabetes or with risk factors for developing type 2 diabetes; 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. HONDA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1258. 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 Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 1259. A bill to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1260. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land in San Juan County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BASS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 1261. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish fair and transparent practices related to the marketing and provision of overdraft coverage programs at depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1262. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to provide guidance and limitations regarding the integration of unmanned aircraft systems into United States airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. JENKINS):

H.R. 1263. A bill to increase access to community behavioral health services for all Americans and to improve Medicaid reimbursement for community behavioral health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1264. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal medical assistance percentage for the District of Columbia under the Medicaid Program to 75 percent; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1265. A bill to require the continuation of tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces for the remainder of fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1266. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, concerning the calculation of transactions for the lease of land ports of entry and international bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. PALAZZO:

H.R. 1267. A bill to delay and phase-in increases in flood insurance premium rates under the national flood insurance program for certain properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 1268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for qualified flood mitigation expenses incurred with respect to certain residences for which the chargeable premium rate under the national flood insurance program is increasing and to provide increased funding for mitigation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RADEL (for himself, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 1269. A bill to prohibit the use of lethal military force against citizens of the United States located within the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. ROBY (for herself, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 1270. A bill to provide for greater transparency and honesty in the Federal budget process; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, 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. TAKANO:

H.R. 1271. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax as an incentive to partner with educational institutions to provide skills training for students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 1272. A bill to support State and tribal government efforts to promote research and education related to maple syrup production, natural resource sustainability in the maple syrup industry, market promotion of maple products, and greater access to lands containing maple trees for maple-sugaring activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 1273. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to reauthorize and improve the Rural Energy for America Program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 1274. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program; 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. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COOK, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution recommending the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor to Sergeant Rafael Peralta; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. CAROLYN B.

MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COLE, and Mr. GERLACH):

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution supporting the formation of a bipartisan Presidential Commission to study the establishment of a National Museum of the American People; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Res. 127. A resolution dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth District of Texas; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. STIVERS):

H. Res. 128. A resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the start of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation New Dawn; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG:

H. Res. 129. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should not pass any legislation that would tax or confiscate personal savings accounts, including retirement accounts such as Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs) and 401k plans, certificates of deposit (CDs), or other personal savings to provide financial relief for private businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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.

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. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 1248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 1249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to healthcare.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare) and Clause 3 (Commerce)

'Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare'

'Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate Commerce'

The Medicare Audit Improvement Act makes several changes to the way hospital audits are conducted which involves at least three parties: a hospital, a private Medicare contractor who conducts audits and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services. During the auditing process, transactions take place between these parties which is what constitutes this bill as regulating commerce. Further, Medicare is considered to be constitutional as part of providing for the general welfare and therefore any changes to Medicare would fall under this provision as well.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD:

H.R. 1251.

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 1, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 1252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 1254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 1255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 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''), 3 (''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''), and 18 (''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 Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 1257.

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. HONDA:

H.R. 1258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution; and

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 the Commerce Clause

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1264.

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. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 1265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this legislation is Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 12.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1266.

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, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 1267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 1268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. RADEL:

H.R. 1269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This law is enacted pursuant to the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 11; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18;

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 1270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests in the power of Congress in regards to appropriations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 7, Clause 1, Article I, Section 8, Clause I, and Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 (Bills of Revenue):

''All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.''

Article I, Section 8 (Enumerated Powers of Congress):

''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 9 (Limits on Congress):

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof..

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have 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.

AND

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the Power * * * to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 61: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 104: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 118: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 147: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 175: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 176: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 183: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 258: Mr. KILMER, Mr. MARINO, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 292: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 311: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 321: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 324: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COOK, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DENT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HURT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MICA, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RADEL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YODER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LONG, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 335: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 346: Mr. MESSER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 357: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 360: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 375: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 385: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 392: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 401: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 449: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 452: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 460: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 474: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 483: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 493: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 503: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 507: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 523: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 525: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 527: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 540: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 543: Mr. PETERS of California and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 567: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 569: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 570: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 574: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 578: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 580: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 582: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 594: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 627: Ms. CHU, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MENG, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 630: Mr. NADLER, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 631: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 634: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 637: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 647: Mr. MESSER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 649: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 659: Mr. REED.

H.R. 664: Mr. REED.

H.R. 666: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 683: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 685: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 688: Mr. PETRI, Ms. MENG, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 693: Mr. STEWART and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 714: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 721: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 724: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 736: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 742: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 755: Mr. PETRI and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 761: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 763: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 766: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 772: Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 783: Mr. FARR and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 800: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 811: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 813: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LYNCH, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 818: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 824: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 833: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 836: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 850: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 896: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 900: Mr. COHEN and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 903: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 918: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 920: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 924: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 927: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 940: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 955: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 958: Mr. KILMER and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 961: Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 963: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 968: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 974: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 986: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 990: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 992: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 999: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1003: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1005: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 1015: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1020: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1024: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 1026: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LATTA and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1033: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1038: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1039: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1040: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1063: Mr. COLE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1072: Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1093: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MENG, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1094: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1096: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1097: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1102: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. CHU, Mr. BERA of California, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1108: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1123: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1130: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1138: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1144: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1146: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1179: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1201: Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1204: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1209: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HALL, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. REED, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1220: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 1223: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1242: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 20: Ms. NORTON.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. COOPER and Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. ROKITA and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H. Res. 10: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Res. 30: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 31: Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 36: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. DESANTIS.

H. Res. 51: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 71: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 76: Mr. STIVERS.

H. Res. 90: Mr. FARR, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LEWIS.

H. Res. 100: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 104: Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 126: Mr. LANCE.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 2013 No. 40

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal spirit, You are God, and all creation worships You. To You all angels, all the powers of Heaven sing in endless praise.

Draw the hearts of our Senators to You today so that they will trust You to guide their minds and control their wills. Replenish their strength, rekindle their enthusiasm for Your purposes, and renew their commitment to serve You with all their hearts. Whatever they plan or accomplish today, may it bring America closer to the righteousness that exalts any nation and away from the sins that bring reproach to any people.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 933, the continuing appropriations legislation. The Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. today for our weekly caucus meetings.

We are going to continue to work to see if we can get these amendments in order. We wanted to vote on them last night, but we hope to complete the CR very quickly.

I have not had an opportunity yet to speak to the Republican leader this morning, but very shortly I am going to move to begin work on the budget. Senator SESSIONS and Senator MURRAY are anxious to move forward on that.

I had a long conversation with Senator SESSIONS last night—and I speak to Senator MURRAY quite often—and there is no reason that 30 hours postcloture should be wasted. A Senator who doesn't like what went on before can have 1 hour, but we should not waste our time as we have done so often by killing 30 hours. We should start the budget.

If people decide they are going to use the 30 hours and then another 30 hours—we have to have cloture not only on the substitute but on the bill itself, it is 60 hours—that would mean we would start on the budget sometime Thursday morning. We are going to do it. The 60 hours will be eaten up sometime Thursday morning. I hope we don't have to waste that time, but we are going to finish the budget before we leave here.

We have had conversations on both sides of the aisle about how we need a budget. Because we had the Budget Deficit Reduction Act, which set our 302(b)s, we didn't need to do our usual budget because we had one signed into law by the President. Regardless of that, there will be no more talk about not having a budget. We will have a budget. No matter how long it takes, we are going to do that before we leave for the Easter break.

As everyone knows, there is 50 hours under the budget act, which is statutory, and then afterward there could be a lot of amendments. So everyone should be aware we should start using some of this time to work on the budget, and we will do that. I will come and propound my consent shortly.

MARINE BASE EXPLOSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in the late 1920s, there was a violent explosion in New Jersey at an ammunition depot of our military. Basically, it was the Navy at that time, and it was a very bad explosion. After that explosion, there was a decision made that storing our ammunition should be someplace else. After some work done by relevant committees in the House and Senate and working with the President, it was decided the best place to do that was in Nevada near a place called Hawthorne.

Hawthorne is, frankly, in a kind of remote place. That base has been there since about 1930. It was originally a naval ammunition depot where most of our ammunition was stored, and it is still there. It survived base closings—the BRAC work—and it was determined it was essential for the security of this Nation.

Anyone who flies over that area will see miles and miles of bunkers where ammunition is stored. Some ammunition is stored there from World War II. It is a wonderful place for storing ammunition because it is so dry so stuff can stay there for long periods of time.

I just met with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. They were very impressed with this. It has also become a terrific place for tearing down ordnance—demil, they call it. In recent years, it has also been used as a training facility. The terrain is much like a lot of the desert in Afghanistan and Iraq and places such as that. We have had training exercises there for some time. It is very valuable.

Late last night, seven of our marines were killed in Hawthorne, and many others were injured in an explosion during a training exercise near the ammunition depot in Hawthorne, NV. We don't know exactly what happened, but we know it was a violent explosion. My thoughts are with those who were injured and, of course, the families of those who lost loved ones.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Marines all over the world are now focusing on the loss of their fellow marines. They are grieving their loss. Details are emerging, but at this time we don't know everything. The area has been blocked off. As I indicated, it was quite a big explosion. We will follow this news very closely. I will do whatever I can going forward to support the U.S. military and the families of the fallen marines.

It is very important we continue to train our military—it is so important—but one of the things that has happened due to the sequester is we have cut back on our training and maintenance. That is the way the sequester was written. The bill that is on the floor—we hope to pass today—helps that a little bit. At least for the next 6 months it will allow the military some degree of ability to move things around a little bit. We call it flexibility, which is good. But we have to be very vigilant. This sequester should go away.

We have already cut huge amounts of money in deficit reduction, which is not appropriate. Our military cannot train and do the maintenance that is necessary. These men and women are marines who are training in Hawthorne, and with the sequester, it is going to cut stuff back. I hope everyone understands the sacrifices made by our military. They make significant sacrifices by being away from home, their families, and their country. The sequester needs to go away.

THE BUDGET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for 4 years, the first priority for the country and Congress has been to improve the Nation's economy and strengthen the middle class. Our efforts have paid off. It has pulled us out of the great recession; however, unemployment is still too high. Over the last 36 months, businesses created 6.4 million new jobs—good new jobs—but the economy is not back to full strength.

During the Bush years we lost a lot including our Treasury. When he took office, we had a surplus over 10 years of $7 trillion. The 10th anniversary of the war in Iraq is today. That war cost us more than $1 trillion, and we are paying for the loss of life and all the injured in many different ways. We cannot take chances with our recovery. We are pulling out of the mess economically that the President created by all the taxes and a war that was not paid for. We must renew our investments that have always made America strong, such as innovation and job training, education, preventive health care, new roads, bridges, dams, water systems, sewer systems.

To meet our country's long-term economic goals—including the deficit—we must enact policies that support a strong and growing middle class, and that is why this week the Senate will pass, as I indicated earlier, a budget, crafted by one of the most wise Senators ever to serve in this body, PATTY MURRAY of Washington. ''Wise'' is the word I chose perfectly for her because it does fit. The work she and her committee have done fully replaces the harmful sequester cuts I have just talked about with balanced and responsible deficit reduction.

The policy outlined in her budget—our budget—will save hundreds of thousands of jobs and safeguard communities by keeping police, air traffic controllers, meat inspectors, and firefighters on the job, but first we must avoid self-inflicted wounds so we can build on the success over the last 3 years. The Senate budget will continue the progress by creating new jobs, repairing crumbling roads, bridges, and train workers for high-skilled jobs. These investments are paid for by eliminating the loopholes that benefit the wealthy of America and the most profitable corporations.

I had the fortune to serve in the Senate with a man by the name of Bill Bradley, who is one of America's great alltime basketball players. I, of course, always wanted to be the athlete he was. I admired him so much and enjoyed my friendship with him. He came out today—this Rhodes Scholar and brilliant man—and said we need to eliminate $1 trillion in taxes that are unfair and unnecessary. He said that. In addition to that, our budget also makes nearly $1 trillion in responsible spending cuts across the Federal budget. Meaningful deficit reduction requires shared sacrifice which includes contribution from the wealthiest among us.

If someone owns a profitable corporation that ships jobs to China or India, Democrats in Congress cannot stop them. Go ahead and ship them. But we can keep them from getting the tax break for outsourcing, and that is what we want to do. If they are successful enough to own a second home or yacht, more power to them. That is wonderful. That is an American success story. But Democrats in Congress do not feel we should subsidize these tax breaks for their vacation home or their boat. Ending these wasteful giveaways makes sense to most people. An overwhelming majority of Americans—including a majority of Republicans—support this balanced approach.

In the last 2 years, we have reduced the deficit by $2.5 trillion. The Senate budget continues this effort without jeopardizing our economic recovery or breaking our promises to seniors and veterans. This budget keeps Medicare strong for today's seniors and preserves it for our children and grandchildren.

PATTY MURRAY is qualified to be budget chair for a number of reasons, not the least of which she was the chair of the supercommittee. She had 12 Members of Congress—6 Republicans and 6 Democrats—arrive at a grand bargain. She was pulled back because a week or so before they were ready to make their decision—which would have been spending cuts and revenue—we got a letter from virtually every Republican saying: No thanks. No revenue. So that failed.

She is qualified in many different ways to lead this committee. Her budget reflects Democratic values, and it honors the belief that success doesn't trickle down from the top; it grows out in the middle class. The Ryan Republican budget introduced earlier this week reflects an entirely different set of priorities—skewed priorities Americans have rejected time and time again. This is the third go-round. President Obama was reelected basically for a number of reasons but not the least of which is the Ryan Republican budget. They are at it again.

The Ryan budget would hand out more budget-busting tax breaks for the wealthy to pay for these wasteful tax breaks. It would end the Medicare guarantee. It would rob 50 million Americans of affordable health insurance. It would raise taxes on middle-class families. To appease the tea party, the Ryan Republican budget would risk lives and risk the recovery, and that is just too high a price to pay.

I was stunned this morning. A Republican Congressman writes an op-ed piece—I don't know if it was in the Times or the Post—saying that the Ryan Republican budget isn't good enough for the tea party and that it should be even more stringent. That is what we are faced with.

The work done by Chairman MURRAY reflects the priorities of the American people, not the wackos referred to also in the op-ed page of the Washington Post today by a person who has won a Nobel Prize for economics.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 933, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 933) to make appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Mikulski/Shelby) modified amendment No. 26, in the nature of a substitute.

Toomey amendment No. 115 (to amendment No. 26), to increase by $60 million the amount appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Department of Defense for programs, projects, and activities in the continental United States, and to provide an offset.

Durbin amendment No. 123 (to amendment No. 115), to change the enactment date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

THE BUDGET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last week I noted that the Senate Democratic budget was one of the most extreme, most unbalanced pieces of legislation we have ever seen, one that would never balance, ever, and one that would have a devastating outcome on the middle class.

I said that its centerpiece is a $1.5 trillion tax hike that would be the largest in American history. Some on the other side have argued with this $1.5 trillion figure. They say their budget only contains a $1 trillion tax hike, which is a stunning and telling admission in itself. Just months after Democrats got hundreds of billions in new taxes, they now freely admit their intention to hit Americans with another $1 trillion in tax hikes. But in reality, it would be more than that since their budget envisions $1.5 trillion in new revenue. While the Democrats' math may be fuzzy, their intentions are unmistakable. Their massive tax hike would cost average middle-class families thousands in lost income and lost opportunity. And despite that massive hit to working families, the Democrats' budget would still not ever—ever—balance.

But that is just one of the reasons this budget is so destructive to the middle class. Take spending for example. Americans know that a good way to create jobs and increase economic growth is to balance the budget and put our massive national debt on a path to elimination. Yet the Senate Democratic budget would actually increase spending by more than $½ trillion—increase spending by $½ trillion.

Put another way, Democrats want to take another $½ trillion out of the economy, on top of all of the money they would take out with their tax increase, and put it in the hands of Washington bureaucrats and politicians to spend or waste as they see fit. And their budget would balloon the debt by 42 percent, increasing every Americans' share to a whopping $73,000. They want to grow the government at the expense of the economy, and that is not the way to create jobs or get the private sector moving. In fact, by some estimates, this budget could result in more than 600,000 lost jobs if enacted.

Of course, the Senate Democratic budget won't prevent Medicare and Social Security from going bankrupt. It is not going to prevent Medicare and Social Security from going bankrupt.

So here is what we would get with the Democratic budget: No. 1, a massive tax hike and thousands less for middle-class families—a massive tax hike; No. 2, $½ trillion more in big-government spending; No. 3, 42 percent more debt, with each American owing $73,000; No. 4, more than 600,000 lost jobs.

Here is what we won't get: We won't get balance, just more and more unbalanced tax hikes. We won't get the kind of deficit reduction our country needs, just more spending to enrich the Washington establishment at the expense of Main Street. We won't get more jobs or a better economy or sensible reforms to prevent Medicare or Social Security from going bankrupt. And we certainly won't get a balanced budget.

Not only does the Senate Democratic budget never balance—ever—but top Washington Democrats now say they simply don't care about balancing the budget anymore. They just don't care about that. Well, Americans do care. A party that once cared about hard-working American families seems to have gone off the leftmost edge of the reservation with this budget. DC Democrats' priorities are just so far removed from the actual needs of middle-class Kentuckians and Americans who continue to struggle in the Obama economy.

I appreciate that the Senate majority has finally decided to put its ideas on paper. It took 4 years—4 years—to get a budget from them, and we now know why it took so long: because their ideas are so unbalanced and so extreme, so destructive to the economy Americans want us to fix.

We can help foster the conditions necessary to make the economy healthier and create more jobs but only if Washington Democrats finally reach across the aisle to address America's real concerns in a truly balanced way. I hope that will ultimately happen because it is time to start making divided government work for the American people who elected it, and it is time to grow the economy, not the government.

PRESIDENTIAL VISIT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this week President Obama will travel to two of our closest allies—Israel and Jordan. His visit will come at a moment of great importance for each of our governments.

I join in conveying a message of congratulations to Prime Minister Netanyahu in having formed a new government, in restating our determination to use all available means to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and in pledging to work with Israel to meet the regional challenge caused by civil strife within Syria. The fighting in Syria has produced refugee flows of at least 1 million people into Iraq, Turkey, Jordan, and Lebanon. Also of concern to Jordan, Israel, and other allies in the region is the flow of foreign fighters into Syria, especially the al-Nusra Front.

During his visit, I hope the President makes progress in working with our allies to address these threats that have developed while Bashar al-Asad remains in power and to begin the important planning to address the challenges that will come with his fall, such as how best to secure chemical weapons stockpiles.

None of these threats or challenges can be addressed with simple, easy answers, but I fully support America working with Prime Minister Netanyahu and King Abdallah to craft original strategy that serves all of our national interests.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss something of deep importance to me and, I believe, to our country.

Last night the majority leader of the Senate came to the floor to speak on the continuing resolution, which is essentially the only bill we will consider this year to fund the government. It is over $1 trillion in taxpayer money. He came to the floor and propounded a unanimous consent request that only contained a handful of amendments that could be brought to the continuing resolution. Many germane and, in my view, reasonable amendments that had been advanced and brought to the attention of both sides well in advance were denied an opportunity for a vote on the floor. Because of that, I objected to the consideration of the continuing resolution and the unanimous consent request.

Frankly, I think that when we are spending over $1 trillion in the only funding bill we are going to vote on, essentially, this year—appropriations bill—we should be allowed to have votes on amendments, particularly germane amendments, as many of my colleagues have had, and my own amendment, which is one that would strike funding for, essentially, a missile to nowhere, which will never produce a missile program or a product our military will ever be able to use.

My amendment is very straightforward. The amendment would strike funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System Program, called the MEADS Program, by $381 million—These funds were appropriated for this program—and would actually transfer the funds to the operations and maintenance portion of the defense budget so the money could be used for our men and women in uniform for things they actually need as opposed to $380 million for a missile to nowhere for which we will never get a result.

When we are almost $17 trillion in debt, it is truly shocking that we would continue to spend money on a program the Army says it does not want. In fact, in the Defense authorization last year, the Armed Services Committee actually prohibited funding for the MEADS Program. This is something that was passed unanimously on a bipartisan basis last year in the Defense authorization bill that prohibited any further funding for this missile to nowhere. Yet it got included in the appropriations, in this continuing resolution, despite the fact that we are not going to get anything our warfighters can use from $380 million of spending.

In fact, when Secretary Hagel was asked about whether the Pentagon

would comply with this law, he said: Yes. Let's just review where we are with this program. The Army has already invested over $2 billion for this program, and we are not going to get a result. It was underperforming.

So according to John McHugh, the Secretary of the Army, in 2011, he said:

> The Army has invested over $2 billion and that's only the partial cost of the program. Frankly, it was under performing.

What else has been said?

Frank Kendall, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, said:

> MEADS is a program that the U.S. decided not to procure a year ago. . . .

So why, when our country is facing sequestration, when our men and women in uniform need to make sure the defense dollars we are providing them are actually resources that they can use for their needs to protect them, to protect our country, are we spending $380 million on something we will not procure, for which we will not get a result? To me, this is outrageous. If we cannot cut spending for this, how are we ever going to deal with the underlying drivers of our debt, with our nearly $17 trillion of debt?

In fact, this is what the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has said. I have great respect for Chairman LEVIN, and he said this about the MEADS Program:

> We feel strongly that it's a waste of money.

I stood up on the floor last night because I have bipartisan support for this amendment. This is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. This is about making sure we do not waste money at a time when our warfighters need the money for support and training, at the time they are facing sequestration and we are facing real threats to our country. We cannot afford to spend more money on a missile to nowhere.

So I am very proud I have bipartisan support from Senator BEGICH, Senator SHAHEEN. Yet it is shocking to me that I cannot get a vote—it is germane—that we cannot strike this funding or get a vote on this Senate floor to strike this funding from this continuing resolution and to make sure the funds actually go to the operations and maintenance portion of the defense budget so they can use this money, warfighters can use it for needs they actually have.

I also want to mention that the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste supports my amendment.

The CEO of Concerned Veterans for America has said: MEADS is the quintessential Pentagon program that lives on indefinitely despite the fact that it will never see the field of battle. With our Nation drowning in $16.7 trillion worth of debt, Congress must undertake serious reforms to defense spending to maintain a sustainable fiscal path that preserves American power.

Concerned Veterans for America has supported this amendment.

Basically, this is common sense. This is the kind of thing people see at home and say: How could you possibly spend $380 million on a missile to nowhere when we know our men and women in uniform can use those funds for equipment they can use in theater, for training they can use to be prepared?

It is really unconscionable that we will not allow a vote on the continuing resolution for something that has bipartisan support, for something that was actually struck by the authorization committee on both sides of the aisle, both in the House Armed Services Committee and in the Senate Armed Services Committee.

When the majority leader took to the floor last night, he said: Oh, we have made reasonable accommodations. I do not see what is reasonable about giving a handful of amendments with over $1 trillion of spending.

On Wednesday, Senator MCCAIN brought forth an amendment—last Wednesday, so almost a week ago—he brought forth an amendment to strike other unauthorized funds from the continuing resolution and to leave those funds for the military to use for priority items and for things our men and women in uniform actually needed. Do you know what happened? There was a motion to table brought against Senator MCCAIN's amendment. Essentially what he was trying to do is what I am trying to do today—to stop money that has not been authorized, to stop spending money when our men and women in uniform need us to allow them to use these resources for the basic needs they have. That is why he brought this amendment to the floor. Do you know what happened? There was a motion to table filed against his amendment, and I think there was a real shock on the floor from both sides of the aisle because on a bipartisan basis that motion to table failed because both sides of the aisle realized that when we are facing sequestration, when we are facing a dangerous world, when we owe it to our men and women in uniform, we cannot continue to fund things that are not priorities, we cannot continue to fund missiles to nowhere. And that amendment was eventually adopted by voice vote. This amendment is just like that amendment.

The American people are tired of us not allowing commonsense amendments to come to the floor for a vote. With $1 trillion in spending, if we had started voting on amendments last Wednesday, after the floor was shut down—and I think there was a shock among leadership that Senator MCCAIN won his amendment on a bipartisan basis and was able to overturn the motion to table his amendment. If we had started voting on amendments then, we would have already passed the continuing resolution. So it is an absolute cop-out to say that we are somehow faced with a government shutdown, that somehow we cannot have votes on the Senate floor on amendments that are important, germane, and relevant.

Before I yield, I wish to support my colleague JERRY MORAN because he was also denied an amendment that is an important amendment. I am a cosponsor of that amendment. The FAA has notified 189 towers across the country that it is going to cease to fund the towers' operation because of the sequester. Senator MORAN has a commonsense amendment that would make sure it restores 95 percent of this funding by taking money from other areas in the FAA budget that will not disrupt operations.

Well, there is a tower in Nashua, NH, at Boire Field that was on the list of the FAA despite the airport's importance to both the United States and New England and despite a recent investment of over $24 million by the FAA to upgrade the airport's runway.

Senator MORAN's amendment, which he is also being denied an ability to bring on this floor to have both sides vote on—he has strong bipartisan support—this amendment would ensure that towers like the tower at Boire Field in Nashua, NH, my hometown, would continue to operate. Yet we will not be given a vote on this Senate floor despite the strong bipartisan support Senator MORAN has for his amendment, just as I have bipartisan support for my amendment.

So I have to ask, what is the problem? Why can't we just vote on the amendments—start voting, keep voting, get it done? We can pass the continuing resolution. We can continue to fund this government. But do you know what. We can make improvements to the continuing resolution by striking money for the missile to nowhere, by making sure the air towers that the FAA is shutting down continue to operate in this country.

I am sure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have many more ideas as to how we can improve this continuing resolution, but the American people will never know about those ideas because we are on a Senate floor where we are not being allowed to vote, to vote on the amendments that matter to the American people, that strike wasteful spending, that improve this important piece of legislation.

I think if we had started voting last Wednesday, we would have already allowed every person in this Chamber to have a vote on their amendment, as the Senate was intended to operate. This is intended to be the most deliberative body in the world. Yet, if you cannot bring up an amendment that is germane to strike spending for a missile to nowhere, it really renders the operation of the Senate at this point not what the Founding Fathers intended, and it puts a gag on the American people; that their elected representatives cannot come here and get votes on things that are going to strike funding like this, that are going to make sure air towers continue to operate in this country.

I think we owe it to the American people that their elected representatives can come down here and get a

vote on amendments that matter, that make a difference, that can improve this continuing resolution. Frankly, this notion that we cannot have votes on it—obviously, people do not want to have votes on it. They want to continue funding missiles to nowhere, whether it is their parochial interests or whatever interests that are driving them. It is wrong. We have to stop it.

Bring this amendment to the Senate floor. Let's vote it up or down now, and let's move forward.

Mr. President, I thank you for the opportunity to speak today, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we were originally looking today to begin the presentation of the budget that came out of the Budget Committee, produced by the Democratic majority. It passed on a party-line vote. It was drafted by the majority in secret. It was produced and brought to the floor.

I see the distinguished floor manager of the bill is on the floor today. I certainly have no intention of interrupting the Senator's debate, but I was using the opportunity to speak in morning business, if that is all right.

Under the Congressional Budget Act, we need to produce a budget by April 15. There are 50 hours allowed for debate and an ability to offer unlimited amendments to that most important document. That is where we are. I had hoped we would start today. Now it looks as though we have floor disputes and things are dragging out.

I want to say how this can be handled. If the floor debate is not shortened, I would suggest we could come back the week of April 8 and complete our work by April 15 easily. That would be my suggested way to deal with the most important issue we face as a Nation, our financial future and the debt course we are on. That would be the right thing to do. If the majority leader is determined to move forward even into the weekend, we will be here. We are not going to concede any of the time that is set aside for debate, because this is the first budget that has been to the floor of the Senate in almost 1,500 days, over 1,400 days—4 years. We need to talk about where we are, where we are going as a Nation. So I want to say there will be no yielding of time on this side with regard to the opportunity to discuss the financial future of America.

The American people need to know about this. It should be done publicly. They need to know the choices we are dealing with, how tough they are, but what an opportunity we do have to get the country on a sound path without doing damage to the programs we value in America. We need an open process. The American people need to be engaged with it. But I have to say, it has absolutely been the policy of the majority in the Senate to do just the opposite. Senator REID said it would be ''foolish'' to have a budget. He has held that view for 4 years now.

The law requires us to have a budget by April 15. He has refused to do so because he did not want to be responsible for laying out a financial path for America. Those are the facts.

The House passed legislation that said: No budget, no pay. Now the Senate is moving forward with a budget, at least to get it out of the Senate and pass it out of the Senate, and then probably we will get paid.

It is important that the budget be moved. It should not be a pro forma act but a very serious evaluation of where we are. I want to say this to my colleagues as we confront the difficult choices facing our country: This is so important to me. I believe, based on a series of important studies in recent months, all of which having come to the same conclusion, that the debt level the United States has today is already pulling down economic growth. It is one of the reasons—maybe even the largest reason—that we have had such little economic growth.

Our debt to GDP ratio—the gross debt to GDP ratio—is over 100 percent. According to the Rogoff-Reinhart study that has been out there for a number of years, which was widely praised, which Secretary of Treasury Geithner told us was a very important study, and which maybe underestimated the risk our Nation faces, but has been universally praised—they say, when debt exceeds 90 percent of GDP, based on their studies of economies all over the world that have gotten into financial trouble, the result is a 1, maybe 2-percent drop in growth. The lack of growth of 1 percent represents 1 million jobs in America. So the difference between 2-percent growth and 3-percent growth is 1 million jobs. The difference of 2-percent growth and 4-percent growth is 2 million jobs, people unemployed, not getting work. Why? Because of the debt overhang that is out there, for a whole lot of factors too complex for us to discuss at this moment, but which are out there that begin to pull down growth.

So one of the reasons we need to decrease deficits in America and balance the budget is to create growth, create jobs, and create prosperity, whereas my Democratic colleagues contend the way to create jobs and create growth is to borrow more money and spend it on a stimulus package. In fact, they have got another stimulus package in the bill they passed out of the Budget Committee, another tax, another borrow-and-spend plan, $100-plus billion.

This is a big difference in where we are. We cannot keep borrowing, to spend, to create some temporary sugar high. It all rubs off in the end. There are the studies out there. I mentioned Rogoff-Reinhart. That has been out several years and has been a topic of great discussion among economists and throughout the field. But in recent months, the International Monetary Fund, certainly not controlled by frugal Republicans, the European Central Bank, and the Bank for International Settlements, all have independently done studies. And those studies say that debt begins to slow growth. That is what they conclude—that debt slows growth.

Now if that is true, we have a problem, because they say you can carry a certain amount of debt and it does not slow growth, but if your debt reaches 90 percent of your economy, at least according to Rogoff and Reinhart and the numbers they were using—and, by the way, they were using gross debt, it is absolutely clear in their papers, and not the public debt—then you have slow economic growth.

Let us take a minute to discuss growth in public debt. The public debt is external debt of the United States and it is about 76 percent of our economy. The size of our growth of public debt amounts to almost the size of the economy—three-fourths of it. But if you take the gross debt of the United States, including borrowing from Social Security and Medicare and things like that, it is over 100 percent. What I want to say to you is that people have misinterpreted the Rogoff-Reinhart study over the last several years. They thought the debt figure they were referring to was the public debt.

The $16 trillion we see on the debt clocks that show how it is increasing every year—the $16 trillion, almost $17 trillion now in debt—that is the gross debt, and it is over 100 percent of the economy. And they say growth slows every time—it slows relentlessly—we as a Nation run up too much debt and it gets that high. So the International Monetary Fund, the European Central Bank, the Bank for International Settlements may come at it slightly differently, but they all conclude that when debt levels reach as high as we have in the United States, growth slows.

Jobs are lost when growth slows, tax revenue is lost when growth slows, and people are not going to pay taxes if they are not working. Businesses that are not making profits are not going to pay taxes. If businesses are not expanding, not growing, not investing, not hiring, the economy is hampered and the tax revenue to the Federal Government is less, as a matter of fact. But most importantly, people are not working, jobs are not being created, and more people are on welfare. More people are dependent on the government—unemployment insurance—and that is not good.

Are we making some progress? Yes, we are making some progress. The economy had virtually no growth in the fourth quarter of last year—a stunning development. They are predicting

a slow growth the first quarter of this year. Last year we were well below predictions. Last year our growth, I believe, was about 2.2 percent. Two years before that, the Congressional Budget Office predicted growth for last year would be around 4 percent. They were predicting 2 years ago that growth for 2013 would be over 4 percent, maybe 4.6 percent. That is what the prediction was. But now, as we enter 2013, it looks as if we will be lucky to get much over 2 percent growth.

I am not saying I know with an absolute certainty that the debt is the factor they have to consider when they calculate our growth out of this recession. I don't know for sure. But I am telling you that Rogoff-Reinhart, the International Monetary Fund, the European Central Bank, the Bank for International Settlements—all of those—have concluded when debt is as high as we have in the United States it will slow growth. So I ask: What should we do to get America on a sound path to increase growth at a time we are discussing the budget? We should balance the budget and get on a course to reduce the debt significantly, and we should do it now. If we get that back down, which we can do, we will see more growth. We will see more jobs.

The idea that we should keep borrowing from the future to spend today in order to create growth only has to be said to understand how bogus it is, how irresponsible it is. Why don't we borrow three times as much and spend three times as much if this puts us on a sound path? It doesn't. It weakens us.

The Congressional Budget Office said—when this Congress, and not with my vote, voted for $787 billion for the stimulus package—yes, if you borrow $787 billion from the future and spend it today, you will get economic growth for a few years, but it quickly goes away. The money has been spent. The little lift in the economy is over very quickly. What is left then? CBO now estimates that we are carrying a total of $830 billion, plus interest, from the stimulus, so now we are at $1 trillion in new debt that we have to pay interest on every year and the growth benefit is long gone.

Now hear this, colleagues: Back when the President took office and he pushed through the stimulus package, they said over a 10-year period we would have less growth if we had a stimulus package than if we didn't have a stimulus package. Did you hear that, my colleagues? That is so important for us to understand. You cannot get something from nothing. Nothing comes from nothing. Nothing ever could, as Julie Andrews sang in the ''Sound of Music.'' Nothing comes from nothing, nothing ever could.

So we borrow the money and spend it today and it is always with us unless we have a plan to pay down the debt, and we have no plan. So already we are about at the point where all the benefits of that stimulus of 3 years ago are gone and we are beginning to have the burden of carrying the debt indefinitely. I think the American people understand that. The people who don't understand that are the Paul Krugmans and the people who have been driving the agenda in the Senate and in this Congress to borrow and spend. We have to get our heads together on that subject.

Finally, I will point out that the budget that has been produced is totally promoted improperly. This budget came out of the committee, and it claims it reduces the deficit by $1.85 trillion, but that is not accurate. It took me a long time, and I had to stay on the staff people for the Democratic majority, but eventually, when confronted with the facts, they had to tell the truth and they told the truth. The sequester cuts—that 60 percent of the Budget Control Act we agreed to 18, 20 months ago—is wiped out. Those cuts are eliminated. But they were really not cuts. They were reductions in growth of spending. But that reduction saved us about $2.1 trillion, and the sequester part is $1.2 trillion. So that is the $1.2 trillion that is wiped out. That means we are going to increase spending $1.2 trillion, and it is not scored in their budget as an increase in spending to offset the $1 trillion in tax increases they have.

When you consider all of that, you will find this budget, with other gimmicks included in it, barely reduces the deficit at all—at best, maybe by $300 billion. And over 10 years that amounts to about $30 billion or $40 billion in deficit reduction a year, when last year our deficit was $1.2 trillion.

So this budget plan increases taxes, it increases spending over our current rate, and it does nothing to change the debt course of America. We need a plan that can balance the budget. We can do that and still increase spending every year. It will balance in 10 years if we stay disciplined, but that is not the plan on the floor right now. Our colleagues need to study this budget and should not be voting for a plan that makes no change in our debt course, that does not create growth, but simply borrows more.

I see my colleague, the Democratic whip, I will call him, on the floor, but I appreciate the opportunity to share these remarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend for yielding.

Earlier today my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator AYOTTE, came to the floor and spoke about the Medium Air Defense System known as MEADS. This is a program the United States has been developing for air defense with our NATO allies, so U.S. taxpayers are truly investing in this program, but our allies are as well.

I am new to this assignment as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and I don't take any pleasure in what I am about to say, but it is a fact and we have to put the facts out before the American people. As we started developing this system, we reached the point where we concluded, the Department of Defense concluded, it wouldn't work. That happens. Some of the greatest ideas turn out not to be feasible, and that is where we are at this point. The question that has been raised by Senator AYOTTE is: Well, if it doesn't work, why do you want to finish the research on it this year?

That is a legitimate question, and the vast majority of Americans would say: Of course, she is right, don't spend another penny on it. The problem is this: We entered into an agreement with our allies that if we terminated the program, there would be penalties assessed to the United States that we would owe to other nations that participated in funding the research, and it turns out the amount of money needed to finish the program is about equal to the penalties we would pay if we terminated it at this moment.

So we have tried to make the best of a very bad situation. The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for 2013 includes $380 million—a reduction of $20 million from the original request—for the Department to bring an orderly close to the Medium Air Defense System by either completing the development program or paying the termination.

This is a NATO program, as I said, that we jointly developed with the Germans and Italians. All of us thought this was a good idea and a good investment. It wasn't until we got into it that we realized it wasn't going to do what we thought it would do. The Department determined it would not procure MEADS but has requested funds for the rest of the year to conclude the program to live up to the agreement with our allies, who have also put money into this. The Department does plan to use the advanced technology we did develop here to upgrade other systems. So it is not a complete waste. And it shouldn't be because the taxpayers have their tax dollars on the line.

I share the frustration of many of my colleagues that we have spent so much money and so many years and have reached this point. But I will tell you, we don't want to build a system that doesn't work. We don't want to create false security. And we do want some honesty from those who are developing these systems if, in fact, something we have spent money on is not going to reach its completion.

The cost to finish the development of this program is almost exactly the same as the cost to unilaterally terminate it—a point not made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

She argues about all the savings from these programs in terminating it but doesn't talk about the termination costs we are liable for as a result of that termination. It is unrealistic to assume that you can terminate a major defense program with our allies and walk away without some obligation.

For example, when the Army's Future Combat Systems Program was terminated, the Department was legally obligated to pay over $500 million in termination liability. In return, we received several technologies that were incorporated into other programs. The same applies to MEADS but only if we fulfill our obligations and pay the termination liability. The Defense appropriations bill is fiscally responsible by providing the funding to the Army to bring this program to an orderly close instead of levying another bill on the Department in times of fiscal constraint.

I urge my colleagues, if the Ayotte amendment does come to the floor, to oppose it—not because I am asking them to vote for a program which we are in agreement is never going to reach the goal it was set out to reach but, rather, let's be honest about this. We are going to pay this money one way or the other. The Army has said, Give us the option to complete the program or pay the termination fee. That to me is a more reasonable approach.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD statements and letters from a variety of different sources, including the Department of Defense, on this program.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINISTERO DELLA DIFESA AND BUNDESMINISTERIUM DER VERTEIDIGUNG.

Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC.

Thank you for your continued support of the MEADS program. As you are fully aware of the present situation surrounding the MEADS Program, you will know that Germany and Italy have grave concerns about the outcome of the MEADS funding discussion in the USA. This is, unfortunately, not a new situation.

The results of the Design and Development (D&D) phase of the MEADS program remain vital for both Germany and Italy as they will be the basis for our future Air and Missile Defense System Architecture. As such they are fundamental for the German and Italian contribution to the ''NATO integrated Air and Missile Defense'', which is a key element of the Defense package agreed in Chicago by our heads of State and Government.

As Germany and Italy have been fulfilling their full commitments under the MoU, we hope and we do expect that the United States will live up to their MoU commitment as well. If the US does not fulfill its funding commitment for 2013, Germany and Italy would need to interpret this as a unilateral withdrawal. Under the terms of the MoU, Germany and Italy expect formal notification of the US intent to withdraw from the MoU (while funding up to the effective date of the withdrawal). In addition funding for all contract modification and termination costs incurred as a result of the US actions shall be paid by the United States.

We assure you, that this is not negligible. In a first estimate the current US position results in an economic damage to Germany and Italy of more than 400 Mio. US$. This is a result of development activities, which cannot be executed due to the missing FY 2013 US funding and the termination liability for terminating those contracts earlier.

In addition, there are wider implication of the US withdrawing or breaking the MoU and this would set a bad precedent for future transatlantic cooperation in principle. In particular one result would need to be the reconsideration of multinational cooperation in the context of NATO's SMART Defense initiative. After the Canadian withdrawal from the NAEW&C and AGS programs, the current US position would represent the second evidence in one year of the lack of reliability and as such would set a bad precedent for future transatlantic cooperation in principle.

It should be of common interest not to risk the prominent and significant merits of continued transatlantic co-operation and collaboration between our nations. We rely on your intervention to ensure the timely and full availability of 2013 funds by the end of March 2013 (with no prohibition on expenditure of MEADS funds) so as not to disrupt harvesting of MEADS capabilities in order to enable future meaningful European contribution for NATO Air and Missile defense.

The three Nations' investments have been very fruitful to date, which included a successful 360 degree intercept mission in November 2012. We are in the final year of funding under this MoU and not funding this effort would put in jeopardy all of the significant investment made to date by our countries. After the restructuring MEADS has executed on schedule and within budget for more than 4 years now, which is remarkable in particular given the situation of the program after the US decision not to procure MEADS.

The successful completion of the MEADS activities should be in our common interests for a large variety of reason. The FY 2013 funds of the US are a prerequisite to achieve this goal.

Thank you for your leadership and support on this important defense and transatlantic issue.

Yours truly,

Il Ministro della Difesa,
Bundesminister der Verteidigung.

EMBASSY OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, WASHINGTON, AND EMBASSY OF ITALY IN WASHINGTON,

Washington, January 29, 2013.

Hon. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
Chairwoman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRWOMAN, First. let us warmly congratulate you on assuming the chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We wish you all the best in steering this important committee through all the challenges that lie ahead.

Among the many issues and decisions to be taken is one at the very center of transatlantic relationships, the future of the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS). This joint development program has brought together three close NATO allies to provide their forces with state-of-the-art technology to meet future threats. The program has achieved important milestones, including a successful intercept test in November 2012.

Italy and Germany have met their MoU obligations by contributing more than 40 percent of the necessary funding for the program since it has started in 2004. A final decision by the U.S. Government to prohibit further funding for MEADS at this advanced stage would lead to a significant loss of technology for which we have commonly worked so hard. It would also be perceived as a serious setback for transatlantic cooperation in general.

The U.S. Department of Defense has acknowledged this fact and requested further funding for MEADS in fiscal year 2013 to meet its international commitment and also to put itself and its partners in a position to harvest the technologies in which we have all significantly invested.

As the debate on an appropriations bill for the Department of Defense in 2013 continues, we greatly appreciate your consideration of these aspects.

In concluding, we would like to stress that both our governments continue to assume that all parties will ultimately abide by the agreement.

Sincerely,

DR. PETER AMMON,
Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany.
CLAUDIO BISOGNIERO,
Ambassador of Italy.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, DC, September 19, 2012.

Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I concur with Secretary Panetta's letter of June 26 and support, within the Department of Defense budget allocation, funding the final year of Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) development that includes key demonstrations, completion of documentation, and an orderly close of a program of significant importance to two of our important European allies, Germany and Italy. While we are encouraged by the recent Senate Appropriations Defense Subcommittee action recommending $380 million in fiscal year 2013 funding for MEADS, we recognize this development will need to be reconciled with other Congressional actions.

Honoring our commitment for the final year of the MEADS ''Proof of Concept'' would signal the U.S. commitment to working with allies to cooperatively develop capabilities required for the challenges facing the NATO Alliance. Commitment of U.S. funds would enable and further encourage our European partners to make additional contributions to NATO missile defense. Failing to provide the final year of funding when we are so close to completion would send the wrong message to all of our allies and partners at a time when the global situation requires more, not less, cooperation.

The United States relies on our NATO allies to share the burden of defense of NATO territory and peacekeeping in coalition activities. Difficult domestic budget and economic situations make it imperative for allies to consider ways to work together to maintain and build new capabilities to defend against modern threats, like the proliferation of ballistic missiles. These are vital capabilities that many allies can only obtain if they work together to develop and acquire them. We made a commitment to two of our closest allies, Germany and Italy, to develop MEADS cooperatively, share development costs, and realize integrated coalition capabilities. It is critical that we honor our commitments.

At the NATO Summit in Chicago, allies declared an interim missile defense capability as an initial step toward establishing the NATO missile defense capability that allies agreed to develop at the 2010 NATO Summit in Lisbon. While the United States is making a significant national contribution to this system through the European Phased Adaptive Approach, we expect and have requested additional contributions from allies to make the capability more effective and share the burden of missile defense protection of European NATO territory, populations, and forces.

Germany and Italy envision MEADS not only as an essential basis for their own future air defense capabilities, but more importantly as the basis for their respective contributions to NATO missile defense. The agreement to deploy a territorial NATO missile defense capability and its implementation are major achievements of U.S. and Allied policy. A decision by Congress not to provide or to prohibit funding MEADS at this late date would diminish the consensus reached in Lisbon and Chicago for this capability, discourage allies from participating in cooperative projects in the future, and ultimately, delay greater European contributions to NATO missile defense.

My staff is ready to answer any questions you or your staff may have. Sincerely yours,

Sincerely yours,

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your inquiries, I am writing to ask that you strongly support the President's Budget request for FY 2013 funding to complete the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) Design and Development (D&D) Proof of Concept (PoC) effort with Germany and Italy. The Department is seeking $400.9 million in FY 2013 funds to honor the final year of our MEADS D&D Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) commitment that will enable completion of the MEADS development phase as it is currently planned. The PoC effort enables all three nations to obtain benefit from our collective program investment to date and will bring the development program to an orderly conclusion, Failure to fund our FY 2013 commitment will be viewed by our allies as reneging on our promises.

During the NATO Summit in Chicago on May 20, 2012, NATO Allies achieved a major breakthrough on missile defense—10 years in the making—by declaring an interim ballistic missile defense capability as an initial step towards establishing a NATO missile defense system. The European Phased Adaptive Approach will be a major contributor to NATO missile defense and is designed to protect the U.S. homeland, U.S. deployed forces, and our allies against the increasing threats posed by the proliferation of ballistic missiles. Where ballistic missile defense was once a controversial subject within the Alliance, we have reached consensus to operationalize this capability and have the Allies share the burden of deterring and defending against those who could threaten us with ballistic missiles. This is a major achievement of U.S. policy; a decision by Congress to prohibit any additional funding for MEADS at this late date would diminish the consensus reached in Chicago.

The United States relies on allies to share the burden of peacekeeping and defense in coalition activities and the development of effective defense capabilities that are of direct benefit to the United States. In this context, I believe that it is important to live up to our commitments to our allies. We made a commitment to two of our closest allies, Germany and Italy, to develop MEADS cooperatively to achieve those objectives. Failure to meet our MEADS MOU FY 2013 funding obligations could negatively affect allied willingness to join future cooperative endeavors, bilaterally or through NATO, that have been strongly supported by the Administration and Congress at a time when cooperation through concepts such as Smart Defense is critical to ensuring NATO and its members are developing needed capabilities for the future.

In addition, failure by the United States to provide funding for FY 2013 likely would lead to a dispute with Germany and Italy, both of which have indicated that they would assert that the United States has unilaterally withdrawn from the MOU. On the other hand, full funding of the final year of the MEADS PoC would ensure that the United States receives a return on its 8-year investment in the form of a data archival package for future potential use on other U.S. air and missile defense improvements.

We must act now to avoid a situation that would cause harm to our relationships with two of our closest allies. My staff is ready to answer any questions you or your staff may have on MEADS.

Sincerely,

LEON PANETTA.

DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, almost 1½ years ago I sent the Government Accountability Office a letter asking them to examine the FDA's Adverse Event Reporting System for dietary supplements.

Dietary supplements, vitamin pills, and mineral pills are common across America. There are shops all over Chicago and downstate Illinois selling these supplements, and many people—including myself—take a vitamin each day. Maybe it is good for me, maybe it isn't. I hope it is good. It is certainly not harmful. But there are thousands of dietary supplements for sale. They are not all made in the United States, and they are not all made to the highest specifications.

So we said to the Food and Drug Administration, We want you to collect information from American consumers if there is a problem. If there is a dietary supplement that is being sold and someone has an adverse event—in other words, a health event—that could be serious, report it to the FDA. If we receive more than one, it is worth taking a look at to see if there is a pattern emerging and we should take something off the shelf.

Today the General Accountability Office released a report assessing how the system is working on this adverse event reporting on dietary supplements, and they had some recommendations. This reporting system is an important surveillance tool the FDA uses to identify and respond to cases of serious adverse reaction, such as heart attacks, hospitalizations, and, in some cases, death.

Over the years the types of dietary supplements sold have evolved from some very basic formulas such as simple vitamin C and calcium supplements to include products with potentially serious side effects, and even foods and beverages masquerading as dietary supplements that could pose a significant danger.

Take a look at these energy drinks that are for sale everywhere. Try to get past the cash register at your local gas station without running into a 5–Hour Energy drink or Monster Energy drink. And for some of them, when you turn the container back you will see it is not being sold as a beverage; it is being sold as a dietary supplement—in other words, like a vitamin or a mineral. There is a reason for that: because if it is sold as a beverage, FDA has different regulatory authority over the product and its ingredients. If it is sold as a dietary supplement, the regulations are not there in the same way as they would be for beverages.

Unfortunately, people are led to believe these products have all been approved by the FDA and pose no risk. In reality, unlike drugs or over-the-counter drugs, dietary supplements are not reviewed and tested by the FDA for safety or effectiveness before being sold to the American public. That will come as a surprise to a lot of people. Most dietary supplements today are safe and they are used by millions of Americans as part of their personal choice for a healthy lifestyle. That is not true of all supplements.

In 2002, a 16-year-old boy named Sean Riggins from Lincoln, IL, just a few miles away from my home in Springfield, died after taking a dietary supplement containing ephedra. Sean was a high school football player. Before playing in a game, he went to the local gas station and bought something called Yellow Jackets. It was a form of ephedra, clearly marketed to children to give them an energy boost. How often do you hear that? Sean washed the pills down with a bottle of Mountain Dew. Sean was unable to finish the football game that day and died of a heart attack.

Before his death, Metabolife—the largest manufacturer of supplements containing ephedra—claimed they had no ephedra-related adverse events to report. This was 2002. Under pressure, Metabolife later gave FDA over 13,000 ephedra-related adverse event reports that showed people taking their products with ephedra and getting sick.

In 2006, I worked with Senators ORRIN HATCH and TOM HARKIN to pass the Dietary Supplement and Nonprescription Drug Consumer Protection Act. The law requires dietary supplement manufacturers to report serious adverse events to the Food and Drug Administration.

Today's GAO report shows that since the law was enacted, serious adverse events reported to the FDA have increased dramatically, from almost 400 reports of serious events in 2007, to 6,307 between 2008 and 2011. The GAO report highlights commendable efforts by the FDA to improve the safety of dietary supplements. In 2008, the FDA only conducted 120 inspections in the United States. By 2012, that number was up to 400 inspections. Between 2008 and 2011, FDA took 19 regulatory actions, including warning letters and injunctions, against companies that didn't report as required—such as reporting serious adverse events but omitting contact information on their labels. That is pretty basic, isn't it? When you buy a product like a dietary supplement, you ought to at least know who made it and how you can contact the people who made it. If

something goes wrong or if there is a question and you need to contact someone, that basic information should be there.

In addition to outlining steps, FDA is taking steps to strengthen the Adverse Event Reporting System to protect consumers. The GAO report also suggests ways the FDA can improve this process. For instance, in some cases FDA has used these adverse event reports to inform actions to protect consumers. But the Agency could do more and develop ways to educate consumers about potentially harmful products.

The GAO report encourages the FDA to issue final guidance clarifying the definition of a conventional food and dietary supplement. The vague distinction between a dietary supplement and conventional food or beverage has created a murky growing market where some companies sell products potentially dangerous with unapproved ingredients, products such as Lazy Cakes, a brownie marketed as a dietary supplement—not as a brownie, but as a dietary supplement, that contains roughly 8 milligrams of the sleep aid melatonin, almost double the upper limit of the typical dose—and energy drinks sold in huge 16-, 24-, and 32-ounce cans right next to soda and Gatorade. Soda and Gatorade are regulated; the energy drinks are not. How would a consumer know?

The GAO report also encourages the FDA to work with the Poison Control Centers to establish a data-sharing agreement. This is a source of real frustration, and when I describe the situation you will understand why.

As you can imagine, when somebody feels sick after using a supplement, they don't usually call the Food and Drug Administration; they call a local hospital or the Poison Control Centers which are all across America. Between 2008 and 2010, Poison Control Centers heard from 1,000 more people who had experienced adverse events with dietary supplements than the Food and Drug Administration did. The Poison Control Centers information could be a meaningful contribution to the information the FDA is receiving about harmful products—information that can help us protect American consumers. I encourage the Food and Drug Administration and Poison Control Centers to work together to share this information. Sadly, the Poison Control Centers are demanding millions of dollars that the FDA doesn't have to get access to the basic information about dangerous products sold in America that are causing harm to Americans. Holding back this information is not in the best interests of keeping America healthy and safe.

Moving forward, I am going to continue to work with the FDA to enhance the regulation of dietary supplements and ensure customers have the information they need to make informed decisions. Every time I come to the floor and say anything about dietary supplements, I can guarantee you that at some Web site somewhere they are saying, Here comes Durbin again. He is going to take your vitamin pills away. He is going to make it so you need a prescription to take vitamin C. Not the case at all. That is not what I am arguing for.

Let me tell you the bill I will reintroduce this year, the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act, would do. It addresses the growing concern of dietary supplements with misleading information and the bad actors selling it. This bill would require more information on labels. People using dietary supplements have the right to know if there is a risk associated with the product. Some ingredients may be safe for the general population but risky for groups such as kids or pregnant women, or the ingredients included in there might be dangerous for people with special conditions such as diabetes or high blood pressure.

The bill would also help curb the growing practice of foods and beverages with added ingredients masquerading as dietary supplements by directing the FDA to establish a definition for conventional foods. This definition would clarify for industry, consumers, and even the FDA what products are foods and which products are dietary supplements. Today you can't tell.

If you have the time and good eyes, go into that gas station and take a look at some of these energy drinks, and then look at the bottle of Gatorade or soda next to it in the case. One often regulated as a beverage, the other—the dietary supplement—is not.

Many people would be surprised to learn that the FDA doesn't even know how many dietary supplements are being sold in the United States. I will bet you the majority of American people are sure their government is testing those things that are on the shelves. Not necessarily. Most people don't know if a dietary supplement ingredient presents any serious health concerns. The FDA doesn't have the information to track down products containing these harmful ingredients in many circumstances. The Dietary Supplement Labeling Act which I am introducing would require dietary supplement makers to give the FDA the name of each supplement they produce, along with a description, a list of ingredients, and a copy of the label. Is that onerous? Is that the heavy hand of government? If you want to sell a dietary supplement product in America, isn't it reasonable that you at least register the name of the product, its ingredients, the name and address of the company that can be reached if something goes wrong? That, to me, sounds very basic, and I hope my colleagues will consider supporting it. With that information, the FDA would be better equipped to protect consumers' health and to work with supplement manufacturers to address problems as they arise.

I visited dietary supplement companies in Chicago. I am impressed. They take it seriously. It looks as you would hope it would look, like a very sterile, professional environment with medical professionals on board. The same cannot be said of all the things we are importing from all over the world. If you take a look and see that the product was made in China, you may have some second thoughts about buying it or giving it to your children. We have had some scandals associated with adulterated products coming in from China. I would pause if that were the source of a dietary supplement. I would have more confidence if it is made in the United States, particularly by a reputable dealer that I have seen on the shelves in a local drugstore over and over again.

Let me reiterate. Most dietary supplements available in America today are safe and are used by millions of Americans as part of a healthy lifestyle. As I said, I am one of the consumers taking that dietary supplement multivitamin every morning. But the GAO report confirms there is still work to be done to enhance the FDA's Adverse Event Reporting System, and to ensure that people who take these products have the information they need to make healthy, informed decisions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am back on the Senate floor today with my favorite chart, one that I think is indicative of the fiscal dysfunction that is occurring here in Congress, particularly in the Senate, now marking 1,420 days without a budget. But people should be encouraged that as a result of the House passing a ''no budget, no pay'' bill, it has finally prompted our friends across the aisle to mark up a budget in the Budget Committee that will come to the floor in the next few days, and we will be having a lot of important discussions and debates about budgets, taxes, and debt ratios.

I hope everyone remembers what this is really about. It is not just about numbers, it is about our obligation, our moral obligation to future generations of Americans.

I would just footnote that the President in a recent interview said that we do not have an immediate debt problem, and to say: Mr. President, the debt is discouraging and retarding economic growth which we need in order to get Americans back to work.

That is why unemployment is at 8 percent, roughly, with some 23 million Americans either out of work or underemployed, working part time when they would like to work full time. It is

a national tragedy and why we need to get our fiscal house in order here so we can put America back to work and grow our economy and opportunity.

Like many in this Chamber, my father was a member of what we call the ''greatest generation.'' I think Tom Brokaw coined that phrase, talking about the World War II generation that fought and won a world war. My dad was a B–17 pilot, and on his 26th bombing mission over Mannheim, Germany, he was shot down and captured as a prisoner of war. Thank goodness that after 4 months he was released from captivity thanks to General Patton and his Army sweeping through that part of Germany at the end of World War II.

My father and others like him fought to ensure that his children and his grandchildren would grow up in a country that had greater opportunity than he himself and my mother had when they were alive. Indeed, that is every parent's dream, that their children and their grandchildren will enjoy more opportunity, more freedom, and a higher standard of living than they themselves had. That is the reason why parents and grandparents sacrifice and why they work hard for their kids and grandkids—because of their hope and their belief in that dream. As a result, my dad and my mother and countless other members of the ''greatest generation'' left this country better off than they found it. The question for all of us today is, Will the present generation do the same? I certainly hope so, and I am doing everything I know how to do, as one Senator, to make sure we do.

As a parent, I want nothing but the best for my two daughters. My wife and I want and hope and pray for the best for them. As an American, I want to see every child, everyone's sons and daughters, succeed and prosper. But right now we have, in effect, a war being waged against America's youth. I know some might consider that hyperbole or perhaps unnecessarily inflammatory, but let me explain to you why I do believe that you could logically conclude that we have been waging a war against America's youth.

Consider the following: Our national debt is close to $17 trillion. That means every child born in America today comes into this world owing $53,000 in debt. Meanwhile, the Federal Government is spending more than $200 billion a year on interest payments alone. The Medicare hospital insurance trust fund—Medicare—is projected to go bankrupt within 11 years, and we are looking at more than $100 trillion in unfunded liabilities; that is, promises we have made to future generations, and we currently have no clue how to pay for those. That is what ''unfunded liabilities'' means.

We know the younger generation has virtually no hope that Medicare and Social Security will be there for them when they retire unless we act—and we must act. But rather than reform and protect our existing programs, such as Medicare and Social Security, the President chose in his first year in office to create yet another new entitlement program funded by a $1 trillion tax increase. Of course, we all know it goes by the name of ObamaCare or, if you prefer, the Affordable Care Act, which I think, if you look at it, history will ultimately conclude was unaffordable—not the Affordable Care Act but the Unaffordable Care Act.

One impact of ObamaCare is that young people under the age of 40 are going to have to pay higher and higher health insurance premiums. You might ask how that is possible since they are the healthiest people in America today. This is a phenomenon known as age banding, which says under ObamaCare that seniors can pay no more than three times what young healthy people pay for their health insurance. But it is no secret that older Americans incur higher medical expenses by virtue of their advancing years. Yet they can only pay three times what young healthy people pay for health insurance. That will lead to much higher premiums for young people in America. Indeed, one recent survey found that premium costs for young and healthy Americans ''will increase on average by 169 percent.'' I have no way of knowing whether that prediction will be entirely accurate, but I can promise that health insurance premiums for young, healthy Americans will continue to rise under the current law known as ObamaCare.

Such a dramatic rise in health insurance premiums will come at a time when young workers and middle-class families are already struggling to make ends meet. After all, the median household income in America has fallen by more than $2,400 since June 2009. In other words, average households in America are not just treading water, maintaining their place, they are losing, they are taking on water, and they are $2,400 poorer today than they were in June 2009.

Not only will ObamaCare drive up insurance premiums for younger Americans, it also is destroying jobs. In fact, we already have evidence that many full-time jobs are being reduced to part-time jobs in preparation for ObamaCare's costs and regulation. In particular, in many places where young people get a start in their work life—working in restaurants, working in hotels, working for retailers—those very same employers are now replacing full-time jobs with part-time jobs in order to avoid the crushing costs of ObamaCare. So this will hurt younger Americans more than anyone else.

Then there is this: While unemployment is, generally speaking, about 7.9 percent—the Congressional Budget Office expects it to go up to 8 percent by the end of this year—fewer and fewer people are still looking for jobs. It is called the labor participation rate. You can go online and look at the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and they will show you that the number of people looking for work as a percentage of the population is as low as it has been for 30 years. So not only are people having a hard time finding full-time work, if they can find work at all, some have simply given up.

A new study shows that the unemployment rate among teenagers is over 25 percent now, and a new study shows that Americans in their twenties and thirties are accumulating savings at a much slower rate than their parents did. What we find among many young Americans and not-so-young Americans is that they are living off of their 401(k) or retirement savings now at unprecedented rates.

I ask my colleagues, is this really the future we want to leave our children and grandchildren? Will this leave them better off than we were or will it leave them worse off? I know that no one in this Chamber and no American in this country wants to leave their children and grandchildren worse off than they are. That is why we have to do everything we can to reverse the Federal overreach of the past 4 years and to boost economic opportunity with policies that will promote fiscal health and strong, broad job creation and upward mobility. In other words, we need to embrace policies that expand our economy and not government. We do not need people more dependent on government, we need more people independent and prospering on their own because we have a growing economy that provides opportunities for them to work, to save, and to support their families and deliver to their children and grandchildren greater prosperity than they inherited from their parents. That is the future Americans want, and that is the future we must strive to deliver.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an amendment that has been filed by my friend Senator MORAN that I am proud to support. This amendment would stop the Federal Aviation Administration from targeting air traffic control towers across the country, including the towers that are considered to be in the Contract Tower Program under sequestration.

As I have said before on this floor and will continue to say, many of these problems will be resolved, I am convinced, if the Appropriations Committee does its work and that work is recognized and debated on the floor. And I hope we will not be having this same kind of discussion on October 1 when we begin the new spending year.

But the impact of sequestration—cutting from this account—is real. Senator MORAN's amendment is important.

It is something that could impact the communities served by these towers. This amendment tries to ensure that these communities are not impacted.

In our State, there are contract towers in Missouri—in Branson, in Joplin, in Colombia, in Jefferson City and Saint Joseph. All those could be affected, depending on how the FAA administers this cut in the contract tower line. A number of other airports in Missouri, including Springfield, downtown Kansas City, and downtown St. Louis, could lose their towers in the after-midnight service, and those planes that now land there after midnight would either not do that or would do that without the support of the tower they have now that assists in landing.

This amendment of Senator MORAN would protect those towers as well as the federally funded portion of 16 cost-share towers, which also could be closed at the end of this fiscal year. Specifically, this amendment takes $50 million from one place in the FAA—in fact, it is $50 million in research and capital funds—that is money that could easily be set aside for this short period of time so that these towers do not close—and then Senator MORAN would add $50 million in the Federal Aviation Administration operations account. The amendment makes it clear that the Contract Tower Program and contract tower cost-sharing programs are subject to the 5-percent sequestration cuts but, again, would transfer enough money within accounts that there should be money to keep these important towers open in Missouri, in Kansas, in Maryland, in Alaska. Many States—almost every State has something that would be impacted by this contract tower section.

This $50 million would be more than 95 percent of the estimated money necessary to be sure that the contract tower program and the cost-share program would stay in place. If someone was using one of these airports and bought a ticket to travel out of one of these airports, or if someone is a general aviation customer at one of these airports, the tower is one of the ways they would expect their tax dollars to be spent.

What Senator MORAN is trying to do is find a way to do that which still allows sequestration to occur and still keeps the spending below the spending cap in the law. It is exactly in sync with the spirit of the law as well as the letter of the law. This just tries to solve a problem.

I wish to solve this problem in another way, by saying that Federal funds and employees who are involved in public safety have to be prioritized as people who show up, and we are going to move forward with that particular view legislatively if we cannot get it added to this spending bill which takes us from now until the end of the year.

It is my hope we are not talking next year about how we get to the end of the year because we figured out how to get to the end of the year at the beginning of the year. That does not sound like an incredible goal for the Senate to have. But in a Senate that has not voted on a single appropriations bill for 16 months, updating the spending—5 of the 12 bills spend 70 percent of the money—in this continuing resolution is in the spirit of what our new chairman and our new ranking member want to do, and what the Senate should want to do, which is to deal with these things in the regular way.

I would very much like to see Senator MORAN's amendment included in what we are doing today. Just as importantly, I want to work with Senator MORAN to see that as we look toward October 1, these kinds of issues don't have to become a regular part of our process, but the kind we look back on and say: Remember we failed to do our job the regular way and all the problems that created? Let's get back to regular order.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, before the Senator from Missouri leaves the floor, I wish to make a comment.

First of all, I would personally like to thank him for all of his cooperation in trying to help move this bill forward within the Senate. It is characteristic of both him and the spirit in which Vice Chairman SHELBY and I have undertaken this effort. We have tried to work together to get this bill disposed of in an orderly way in order to avoid a government shutdown. It is not the bill we like, but it is the bill that was presented to us. At the same time we are beginning to establish both a tone, a decorum, and a process so we can get back to regular order.

I share the frustration of the Senator from Missouri in that we are dealing with a really big bill. The legislation that is pending here includes all 12 of the separate appropriations bills. It is very difficult to parse them out and to have rational conversations on matters of policy.

I hope as we get to October 1, which is our fiscal New Year's Eve, we will have had an orderly disposal of all 12 of the bills. I truly believe we can agree on the process and procedure. We can and should have a debate on policy. There should be a debate on funding. I am not one who likes to contain debates or contain amendments, but the clock is ticking.

We have two big issues before us. One issue is the funding for the rest of the fiscal year—fiscal 2013—and then we have the budget for fiscal 2014 which Senator MURRAY and Senator SESSIONS want to bring to the floor. I would like it if we could bring our bill to an orderly close and move to the budget debate so when we take our Easter-Passover break, if we do that, we will have shown the people of America that we can govern by disposing of two major policy considerations with decorum, dignity, civility, and pretty robust conversation.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am here, once again, to sound an alarm about carbon pollution's damage to our oceans and to our climate. It is past time for Congress to wake up to our responsibility as elected officials and as stewards of this planet.

The alarm has been sounded by the scientific community which overwhelmingly warns about the effects of our carbon dioxide emissions on our atmosphere and oceans. Our defense and intelligence communities warn of the threats posed by climate change to national security and international stability. Economists recognize the distortion of energy markets that overlook the true cost of carbon pollution, and government accountants now list climate change as a threat to our fiscal stability.

Today, as we enter the Passover and Easter season and as Catholics the world over celebrate the selection of a new Pope, we turn to voices of faith. They too call upon us. They call upon us to heed the moral imperatives of protecting creation and seeking justice for all people. They call upon us to reflect on our faith, on our relationship to our world and each other and on our responsibility to future generations, and they call upon us, as President Obama reminded us in his inaugural address, to ''preserve our planet, commanded to our care by God.''

I lay no claim to religious authority, but I must believe this: Something that harms others, something that disturbs God's creation, something that stands on lies and greed—protecting that must not be consistent with God's will.

In his 2010 World Day of Peace message entitled ''If You Want to Cultivate Peace, Protect Creation,'' Pope Benedict XVI called upon the faithful:

> . . . [t]o protect the environment, and to safeguard natural resources and the climate . . . while at the same time taking into due account the solidarity we owe to those living in the poorer areas of our world and to future generations.

In his inaugural mass this morning, Pope Francis said:

> Please, I would like to ask all those who have positions of responsibility in economic,

political, and social life, and all men and women of good will: let us be ''protectors'' of creation, protectors of God's plan inscribed in nature, protectors of one another and of the environment.

As early news reports indicated, the new Pope chose his papal name Francis out of respect for Saint Francis's sense of obligation to God's creation. He noted in one of his very earliest comments that our relationship with God's creation is not so good right now. Of course, the Pope is not the only one.

Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I of Constantinople, the spiritual leader of the world's Orthodox Christians, also reminds us to remember those most affected by climate change:

Climate change is much more than an issue of environmental preservation. Climate change constitutes a matter of social and economic justice.

In the United States, hundreds of evangelical leaders signed the Evangelical Climate Initiative statement which declares: ''Love of God, love of neighbor, and the demands of stewardship are more than enough reason for evangelical Christians to respond to the climate change problem with moral passion and concrete action.''

The Hindu Declaration on Climate Change affirms that ''the dire problems besetting our world will all be magnified manyfold by the predicted impacts of climate change.''

Buddhist leaders, including the Dalai Lama, urge both individual and institutional transformation to confront what they call ''the gravest challenge that humanity has ever faced: the ecological consequences of our own collective karma.''

As Rev. Fletcher Harper of the interfaith coalition GreenFaith explains, all faith-based communities have a spiritual connection to the natural world. For example, Sheikh Ali Gomaa, the internationally respected Egyptian Islamist, sees this connection as central to a faithful life. I will read:

If we take seriously our role as God's deputies on Earth, not just by benefiting from the environment, but by preserving it and ensuring that other communities and generations will have the same possibilities to drink clean water, breathe fresh air, and live in a world that is in harmony with itself and with ourselves, we may hope to be among those who are beloved to God due to their care for his creation.

For many, faith compels work toward fairness and justice for all living beings, regardless of nationality or social status, and encourages us to consider the effects of our actions on future generations.

For many individuals all over the world, the fight against climate change is a moral call. As Americans, we have a tradition of calling upon our own deeply held spiritual convictions to address our society's greatest moral challenges. People of faith are answering that call, from major denominational governing bodies down to local parishes and synagogues.

Representative HENRY WAXMAN and I, as part of our work on the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, recently wrote to 300 groups to ask for their views on actions the Federal Government could take to reduce carbon pollution and strengthen our resiliency to climate change. A number of those organizations which answered are religious organizations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts of letters from six of these groups.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COALITION ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND JEWISH LIFE AND JEWISH COUNCIL FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
New York, NY, February 20, 2013.

REP. HENRY A. WAXMAN AND SEN. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Co-chairs, Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change.

DEAR SENATORS WAXMAN AND WHITEHOUSE: Thank you for requesting our input. The Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life (COEJL) and Jewish Council for Public Affairs (JCPA) are pleased to respond to the Task Force's request for input on federal policy responses to climate change.

COEJL deepens and broadens the Jewish community's commitment to the stewardship and protection of the earth. COEJL has been an initiative at the Jewish Council for Public Affairs since 1993. Through a network of 27 national organizations (including all major denominations) and 125 community agencies, COEJL is mobilizing the Jewish community to address today's energy and climate change crisis. Through its role in the National Religious Partnership for the Environment (NRPE), COEJL works closely with our colleagues at the Evangelical Environmental Network, National Council of Churches, and US Conference of Catholic Bishops. JCPA is the public affairs arm of the organized Jewish community and serves as the national coordinating and advisory body for the 14 national and 125 local agencies comprising the field of Jewish community relations.

Today, COEJL's priorities are to mobilize the Jewish community to address the climate crisis through advocacy for appropriate legislation as well as action to reduce our own greenhouse gas emissions. COEJL challenges and supports Jewish organizations to pursue sustainability in their facilities, operations and programs in order to protect the earth for future generations.

COEJL's Jewish Energy and Environment Imperative, signed by over 50 Jewish community leaders in 2012, states that ''the need to transform the world's energy economy while addressing global climate change is not only a religious and moral imperative, it is a strategy for security and survival.'' Next month, COEJL is bringing . . .

COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC JUSTICE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
Washington, DC, February 21, 2013.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Co-Chair, Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Co-Chair, Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight, Senate Committee, Environment and Public Works.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WAXMAN AND SENATOR WHITEHOUSE: At the request of Cardinal Dolan and as chairman of the Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development, I am responding to your letter dated January 31, 2013. We thank you for your leadership to address climate change and for the opportunity to share our suggestions for effective measures to address the moral and environmental challenges of climate change with this Bicameral Task Force.

Effective measures to address climate change are urgent and necessary. Evidence continues to point toward significant damaging impacts from climate related events in the United States, across the globe, and particularly for the poorest developing countries. Some poor nations and small island states already experience these impacts as a matter of survival for their people and cultures.

People living in poverty in communities served by Catholic Relief Services (CRS) already suffer the tragic consequences of climate change. Increasingly limited access to water, reduced crop yields, more widespread disease, and increased frequency and intensity of droughts and storms all make the lives of the world's poorest people even more precarious. CRS, which supports projects in almost 100 countries, already assists many communities to adapt to the consequences of climate change.

In signaling the moral dimensions of this issue and advocating for the needs of the most vulnerable, the Catholic Church brings a distinct perspective to this urgent matter. Throughout his pontificate, Pope Benedict XVI demonstrated strong leadership on climate change in his teaching office and through efforts to reduce the Vatican's own carbon footprint. In his 2010 World Day of Peace Message, If You Want to Cultivate Peace, Protect Creation, he pointed to the urgent moral need for solidarity with creation and those affected by climate change. The pope insists, ''To protect the environment, and to safeguard natural resources and the climate, there is a need to act in accordance with clearly-defined rules . . . while at the same time taking into due account the solidarity we owe to those living in the poorer areas of our world and to future generations'' (no. 7).

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) is guided by the teaching of Pope Benedict XVI and the principles articulated in the USCCB's statement, Global Climate Change: A Plea fbr Dialogue, Prudence and the Common Good. This statement notes that, ''At its core, global climate change is not about economic theory or political platforms, nor about partisan advantage or interest group pressures. It is about the future of God's creation and the one human family.'' As pastors and people of faith, we are not experts on the science, technical remedies and particular provisions of legislation or regulatory measures to address climate change. Our efforts seek to link care for creation and care for ''the least of these.'' As is noted in the bishops' statement, ''Action to mitigate global climate change must be built upon a foundation of social and economic justice that does not put the poor at greater risk or place disproportionate and unfair burdens on developing nations.''

For the USCCB, a fundamental moral measure of any policy to address climate change is how it affects the poor, in our country and around the world. Well-designed policies can both reduce the severity of climate change and protect the most vulnerable. The USCCB supports strong leadership by the United States in enacting policies that protect poor and vulnerable people from bearing the impacts of climate change and from the human and economic costs of any proposed legislation to respond to climate change.

The USCCB asks the U.S. Congress and the federal government to consider the following principles as they shape policies and measures to address climate change:

Prudence requires us to act to protect the common good by addressing climate change at home and abroad.

The consequences of climate change will be borne by the world's most vulnerable people and inaction will worsen their suffering.

Policies addressing global climate change should enhance rather than diminish the economic situation of people in poverty.

Policies should create new resources to assist poor and adversely affected communities to adapt and respond to the effects of global climate change in the U.S. and in vulnerable developing countries.

Policies to address climate change should include measures to protect poor and vulnerable communities from the health impacts of climate change, including increased exposure to climate-sensitive diseases, heat waves and diminished air quality.

Participation by local affected communities in shaping policy responses to address climate change and programs for adapting to climate change is essential.

Technology should be made available to people in the most vulnerable developing countries to help them adapt to the effects of climate change (adaptation) and reduce their greenhouse gas emissions (mitigation).

We appreciate your commitment to address this urgent global challenge confronting the human family. The USCCB stands ready to work with you, members of Congress, and the Administration to ensure that needed climate legislation both cares for creation and protects ''the least of these.''

Sincerely yours,

MOST REVEREND STEPHEN E. BLAIRE,
Chairman,
Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development.

EVANGELICAL ENVIRONMENTAL NETWORK,
New Freedom, PA, February 20, 2013.

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Co-chairs, Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Capitol Hill, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WHITEHOUSE AND CONGRESSMAN WAXMAN: On behalf of the Board and staff of the Evangelical Environmental Network (EEN) I write to thank you for your service to our country, in particular for your leadership on climate change, including your co-chairmanship of the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change. In your capacity as Co-chairs, you have asked us to provide ''ideas for actions the federal government can take to address climate change.'' This letter is our response to your request.

A. THE GREAT MORAL CAUSE OF OUR TIME

We consider overcoming climate change by keeping the temperature rise to 2°C above preindustrial levels to be the great moral cause of our time and the next great cause of freedom. EEN has been seriously engaged on this issue for over a decade, and it remains our top policy priority. We believe overcoming climate change is part of what it means to be a Christian today; it is part of loving God and our neighbors as ourselves, of respecting the sanctity of life given by God, including the unborn and those yet to be born.

B. SOWING THE SEEDS OF BIPARTISANSHIP

We note at the outset that one of the most important things the federal government can do is to act in a manner that enjoys or will eventually enjoy broad bi-partisan support to ensure that whatever actions are taken will carry forward into the future, regardless of which party holds power in the legislative and executive branches. No one knows better than we do how difficult this particular issue can be for the more conservative members of our society, including many Republicans. We know that bipartisanship on climate action is not easy. But it is necessary.

The simple truth is, those opposed to climate action have done a good job of having climate change viewed as a political issue, even a partisan one. We firmly believe that the need to act to overcome climate change is a moral issue, that it should be viewed morally rather than in a partisan fashion. Science helps us understand that there is a problem and the magnitude and urgency of the problem. The systemic nature, the magnitude, and the urgency of the problem require not only that individuals act in keeping with their values, but that government at all levels must act—especially the federal government. But the decision to act, both individually and through our various levels of government, is a moral one. This is a moral cause whose solutions require government policies in keeping with freedom.

As such, we implore you as statesmen to help move our country forward in a manner that sow's the seeds of bi-partisanship to be reaped in the future. Let's work together to stay out of the partisan trap set by opponents of climate action.

C. WE MUST ACT STARTING NOW

Precisely because climate change is the great moral cause of our time and the need for action is urgent, we cannot wait to act until there is complete unanimity. Even in the absence of strong bipartisan support today. actions must be taken now to keep us within striking distance of avoiding 2°C and help us adapt to the impacts that will occur. But such actions must always be taken with an eye towards eventual bi-partisan support, or that would lead to eventual bi-partisan solutions.

D. ACTION TO ADDRESS THE CAUSES: MITIGATION

1. Preference for Market-based Mechanisms

As conservatives, we believe in using the least amount of government power necessary to achieve the common good. Since the issuing of the Evangelical Climate Initiative statement in 2006, EEN has endorsed the use of market-based mechanisms to put a price on carbon, thereby allowing the dynamics of the marketplace to find the most efficient and least-costly ways of overcoming climate change. As such, we favor cap-and-trade or a carbon tax as preferred choices over regulation when it comes to addressing the causes, or climate mitigation.

But we are past time for serious action on climate mitigation, and thus our country must move forward even if Congress is currently unable to price carbon via a market-based mechanism.

2. EPA Regulations, a Second Best Option

Therefore, we strongly urge the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), under its authority contained in the Clean Air Act (CAA), to issue a rule on existing sources that would be finalized in 2014. We further urge the EPA to require strong emissions reductions that keep our country's contribution in striking distance of 2°C, thereby enhancing freedom in the future by reducing impacts. But, also in keeping with freedom, we urge that states be given maximum flexibility as to how emissions can be reduced.

Strength of resolve, flexibility in implementation, infused with freedom—these should be the watchwords for the EPA's regulation of existing sources. Remaining steadfast on the * * *

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, DC, February 20, 2013.

DEAR SEN. WHITEHOUSE AND REP. WAXMAN: FCNL is delighted that you have formed the bicameral Task Force on Climate Change. We are thankful for your leadership on climate disruption—the greatest challenge humanity has ever faced—and look forward to working with you to ensure that Congress does its part to address it. We are honored to be invited to respond to the questions you have posed.

In recognition of the gravity and immensity of climate disruption, the questions posed first merit contextual background—much of which you know all too well—yet bears repeating, for without it, the tangible paths of specific negotiations and actions in present day circumstances can turn in unexpected directions or end in inadequate places.

CONTEXT

As you know, the scientific community feels the world is unable to stay below the 2 degree Celsius target that the global political establishment set in Copenhagen as the maximum global temperature increase acceptable to avoid serious and catastrophic disruptions of Earth's ecosystems and in turn human societal systems. Some scientists, observing and monitoring present day manifestations of climate disruption, feel that this target is now too lenient. Other scientists think it's too late to prevent catastrophic consequences on human civilization even if world GHG emissions halted right now.

Yet human civilization is increasing global GHG emissions in quantities exceeding the worst case scenario posited in the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report. The International Energy Agency says we must keep in the ground ⅔rds of the world's proven fossil fuel reserves to prevent catastrophe, yet some nations and corporations aggressively and successfully pursue policies to the contrary. Few if any national or international policies are in place to abate these trends. Grim is the understated description of these circumstances.

What must be done?

The ideal and mandatory goal is for the world to urgently and dramatically reduce global greenhouse gas emissions (e.g., by transitioning to renewable energy sources, energy efficient buildings and technologies, and protection of carbon sinks like rainforests), and for significant resources and expertise to be directed towards building the resilience of human infrastructure and critical ecosystems to prepare for and withstand the impacts of phenomena generated or exacerbated by climate disruption. With regard to the first aspect of this goal, some suggest reductions more ambitious than that proposed in prior comprehensive climate legislation, e.g., 80% reductions in global GHG emissions by 2025, not 2050. * * *

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE USA,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2013.

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Co-Chair, Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight, Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Hon. HENRY WAXMAN,
Co-Chair, Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce.

DEAR SENATOR WHITEHOUSE AND REPRESENTATIVE WAXMAN: The National Council of Churches (NCC), on behalf of its 37 Christian denominations, is grateful for your leadership on the issue of global climate change and the opportunity to provide input regarding potential actions and legislation that can respond to the global climate crisis. We are appreciative of your continued commitment to bring this issue to the forefront for both houses of Congress.

The NCC, through its Eco-justice Program, has, for more than 30 years, sought to address the issue of global climate change with a focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions to prevent the worst impacts of climate change, ensuring economic protections for those living in poverty as we shift to a low-carbon future, and preparing communities at home and abroad for those climate impacts that we can no longer prevent. In 2006, the NCC along with an interfaith coalition developed its Faith Principles on Global Warming. This document lifts up justice, stewardship, sustainability and sufficiency as guiding tenets for our work and ministry on climate change and has informed the following recommendations.

A central component of the NCC's efforts is focused on minimizing our contribution to global climate change by reducing heat-trapping pollutants both in our congregations and at the national level. This is critical if we are to achieve climate justice and prevent the worst impacts of climate change.

In order to effectively address climate change, the United States must incorporate the principles of mitigation and adaptation at every level and in every branch of government. We currently have a number of administrative options available to us through federal agencies that should be used to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Currently there are a variety of policies that could be both adopted and enforced by federal agencies would limit greenhouse gas emissions. First, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) should use its authority under the Clean Air Act to address methane released from energy extraction processes such as mountaintop removal coal mining and hydraulic fracturing. Both processes release significant amounts of methane, a gas often found in fossil * * *

THE REGENERATION PROJECT
INTERFAITH POWER & LIGHT,
San Francisco, CA, February 20, 2013.

Rep. HENRY WAXMAN,
Sen. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, Washington, DC.

DEAR SEN. WHITEHOUSE AND REP. WAXMAN: Thank you for forming the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change and for including Interfaith Power & Light in your request for ideas for actions the federal government can take to address climate change.

As President Obama said in his inaugural speech, we are ''commanded by God'' to preserve the planet. In his State of the Union address he further said, ''for the sake of our children and our future, we must do more to combat climate change''. We are encouraged that the president sees this as a moral issue. People of faith agree and support bold action. The president's call for Congress to act opens an opportunity, and we thank you for your leadership to advance that action.

In response to your questions we have listed some ideas for your consideration, below.

1. What actions or policies could federal agencies adopt, using existing authorities, to reduce emissions of heat-trapping pollution?

We urge Congress to support proposed EPA standards on carbon pollution from new power plants and ensure timely action to limit carbon pollution from existing power plants and oil refineries.

2. What actions or policies could federal agencies adopt using existing authorities, to make our nation more resilient to the effects of climate changed?

A coordinated strategy involving FEMA, Department of Agriculture, DOT, DOE, and EPA to help prepare communities for the impacts of climate change could be productive. Communities must become more resilient, more equipped for storms and high heat events, droughts and transportation challenges. Supporting local food infrastructure, cooling centers for urban areas, and shelters with their own power sources (preferably renewable) could help communities cope with extreme weather events that disrupt food, transportation and electricity infrastructure.

Superstorm Sandy offered lessons in this regard, and could be used as a case study to be better prepared for future events. However, each community is different, and local communities should be encouraged to come up with their own preparedness strategies. A public campaign coming from the government that declares the climate issue is real, and response is urgent might move more Americans to understand that we need to act. This should be framed as a moral issue, not an environmental or scientific one.

3. What legislation would you recommend Congress enact to strengthen the ability of federal agencies to prevent and respond to the effects of climate change?

We suggest legislation to advance energy efficiency and renewables and to upgrade the electrical grid which would allow for more renewable energy to come to market. In order to level the playing field between renewable energy and traditional fossil fuels, we suggest legislation that would limit the amount of subsidies to oil, coal and gas and redirect these subsidies to renewables. Legislation could also remove barriers to investment in renewable energy, so that wind and solar and other clean energy development can benefit from Master Limited Partnerships and Production Tax Credits.

The Department of Energy could also be directed to help low-income communities and households, as well as nonprofits, take advantage of energy efficiency and renewable energy solutions by providing rebates rather than tax-credits. The upfront cost is currently a major barrier to low-income households, houses of worship, and other nonprofits that want to weatherize, retrofit their facilities or install solar or on-site wind.

4. Additionally we suggest legislation to secure and direct robust funding for international climate adaptation and mitigation. The U.S. must maintain and increase our investments in critical international actions to the impacts that are already being felt, particularly in developing countries and the most vulnerable communities. These investments are essential to promoting global solutions to climate change; protecting our national interests and economic competitiveness, shared security, and development goals; and enabling developing countries and vulnerable communities to plan and prepare for climate-related disasters and losses. In addition, the U.S. should ensure that all our international investments promote low-carbon development pathways and support climate resilience and preparedness, especially for the most vulnerable communities. This is not only our responsibility as a global leader, it is a moral imperative.

I want to assure you that our 40 state affiliates and thousands of congregations view a swift and equitable transition to a clean energy economy as our moral responsibility, and are prepared to support your efforts every step of the way. Thank you for your important work to steward God's Creation and protect our children's future.

With faith,
THE REV. CANON SALLY BINGHAM,
President.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The Coalition on the Environment and Jewish life and the Jewish Council for Public Affairs wrote to us that ''the need to transform the world's energy economy while addressing global climate change is not only a religious and moral imperative; it is a strategy for security and survival.''

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops says:

> At its core, global climate change is not about economic theory or political platforms, nor about partisan advantage or interest group pressures. It is about the future of God's creation and the one human family.

The bishops ask Congress to consider seven principles in shaping responsible climate change policies:

No. 1, addressing global climate change means protecting the common good.

No. 2, climate change will hit the most vulnerable communities the hardest.

No. 3, we must seek solutions that enhance rather than diminish the economic standing of the poor.

No. 4, new resources must be made available to poor communities to adapt to the effects of a changing climate.

No. 5, we must protect vulnerable peoples from the negative human health effects of climate change.

No. 6, local affected communities should have a voice in shaping the response to climate change.

No. 7, technological solutions to reduce carbon emissions and adapt to a changing climate must be made available to the people of developing nations.

That is from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

We heard from the Quaker Friends Committee on National Legislation. They wrote that climate change is ''the greatest challenge humanity has ever faced.''

The Evangelical Environment Network urges immediate, bipartisan action saying:

> The simple truth is, those opposed to climate action have done a good job of having climate change viewed as a political issue, even a partisan one.
>
> We firmly believe that the need to act to overcome climate change is a moral issue, that it should be viewed morally rather than in a partisan fashion.

The National Council of the Churches of Christ, representing 37 Christian denominations, calls for a national policy that ''lifts up justice, stewardship, sustainability and sufficiency as guiding tenets.''

Interfaith Power and Light, a national faith-based campaign against global warming, tells us that its ''[40] state affiliates and thousands of congregations view a swift and equitable transition to a clean energy economy as our moral responsibility, and are prepared to support [the Task Force's] efforts every step of the way.''

These religious leaders and groups are, unlike Congress, not sleepwalking through history. Faith groups throughout America are acting on their sense of spirit, justice, and stewardship, and are mobilizing locally to combat and prepare for the effects of climate change.

In my home State, Rhode Island Interfaith Power and Light provides

free energy audits, training workshops, and online information about implementing and maintaining energy efficiency programs for houses of worship. The Jewish Alliance of Greater Rhode Island's Community Relations Council is working to reduce the carbon footprint of Rhode Island synagogues by 14 percent by next year.

In East Providence, RI, the Newman Congregational Church made some simple changes, such as installing occupancy sensors and better lighting, and experienced a 25-percent reduction in electricity costs.

Last year, the Beneficent Congregational Church of the United Church of Christ in Providence undertook an ecumenical Lenten carbon fast. This spring, from Easter to Pentecost, the congregation will be taking part in the United Church of Christ's national campaign of volunteering and environmental advocacy.

These urgent calls from religious leaders of so many faiths, and these conscientious actions by individual houses of worship, demonstrate the powerful connection men and women of faith feel to the wonders of creation and to our fellow humankind. For some, this connection derives from a connection to a higher power. For others, it is hope for future generations or a commitment to justice for all living things.

I once heard a colleague here in Congress brush off the warnings of science about climate change saying: ''God's still up there,'' implying that there is no need to worry about climate change. Well, if God is still up there, what better use of the gifts of moral reasoning that we have been given as His people than to protect His creation—and one another—from harm?

As we sing in the old hymn:

Field and forest, vale and mountain,
Flowering meadow, flashing sea,
Chanting bird and flowing fountain,
Call us to rejoice in Thee.

We are each called in our own way to wake up and to do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I want to comment on the comments of the Senator from Rhode Island.

First of all, I know it is so heartfelt and so genuine, and I want to thank him for that. And I want to thank him for approaching it from a faith-based standpoint about this fragile ecosystem we live on called planet Earth. He has brought a perspective, with that chart he has of the Earth, that it is so beautiful and yet it looks so fragile. As a matter of fact, when you look at the rim of the Earth from the perspective in space, you see a thin film, and you realize that is what sustains all of life, which is the atmosphere. Even with the naked eye from space, you can see how we are messing it up.

I could see, coming across Brazil, the color differentiation where they were destroying the Amazon. Then I could look to the east at the mouth of the Amazon and see the effects of the extra silt that discolored the waters of the Atlantic for hundreds of miles.

So the Senator brings a great perspective, and I thank him for it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, if I may respond by thanking the Senator from Florida for his kind remarks. He is the only Member of this body now or ever to have seen that view of our planet from the space capsule in which he looked down on Earth. He has spoken with enormous eloquence and passion about what that experience meant to him, both on the floor and to us in our caucus. I am very grateful for his kind remarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I want to say, first of all, we have had three astronaut Senators. We have Senator BILL NELSON, who just spoke so eloquently about the planet and the way he saw it, we have had our own very beloved and hero with the right stuff, Senator John Glenn, and also Senator Jake Garn, our wonderful colleague who retired many years ago but was also on the VA-HUD Committee. When I first came to the Senate, Senator Garn was one of the Members from the other side of the aisle who helped me learn the Senate and he gave me a tremendous introduction to the space program.

In fact, we went, in a bipartisan way, to every space facility in this country so we could learn: what were the great assets we had, how we needed to fund them, and what was the future of the American space program.

So we have had three Senators who were certified astronauts and actually went into space. We have had other Senators who have been in orbit. Some maybe still are out there somewhere.

But I say to my two colleagues, with my feet firmly on the ground, we want to thank them for what they are doing to save the planet. Because of the advocacy talked about by the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Florida, we, in the Commerce, Justice, Science bill, which I fund—which funds not only the American space program but also funds the National Science Foundation—we need to understand our great planet.

Another great astronaut, Sally Ride—a very happy and blessed memory who passed away last year—was asked by NASA to do a strategic plan. What should NASA be looking at? Should we be going to Mars? Dare we go even further? Venus? What about, should we do it with human beings? Should we do it with robots?

Dr. Ride came back with many suggestions, one of which was, she said we should study planet Earth as if it were a planet in our solar system. She said there was a great belief that there was even intelligent life on planet Earth, and we will continue to search for it from time to time here.

But, really, Dr. Ride encouraged us to look at our own planet, and our own planet as if those from outside of our solar system were looking at us. Because she said that what every astronaut feels—and I have talked to many, along with Senators NELSON, Glenn, and Garn—is that when they go up and see the majestic universe that God has created, their greatest thrill is to look back on planet Earth, and how touching and how moving it is, and how we want to protect it.

We need to protect it because there is life on this planet. There is the life of human beings, and there is the life of the bounty that God has given us in both the sea and on the land in agriculture or in others that help take care of us, and we are now called to take care of them.

I pledge to them, if we can work together on a bipartisan basis, it is really not about global warming, it is about saving the planet. We need to look at all of our science across all of the subcommittees and say: What are the best practices that nourish us and nourish our planet and nourish the way we wish to continue to proceed in the 21st century?

I believe science and technology leads the way. It is a great gift given to us: the gift of reason and the gift of discovery. So let's all work together, and I thank the Senators for what they said.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the Senator.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, we are now a few minutes before we are going to recess for the luncheon hour.

POPE FRANCIS

I want to comment briefly to say for those of us of the Roman Catholic faith this is, indeed, a great day. We now have a Pope who has been formally invested as the leader of our church: Pope Francis.

We know there are many Members of the Senate who would have liked to have gone to that investiture. But duty called and we are here bringing to a close our debate on the continued funding resolution to make sure we are funded through fiscal 2013 in an orderly, agreed-upon way and move to our big budget debate.

But Pope Francis is calling us today, as he has in other sermons, to think about the poor, the elderly, the children, and the vulnerable in our society, as well as the very planet. So we say to His Holiness, we really wish him well. We wish him well in the ministry we believe he will provide to the world. But we should also take heed to this message about the children, about the elderly, and about those who are vulnerable populations.

Again, we think what we have in here, our step, is an appropriations that will guarantee funding through fiscal year 2013. I do not want to link it to His Holiness's message. We wish him

well. But I also wish now we could do what we could in these closing hours. We have been guaranteed 30 hours of debate—we have used probably about 5—that we look at how we can bring this debate to a close in an agreed-upon way on both sides of the aisle so we can then move on to the budget debate of fiscal year 2014.

I am sorry, I did not know the Senator from Kansas was here. We will not recess until the Senator has a chance to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Maryland, my chairwoman.

I spoke last night on an amendment I have continued to ask be made in order on this continuing resolution. As I indicated last night, we are going to spend in excess of $1 trillion in this bill, and I am hoping that my amendment, and perhaps others, could be made in order yet during this postcloture 30-hour period of time.

One of the concerns that has been raised is whether, if my amendment were adopted, this would create difficulties in the House of Representatives for the final passage of the continuing resolution. I am pleased to be on the floor, particularly with the chairwoman being here, the Senator from Maryland, to indicate that I now have indications from the Speaker's Office that they would have no objection to the amendment I continue to offer, that I hope will be made in order, that I hope a vote will be taken on related to the air traffic control towers.

Also in the period of time since I last spoke, we have numerous Members of the Senate who have now joined as cosponsors of this amendment. The number is now 14 Democrats and 12 Republicans. The number continues to grow. And I have had a number of conversations with particularly Democratic Members of the U.S. Senate who indicate to me: Why can't your amendment be made in order?

So I am hoping, as Members of the Democratic Caucus and the Republican Conference meet during this 12:30 lunch period, that perhaps there is still an opportunity for this issue to be resolved.

I would indicate once again that, while I listened to the suggestion of the majority leader this morning that we move to the budget during this 30-hour postcloture timeframe, in the absence of some agreement related to this amendment, I will object to moving to the budget until the 30 hours expire.

I also have indicated publicly that I will object to the next 30 hours—the next opportunity in which unanimous consent is requested as we get back to the base bill. It is not my nature to be an obstructionist. This is an amendment that matters greatly. It has been determined by the Parliamentarian to be germane and, in my view, ought to be made in order.

Just as the chairwoman talked about bipartisan efforts, this is one that clearly is bipartisan and apparently bicameral. So I am hoping to utilize the rights as a Member of the Senate to see that there still is an opportunity for this amendment to be considered. I would say that the reason this matters so much in this timeframe is that I am of the view, and I think it is shared by many, in the absence of this amendment being adopted and included in this continuing resolution, and the continuing resolution being passed, that the control towers will be eliminated on April 7, and there will be little if any opportunity for the Appropriations Committee then to restore funding to, in a sense, a program that no longer exists.

There are many of the topics I share with my colleagues here about the consequences of the sequester. I am willing to work with them to see that we move money from one place to another to solve that problem. In the absence of that happening, there is still an opportunity for the Appropriations Committee and ultimately the Congress in the appropriations process to solve those problems. But should April 7 come, the 179-plus contract towers are eliminated. Then it seems highly unlikely to me that any appropriations process would include money for a program that is no longer in existence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I appreciate the tenacity and persistence of the Senator from Kansas in being an advocate for his constituents. I would hope that during this noon hour—I can give no promises. There are leadership concerns on both sides of the aisle. But we have to acknowledge the Senator is a real fighter for what he believes in. We admire that. How that gets translated will be subject to further discussion during this noon hour.

RECESS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 for the respective party conferences to discuss important issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we have been listening to our good friend from Kansas concerning this contract air traffic control tower amendment. I think there is no better example to use when talking about a bureaucracy taking something that everybody wants, that is very inexpensive, and using that to try to force people to do something that should never have happened.

In terms of the contract air traffic control towers, this is not just a rural issue. This is something that can happen all around. It happens that I have six in my State of Oklahoma and up in Kansas I believe they have five, but the fact is this is a major safety issue. We have a huge, bloated bureaucracy in the FAA. Yet we are saying we have to close a handful of towers and let people be uncontrolled. I know a little about that; it is what I did for a living. It is totally outrageous.

So we have an amendment, Senator MORAN and I, to redirect the money within the FAA budget. There would be no additional cost. It would rescind $23.8 million from FAA facilities and equipment. Now, I ask, are facilities and equipment more important than actually having an active control tower in these congested areas? Also, it would take $26.2 million from FAA research and development. Well, I can assure you this is more significant, and no one looking at this would rationally say it is not. So I encourage my good friend from Kansas to pursue this.

Similar to this is something that I, along with several Democrats—the primary one being KAY HAGAN—am concerned about, and that is what has happened in terms of a decision that was made by the Secretary of Defense to take out the tuition assistance. This is a very small amount of money for our troops who are over there serving now.

This is kind of interesting because I was a product of the draft. My service was not voluntary when I was in, and I thought a total voluntary force would not be effective. As I found out, it was. Well, one of the main reasons people do sign up—a lot of people say: Yes, I want to serve my country. A lot say: Yes, I want a career in the Army, Navy, Marines, or Air Force. However, they also want to advance themselves. They want an education, and in many cases, the only way they can get one is to have this tuition assistance program.

I can recall being over in the mess halls in Afghanistan and actually out in the field in Afghanistan where we have some 200,000 Army troops there now who are participating in this program. This is not an expensive program. All we want to do is make sure we give what was taken away from those individuals who are trying to better themselves, trying to better their lives, perhaps work toward a career in the military.

Stop and think about the amount of money that could come out of, say,

some of the green initiatives. How many people know that our Navy was forced to pay $29 a gallon for 450,000 gallons of fuel when you can buy it on the market for $3? All these things. Do we have any business having a biorefinery built by the Federal Government? These are all things in this budget, and any one of them would be far more than the assistance we are giving our troops for their tuition.

We are circulating a letter that draws attention to this, and we have Democrats and Republicans—just about even—saying: Mr. Secretary of Defense, go ahead and rescind that. We have a lot of waste we need to get rid of, but this is not waste. Our troops' preparation for the future is not a waste of our taxpayer money.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

THE BUDGET

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, our national debt currently stands at nearly $17 trillion. It is difficult to believe it has reached that level. What is more difficult to believe is that there is anyone in this country who can look at that number and not feel a sense of urgency to address our Nation's spending and debt problems. Yet, as we begin to debate the first budget resolution in over 4 years, it seems there are many in this very Chamber who seem to think the size of our debt is no big deal. If you take a good look at the budget we are debating this week, there is really no other conclusion to draw. The raw overall numbers make a pretty convincing case that the authors of this budget see no real need to change course when it comes to our debt.

The budget before us maintains our current unsustainable spending and debt trajectory. It doesn't balance, not at any point. Its goal is to grow government, not jobs and the economy. Under this budget, the national debt would increase by more than $7 trillion over the 10-year window; that is, if we are lucky. In 2023 the debt would be over $24 trillion and rising rapidly. How can anyone bring a budget such as this to the floor—one that massively increases our debt without even a faint attempt to reach balance at any time—and claim to be fiscally responsible?

But that is not all. I haven't even gotten to the worst part yet. True enough, this budget will do some pretty irresponsible things, but the real story is what this budget doesn't do. Everyone knows the main drivers of our national debt are our entitlement programs—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. That fact has been confirmed by the Congressional Budget Office, the programs' boards of trustees, and every serious economist or analyst who has spent longer than 5 minutes looking over our Nation's finances. Over the next 10 years, we will spend $6.8 trillion on Medicare, $4.4 trillion on Medicaid, and $11.2 trillion on Social Security, for a combined total of $22.4 trillion. That is trillion with a ''t.''

Medicare by itself is extremely problematic. While the percentage of workers paying into Medicare has been in decline for over a decade, 10,000 seniors join the program each and every day. According to the budget we are debating this week, Medicare will account for $504 billion this year alone. Now, that comes out to about $1.4 billion a day. Over the next 10 years, Medicare spending will increase by over 70 percent, according to the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission's most recent report. By the end of that time, we will be spending more every year on Medicare than on our entire national defense. Even President Obama, who has generally been reticent to consider real changes to Medicare, has admitted that absent reform, the program will be bankrupt within 10 years.

The story is not any better with Medicaid. In 2013, once again according to the very budget we are debating, Federal spending on Medicaid will account for about $265 billion, and if you include what States are spending on Medicaid, that is $450 billion. That is $1.2 billion a day for just this one program. Over the next 10 years, Federal Medicaid spending as a share of the U.S. economy is set to grow by 37 percent, according to OMB. By 2020, 84 million people—nearly one out of every four Americans—will be dependent on Medicaid.

With Social Security, we have a problem, facing more than $20 trillion in unfunded liabilities over the long term. In the short term, the disability insurance trust fund within Social Security is projected to be exhausted by 2016. That means that in about 3 years, the disability insurance benefits will, by law, have to be cut by 21 percent. All combined Social Security trust funds will be exhausted by 2033, at which time all Social Security benefits will have to be cut by 25 percent.

So it isn't just that we are spending a lot of money on these programs, it is that these programs are structurally unsustainable. That is why the Director of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has referred to our health care entitlements as our ''fundamental fiscal challenge.'' It is why the Social Security Board of Trustees, which includes a number of high-ranking officials in the Obama administration, has said with regard to Social Security that ''legislative action is needed as soon as possible.''

Entitlement reform is not an option, it is a necessity. It is not a matter of politics, it is a matter of math. America's social safety net is coming apart at the seams, and if these programs are going to be there for future generations, they need serious structural reforms. If we do that now, it will be much easier than if we wait too much longer.

This isn't new information. It isn't privileged or classified. Anyone paying attention to our Nation's fiscal situation is aware these challenges exist. So what do the authors of the Senate budget propose that we do about it? The answer, unfortunately, is nothing.

Here is a perfect illustration—the Murray budget entitlement plan. We are going to have $22.4 trillion at the end of 10 years. Well, let me just say for a second that if you look at that chart, you will see, as I have stated, that we are projected to spend a total of $22.4 trillion on Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security over the next 10 years. That is the red bar on the chart. All total, the Democrats' budget would reduce Medicare spending by $46 billion and spending on Medicaid by $10 billion. It would make no changes whatsoever to Social Security.

Adding those numbers together, the Democrats would reduce entitlement spending by only $56 billion over the next 10 years or by 0.2 percent. That is the yellow bar, if you can see it, right here on the chart. You heard that right, Madam President. The budget resolution before us would reduce entitlement spending by two-tenths of 1 percent over the 10-year budget window.

Here is the Murray entitlement spending versus the baseline. If you look at this next chart, you can see the path in entitlement spending over the next 10 years in blue. It is the upper line here. That is Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security spending, all combined, with no changes to our budget. The Murray budget spending path for entitlements is in red. It is this little sliver right here. That is the Murray budget. See the difference? The answer, of course, is that you cannot. Put simply, this budget ignores our unsustainable entitlement spending and allows it to continue on a path that will bankrupt these programs.

The Democratic majority has opted to continue to look the other way as our entitlement programs collapse under their own weight. This is simply irresponsible, and it is an insult to middle-class Americans who rely on these programs and want to keep them protected.

In January 2009, President Obama, when speaking on entitlements, said:

> . . . what we have done is kick this can down the road. We're now at the end of the road, and we're not in a position to kick it even further.

With this budget, the Democrats are refusing to even acknowledge that there is even a can that needs to be kicked. The budget doesn't even pay lipservice to the need for reforms in our entitlement spending. It ignores the problem entirely.

Indeed, if you read the documents accompanying this resolution, you will find nothing even suggesting there are any problems with these programs. Instead, you will find a multitude of statements accusing Republicans of wanting to ''weaken'' Social Security, ''dismantle Medicare,'' or make ''Draconian cuts to Medicaid.''

There is a lot of talk about keeping promises but literally no mention of

how these promises can or will be paid for. And there is no recognition that this budget sets in place benefit cuts of over 20 percent for disabled American workers in a few short years, while watching other threads of the social safety net fray as trust funds become exhausted. Anyone supporting this budget will be sending a clear message to younger generations of Americans, which is that they don't really care whether the safety net will be there for them.

This budget is further evidence of what has become a key difference between Republicans and Democrats. Over the last 2 years, Republicans have united around the principle of entitlement reform. We put forward plans that make tough, and sometimes politically difficult, decisions in order to preserve programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security for future generations. Republicans haven't chosen this path out of political convenience, that is for sure. This is simply what the reality of our fiscal situation demands. Rather than acknowledging this same reality, Democrats have opted to attack and vilify any Republican who even suggests that changes to these programs are necessary. They have continued the same talking points of the past, claiming that all of our Nation's fiscal problems can be solved simply by asking the so-called rich to pay a little more in taxes. All the while, according to Democrats, there do not need to be any substantive changes to entitlements. They have pursued this course even as our debts continue to mount along with the evidence that suggests their approach simply is not working.

The budget we are debating this week is proof not only that the Democrats are more interested in politics than solutions but also that their policies simply won't work in the real world. This budget would do all the things Democrats say they want to do to grow the government. It would raise taxes by as much as $1.5 trillion. And, once again, it would leave Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security just as they are. Yet, in the end, this budget never balances.

Under this budget, our Nation's debt would continue to grow, making it more difficult to respond to real crises or emergencies in the future. In the end, our entitlement programs would continue on their path to bankruptcy, and we would end up with an even bigger government that we cannot pay for.

The Washington Post editorial page, not typically known for being overly critical of the Democrats' policies, assessed this budget, saying:

> Partisan in tone, and complacent in substance, [the budget] scores points against Republicans and reassures the party's liberal base—but deepens these senators' commitment to an unsustainable policy agenda.

The editorial concluded by saying that this budget

> . . . gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan for—or even a responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

I couldn't have said it better myself.

The American people have waited for over 4 years for the Senate Democrats to produce a budget. After all that time, we now finally have on paper their blueprint for America's future. Unfortunately for the American people, the blueprint does not address our Nation's most pressing fiscal challenges. Instead, it would continue an unsustainable status quo in terms of both policy and politics. This budget will not grow the economy and jobs; it will grow the Federal Government. This budget will never attain balance; it just taxes more and spends more. This budget will not reduce our debt; it buries the middle class even further in debt. This budget will not preserve the safety net for future generations; it allows entitlement programs to perish.

That being the case, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this budget and demand a more responsible plan for our country. We need to do better around here.

Admittedly, we need to have both parties working together. We used to do that. I used to be part of that; I wouldn't mind being part of that again. But we have got to find some way of getting together and getting these fiscal problems under control. We can't continue to grow the Federal Government, and we can't continue to ignore the structural defects of Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare that are eating us alive and are going to really eat us alive over the next 10 years, and there isn't a thing in this budget that does anything to solve this problem.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, we are waiting for the two party conferences to conclude and for the majority leader to come to the floor and kind of talk about the path forward. Let me outline the pending business here.

We are now continuing the 30 hours mandated under cloture on the continuing funding resolution. Other Senators have come to the floor and spoken quite passionately about the budget that Senator MURRAY and Senator SESSIONS have worked on. I am eager to get to that discussion, too, because it will be about the fiscal funding for 2014 and the path ahead.

The way we get to the budget is to finish the bill I have pending. The methodology for getting to that is for yielding back the 30 hours. So if you want to get to the budget—which I really want to—let's yield back the time under the 30 hours. Right now it is scheduled to expire sometime after midnight. We can talk about talk, we can talk about bills, or we can actually move expeditiously to conclude the continuing funding resolution. Because, remember, when we finish our business on the continuing funding resolution, it must return to the House for them to say yea or nay to our substitute which we are sending back.

I know we are waiting for the leaders to come. We have had great cooperation on both sides of the aisle. I am very appreciative of the cooperation I have received within the Democratic caucus and the cooperation from the other side, which we too have done. But if you want to get to the budget, let's yield back time on the continuing funding resolution.

I know the Democratic leadership will be here momentarily and others are waiting for what the leader has to say. In the meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I rise today to address some comments that were made. I came to the floor earlier to talk about $380 million of funding for the MEADS Program, which is the missile to nowhere. I sought, and continue to seek, to offer an amendment to the continuing resolution and the appropriations bill before the Senate right now to strike that funding, and then to transfer the funding from this missile to nowhere to the operations and maintenance fund so that our troops can use the money for important needs they have, especially in light of sequestration.

My colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN—for whom I certainly have great respect—came to the floor earlier to counter what I had to say. In fact, the Senator from Illinois said essentially that the U.S. taxpayers have truly invested in this program, and he suggested that if we were to cancel funding for this missile to nowhere, we would be incurring damages, or that our allies who have entered into this MEADS Program with us—under the agreements we have entered into, our allies—in particular the Germans and the Italians—would be able to seek damages from us, so, therefore, we would incur damage costs by terminating it.

I want to point out, first of all, not just in my view, this is wrong based on the plain language of the memorandum of understanding we have with our allies.

In fact, I go back to first-year contracts class in law school. When you have an agreement with someone, you start with the language of your agreement and the language of the contract. The language of the contract of the

memorandum of understanding we have on the MEADS Program in 2005 with Germany and Italy says very clearly:

> The responsibilities of the participants will be subject to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes.

So a first-year contract student would know that if we do not appropriate funds for the missile to nowhere, then we will not have legal obligations to our allies. In fact, that is essentially what the Department of Defense said to us when they wrote in a report to Congress about this with regard to the 2013 funding.

Please understand the history of this. In 2012, in the Defense authorization, the defense committee said very clearly: This is it. We are not going to fund a program anymore that is not going to get us a result. We are not going to waste taxpayer dollars anymore. So understand, this is the end of our obligation.

As a result, the Department of Defense said clearly to the Senate Armed Services Committee:

> [i]f Congress does not appropriate FY 2013 funding, the U.S. DOD [Department of Defense] would take the position that the FY 2012 funds represent the U.S. DOD's final financial contribution under the MOU. The U.S. DOD would also take the position that failure to provide FY 2013 funding would not be a unilateral withdrawal from the MOU . . .

So contracts 101, very clearly, if we cut off the appropriations for the missile to nowhere and make sure that this fund goes to actually something our warfighters need and can use, we will not be subject to a claim by our allies because we expressly protected the taxpayers in the 2005 MOU that was entered into.

In addition, I will say that there is another portion of the agreement itself. Section 5 of the 2005 MOU states that our maximum commitment from the United States had to be $2.3 billion. Yet between 2004 and 2011, we have already spent $2.9 billion on a missile to nowhere that we are not going to get a result from. So not only do we have no responsibility because we clearly put in that if we did not appropriate for this, then we would not have further responsibilities under the MOU, but in addition to that, we have already paid $2.9 billion, and the MOU says our responsibility is only $2.3 billion.

So I come to the Senate today to say, with great respect to my colleague from Illinois, his claim that somehow terminating this contract is going to subject the United States to damages is wrong and is not supported by the plain language of the agreement, and we should not continue to fund a missile to nowhere.

I will end with this. If you look at the history of this MEADS Program, what has happened? The House Armed Services Committee said in 2013—excuse me, the 2013 authorization: End funding for this program—zero. The Senate Armed Services Committee said: End funding for this program. It is a missile to nowhere. Zero. The House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee said: End funding for this; We are not going to appropriate for this. Zero.

The only committee that has appropriated for this is the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, and if we stop that appropriation, we can end the missile to nowhere. That is what my amendment is about. That is why I hope we will have an amendment and a right to be heard on the continuing resolution. I wish to make sure money goes into the operations and maintenance fund so it can be used for our troop needs during a difficult time in addressing sequestration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, yesterday the Senate invoked cloture on the appropriations bill we have been working on for several weeks. Now what we are doing is burning, wasting 30 hours postcloture. During the postcloture time, each Senator has the right to speak for 1 hour. It is obvious there are 100 of us, so we all can't speak. Senators who do not like the bill and want to express their views as to why it is a bad bill, they get 1 hour.

This is truly a waste of time. It always is a waste of time, but it is a waste of time now because we have so much important work to do. Next in line is the budget resolution. We have heard speeches over here. Oh, gee, have we heard speeches. We need the Democrats to do a budget. No one mentions, but that is OK—no one mentions we did not have a budget resolution; we had President Obama sign a law that took care of our budget problems. But we want to satisfy the Republicans and we want to get to that budget debate.

I talked this morning about what a terrific job Chairman MURRAY has done on this bill. It has been outstanding. But the budget is here by virtue of a law that was passed. There is 50 hours permitted for debate on the budget. Then we can have a lot of amendments after all debate time is over.

Republicans said let's do the budget debate and we say let us do it. Why should we sit around here and look at each other and do nothing? My friend, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the junior Senator from Alabama, said let's do it after Easter. We are going to do this. We are going to do this before we go home for Easter. If we want to use the whole 60 hours, we will start the debate on the budget sometime Thursday morning and we will have 50 hours and a lot of votes. If that is what they want to do, we can do that, but why put the Senate through that? Why put the Senate through wasting 60 hours?

I wish to make clear to all Senators that we are going to continue working on this, the CR and the budget resolution, until we complete them. When we come back, we have lots of stuff to do. We have gun legislation. We have the WRDA bill, which I am told is going to be reported out of that committee, Environment and Public Works, on a bipartisan basis led by Senators BOXER and VITTER.

That is a strange, unusual marriage, but I am happy to hear that. It is an important bill.

We have to do immigration. We have to do appropriations bills. We have a lot to do. The Senate will not leave—the third time I am telling everyone here—for Easter-Passover recess until we complete the budget. If that means because of the delay in this bill we wasted 60 hours, we will be voting here Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday—whenever we have to do it. My hope would be that we can complete this appropriations measure and move on to the budget resolution this afternoon. But the least we should be able to do is begin debate on the budget. The least we should be able to do is the debate. We have been through these lots of times, some of us, and a budget.

During the first 50 hours, not much is going to happen unless there is an agreement that the time for voting will not be counted against 50 hours. If there is no agreement there, there will be no amendments. What I would like to do is have amendments offered during the 50 hours and have whatever the time is for voting, which is usually 10 or 15, sometimes 20 minutes, that will be counted against the 50 hours. But if we do not do that, then what we will have is just 50 hours of PATTY MURRAY and JEFF SESSIONS talking to each other and whoever wants to join in the conversation.

I hope we can begin debate on this. I have a couple unanimous consent requests. I have alerted the Republicans I would be doing this.

I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding cloture having been invoked on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute, the following amendments be in order: Mikulski-Shelby No. 98, as modified with the changes that are at the desk; and Pryor-Blunt No. 82, this deals with food inspectors, meat inspectors, an important amendment that these two Senators feel strongly about as do a number of us; that no other first-degree amendments to the substitute or the underlying bill be in order; that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments listed above prior to the vote; and that there be 30 minutes equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to votes in relation to the amendments in the order listed; that upon disposition of the Pryor-Blunt amendment No. 82, the Durbin second-degree amendment to the Toomey amendment be withdrawn—that is amendment No. 115; that the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Toomey amendment, No. 115; that all amendments, with the exception of the substitute, be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; and upon disposition of the Toomey amendment, the Senate proceed to vote on

the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment, as amended; that if the substitute amendment, as amended, is agreed to, the cloture motion on the underlying bill is withdrawn and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill as amended.

That is my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORAN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. MORAN. Let me ask the majority leader if the two amendments listed in his unanimous consent, No. 98 and No. 82, are considered, then following that we would move to final action on the bill—on the substitute as potentially amended; is that accurate?

Mr. REID. That is correct.

Mr. MORAN. While I am not opposed, certainly, to the Pryor-Blunt amendment—I am a sponsor of that amendment—because that would then waive the 30 hours and move to final action, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. I have objected to the unanimous consent request, and in addition to my concern that while there are amendments that are fine with me if they are made pending and brought before the floor for a vote, I would object because we would move to final action; but I also would object because the amendment I have offered in regard to control towers is not included in the unanimous consent request.

Mr. REID. I am glad the Senator clarified that because it sounded as if he did not have an objection to this, and I was going to say he could still have his 30 hours, but I got his objection.

I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding cloture having been invoked, at 4 o'clock today it be in order for the Senate to begin consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2014; that any time used for consideration of S. Con. Res. 8 during the postcloture period on H.R. 933 also count toward postcloture time on H.R. 933; further, that on Tuesday, March 19, at a time to be determined by the majority leader after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 933.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I object.

Mr. REID. Madam President, this is one of the amazements of the American people. There is nothing—nothing going to happen during how many hours is left in the 30 hours—nothing. Why, logically, would anyone have an objection to going ahead with the budget resolution? We are looking at each other—not very often, because nobody is on the floor. It is things such as this that are going to cause the Senate to have to reassess all these rules. Right now we accomplish so little. I am disappointed in my friend, for whom I have the greatest respect, my friend from Kansas, whom I know and knew in the House very well. He is a fine person. I like him a lot. I know how strongly he feels about this. But strong positive or negative feelings should not stop the progress of what we are trying to do to help the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, it will not be long—of course it might be longer than it appears to be, but at least this week we were supposed to be considering the budget resolution and hopefully before the week is out we will. It has been 4 years since the Senate has passed a budget. The Senate deficit majority has been devoid of leadership on this matter. While American families and businesses compile a budget each and every year, the Senate deficit majority has shirked its responsibility, producing a budget has even been called ''foolish,'' by the Democratic majority leader.

After years of record deficits and debt, I think the American people disagree with the fact that the Senate has not taken up a budget for the last 3 years, even though the law requires every year for the Senate to adopt a budget. Thankfully, this year it looks as if we are going to have this debate and adopt a budget.

While we are about to debate a budget resolution, a few hours or a few days away, the President has not even proposed his budget for consideration. The Budget Committee, of which I am a member, did not hear from a single administration witness in preparation of this budget that the Senate will be working on. That is a new historical low, for which the Obama administration can take credit. House Budget Chairman RYAN has produced a budget. Chairwoman MURRAY produced a budget. It is quite remarkable that the President has yet to submit a budget, even though the law requires it be done by February 4.

The President plans to release his budget the week of April 8, 2 months overdue. This will be the first time a President has failed to submit a budget until after the House and the Senate have acted.

Once again, on fiscal issues, the President is leading from behind. He set a new low for fiscal responsibility. During the past 4 years, we spent well beyond our means. The gross Federal debt has increased by $6 trillion as a result. Unless we change course, we will add another $9 trillion over the next 10 years. The gross debt is now and maybe by then will still be larger than the U.S. economy. It is approaching levels where economists agree deficits and debts are causing slower economic growth.

During the past 4 years, we witnessed President Obama's theory of economic stimulus. We saw massive expansion of government and deficit spending. President Obama and the Democratic leadership in Congress pushed spending up to 25 percent of the economy in recent years and an $800 billion stimulus bill was a big part of that. That bill was pushed through in the name of economic growth. It was supposed to keep unemployment below 8 percent. It did not keep unemployment below 8 percent because, in fact, the legislation written was more an appropriations bill than a stimulus bill.

It didn't create the sustainable job growth it was supposed to. It was one big ineffective spending bill. The economic growth it was supposed to stimulate never materialized. Now we are dealing with a deficit and debt caused by that failed stimulus bill.

Despite this failure, the President and the Senate deficit majority seem even more fixated on growing the government. According to the economic policies of President Obama, the government needs to grow even bigger to help our economy. It is not going to work. The overriding belief of the administration is that economic growth will only come through private wealth confiscation that supports an even bigger and more intrusive government.

If government just gets a little bigger and a little more involved in every facet of our economy and of our lives, that will surely increase the economic prosperity of Americans, right? Of course not. The problem is raising taxes only extracts private capital from job creators and small businesses. Small businesses happen to be where 70 percent of the new jobs are created. So if we want to create new jobs, why would we take capital out of a sector where job creation can occur and bring it to the government where it is spent wastefully by often inefficient and bloated bureaucracies? The higher taxes are robbing the unemployed of needed jobs. The government they support does not create economic growth or self-sustaining jobs.

This 4-year spending binge we have been on has led to deficits that crowd out private investment which would otherwise be used to grow the economy and create jobs. The government doesn't create self-sustaining jobs; the government only creates government jobs. The private sector creates jobs. Wealth is created in the private sector. It is the responsibility of the government to create an environment for job growth and opportunity—opportunity for entrepreneurs who then create jobs.

Instead of raising taxes, what this country needs is more taxpayers. We get more taxpayers by reducing the unemployment, and we do that by keeping money in the private sector. Besides that, the government can provide this environment by instituting the rule of law, protecting property rights and a patent system. There are many other things I could probably mention as well. The government consumes wealth. It does not create wealth through economic freedom. Entrepreneurs and individuals are free to innovate and prosper.

This budget fails to recognize these simple principles. The budget presented by the deficit majority makes no effort to reduce the deficits, reduce spending, balance the budget, or grow the economy. Instead, this budget seeks to grow government by taxing more and spending more. It is time we all recognize that government exists to serve the needs of the people rather than people serving the needs of their government. There are some who believe government is the only creator of economic prosperity. If others have achieved success, by default they must be the cause of others' hardships. This type of class warfare—demagoguery, as it is—is harmful to America and our future. It seeks to divide America.

The budget presented by the deficit majority is partisan business as usual. It would tax success by adding another $1 trillion. It increases government spending, it ignores the subject of our health care entitlements, and this whole approach is simply not good for advancing America's economy. It places no priority on ever bringing our budget into balance. The deficit majority speaks at length about growing the economy and creating a middle class. Their budget is perfectly backward. It does nothing to address economically harmful deficits and debt or the drag it creates on the economy, and it includes as much as $1.5 trillion in job-killing tax hikes.

The majority claims this revenue can be collected without harming the economy by closing loopholes. The fact is that regardless of how it is described, a $1.5 trillion tax increase will affect the middle class, harm the economy, and not create jobs. A $1.5 trillion tax hike—while economic growth is slow and unemployment remains at 7.7 percent—is a reckless formula and will further devastate the economy. Even worse, the tax increases will not be used to balance the budget. Higher taxes support even higher spending.

This is a typical tax-and-spend budget. This budget was crafted as if we don't even have a spending problem or a debt crisis. This budget assumes everything is just fine and everything will work out if we simply proceed forward on the current path of tax and spend. This budget represents a missed opportunity. Don't take my word for it. Editorial writers across the country have made similar statements about this budget.

A Washington Post editorial called it a complacent budget plan. They wrote that the majority budget fails to recognize the long-term fiscal problems:

> Partisan in tone and complacent in substance, it scores points against Republicans and reassures the party's liberal base—but deepens these senators' commitments to an unsustainable policy agenda.
>
> In short, this document gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan for—or even a responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

The Chicago Tribune had a similar description in their editorial. They described it as a deficit of ambition:

> The Democrats, unfortunately, are feigning fiscal responsibility instead of practicing it. What is needed is a lot more ambition than the Murray plan reflects.
>
> If Democrats don't like the Republican plan for balancing the budget, they should produce their own.

Finally, a USA Today editorial referred to the budget as a namby-pamby budget that underwhelms at every turn:

> The Murray budget neither balances the budget nor reins in entitlements. Its one-to-one ratio of spending to tax increases might sound balanced, but the spending cuts are not actual reductions. They are merely reductions in the expected rate of growth.
>
> All this makes the Murray budget barely a Band-Aid.

And that one-to-one ratio that is quoted in the USA Today editorial reminds me—and let me explain this—of where they raise $1 of taxes for $1 of cuts, which reminds me of the President's own position on that which he stated just before the election in his meeting with the Des Moines Register editorial board and suggested that we raise taxes $1 and cut expenditures $2.50.

How do we go—just before the President is elected—from a $2.50 reduction for every $1 increase to a one-to-one ratio now? I hope when the President submits his budget on April 8 that he sticks to that ratio of $2.50 to $1.

I am sure we will hear the term ''progrowth'' applied to this budget when we hear from people speaking on the other side of the aisle. The only thing it can mean is growth in the size and scope of the Federal Government and growth in the national debt. We will also hear the term ''balanced.'' Please don't be fooled. The deficit majority is not speaking about a balanced budget. Their understanding of balance is higher taxes and higher spending.

This budget does not tackle runaway spending. It raises taxes, not to balance the budget but to spend more and more. This budget will grow the government, harm economic growth, and increase the debt. After 4 years of contemplating a budget resolution, I would have expected a more fiscally responsible budget. The American people deserve much better.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering H.R. 933 postcloture.

Mr. LEAHY. Thank you.

Mr. President, I couldn't help but think, watching the debate, that it has been more than 2 weeks since we had an all-too-familiar stalemate in Congress that prevented the passage of commonsense legislation. As a result, it triggered the across-the-board budget cuts better known as sequestration.

When these automatic budget cuts first became a possibility, everybody said that no Congress would be irresponsible enough to allow them to go into place. Well, in the weeks leading up to sequestration, we heard almost daily from Federal agencies, defense contractors, and Members from both sides of the aisle about how harmful these cuts would be.

Notwithstanding the talk about how ridiculous it is to let them go forward, the deadline for sequestration has come and gone. Now the focus appears not to be upon the wide swath of harm that is beginning to descend on communities across the Nation but instead on the closure of White House tours and whether we are going to have the Easter egg roll. Come on.

I hope the American public and I hope the press and everybody else will focus on how serious these cuts are. In fact, to simply accept and avoid fixing these indiscriminate and harmful cuts is irresponsible. They are slowly being implemented, and they have already begun to affect our States and communities.

I was up in Vermont this weekend for 3 days, and I was all over the State. Everywhere I went—just as I do every day—I heard from Vermonters about the consequences for their jobs, for their children, for their communities.

I have heard from Vermont families who have begun to plan for the furloughs that will hit their family budgets; through no fault of theirs—these are hard-working, honest Vermonters—but because Congress has failed to act.

I have heard from community organizations about the difficult decisions they will have to make in the weeks ahead. It should alarm everyone that reductions are expected, for example, in the number of children being served by Head Start.

I have heard from young scientists at the University of Vermont who have already been denied research grants because of sequestration.

Vermonters facing already high rents are facing a 7-year wait for section 8 housing assistance. Until the sequester is resolved, housing authorities in Vermont will not be granting any new rental vouchers, and hundreds of Vermonters are going to lose this vital lifeline.

To put it in reality, at my home in Vermont, overnight we had 8 or 9 inches of snow. During the next 24 hours, we had another 8 or 9 inches. Once it got past 15 inches, we actually had schools close. This is very unusual. But think of the people who do not have housing, what that is doing to them. It is an unfortunate, needless reality.

I have heard about the impact sequestration is having on our military families in Vermont, as some members

of the National Guard prepare for furloughs. These are Guard members who have been called up and are willing to serve in Iraq and Afghanistan, putting their lives on the line for America, but now they prepare for furloughs and reductions in staff who provide services to their families. Then we have the elimination of the Army tuition assistance program that serves veterans—a promise we made to our men and women in uniform when they were willing to stand up and go into combat for America.

These are the impacts felt in the small State of Vermont so far. We haven't yet seen the consequences for Vermont schools and how sequestration will affect students and teachers. We haven't yet felt the true impact on funding for the grants that support our law enforcement people, our job search assistance, the Meals on Wheels programs, or those programs that provide lifesaving vaccines.

Members have filed amendments to the spending bill we are currently debating to attempt to insulate and protect programs that impact their States most, but they want to do it at the cost of other States. We need to stop looking at how we can save just a single program and get back to the table and negotiate a sensible, balanced approach that addresses deficit reduction in a responsible way and not on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans. We cannot simply cut our way out of this deficit.

We created the situation partly by putting two wars on the Nation's credit card. This morning it was estimated that the war in Iraq is going to cost $2 trillion. It is the first war in our Nation's history where we went to war and said: We don't have to pay for it. We will just borrow the money.

Vietnam and Korea were very unpopular wars. Yet we still passed the taxes to pay for them. In Iraq—although it is going to be over in a matter of weeks and we don't have to pay for it 10 years later—thousands of Americans were killed and wounded, to say nothing about our allies and tens of thousands—hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, and we are stuck with a $2 trillion bill and growing, all on borrowed money.

The only people who pay the price in that war for America are the brave men and women who serve there and their families. They pay a huge price. We don't have a draft, so most families didn't get touched by it. Certainly a lot of people have made a lot of money on that war. They didn't pay a price. And the people, including people who were in the administration at the time who lied to the Congress about what was there—weapons of mass destruction, a connection with 9/11, things they knew were untrue—they simply lied about it, and we ended up having that war. There is $2 trillion.

Do not tell me now—the same people who voted for that war—do not stand here and tell me how we have to take the money out of medical research in America to pay for it, how we have to take the money out of educating our children to pay for it, how we have to take the money out of seniors who need help to pay for it, how we have to take the money out of repairing our bridges and roads in America to pay for it.

My answer to them is you voted for that; you should be willing to pay for it.

We have already reduced the debt by $2.5 trillion, with the vast majority of those savings coming from spending cuts. The American people want and expect us to take a balanced approach. They know it is not wise to protect endless corporate loopholes and tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans instead of investing in our schools, our factories, our roads, and our workers.

I think of the billions of dollars we spend on roads and bridges, for example, in Iraq and Afghanistan. As one Vermonter said: Yes, we spend billions to build roads and bridges in Iraq and Afghanistan, and then they blow them up. Build them here in the United States—in Vermont or West Virginia or Oklahoma. We Americans will take good care of them.

There is a simple bottom line: Putting our fiscal house in order, which we should do, has to go hand in hand with targeted, commonsense steps to promote economic growth, create jobs, and strengthen the middle class—all things President Obama and Democrats in both Houses of Congress are eager to do. But we need some cooperation from the other side of the aisle. We need cooperation. Putting on mindless autopilot the crucial decisions about what should be our budget and growth priorities is a terrible and dishonest way to treat the American people. It is a recipe for economic dysfunction. It threatens tangible harm to millions of families and for communities across the Nation.

Difficult decisions are in front of us. Every single Member of the Senate should go back and read their campaign promise of: Oh, of course, I will face up to difficult questions. Really? We are stalled here. People want to filibuster rather than face difficult questions, but we have to face them. We cannot punt them. We in Congress need to put aside talking points and turn to the task of replacing these harmful autopilot cuts with sensible and balanced budget decisions. Instead of slogans, let's have some substance. The American people expect more from Congress, and they certainly deserve a lot more from Congress.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the important budget debate we will have this week here in the Senate. We hope to get on that soon. We are disposing of some of last-year's budget work before that. But I think this is an important moment for the Senate because it has been 4 years since we did this; 2009 was the last time the Senate acted on a budget. During the time which has lapsed, we have added $6 trillion to our national debt. I would like to think as we get into this budget debate, we could do something about that. Unfortunately, the budget that is going to be put before us by the Senate Democrats doesn't do anything to address the debt.

I think perhaps the reason we are finally doing a budget here is because there was a No Budget No Pay Act passed earlier this year which required that a budget be passed. It was moved by the House of Representatives and drew attention to the fact that the Senate hadn't for 4 years done a budget, and suggested that before the Senate get paid, it actually ought to do its work and pass a budget. So we are here now for the first time in 4 years.

Unfortunately, the budget that has been proposed by the chair of the Senate Budget Committee fails to balance the budget and instead means more taxes, more spending, and more debt. That is a formula we have heard before.

If you look at the last several years, we have added $6 trillion of debt since President Obama took office. We have seen tax increases already of about $1.7 trillion if you combine the tax increases associated January 1 with the fiscal cliff, and then couple that with the tax increases that were included in the President's health care bill—$1.7 trillion in new taxes, $6 trillion in new debt, a runup in spending unlike anything we have seen in recent history. So you would think, given the fact that we have seen debt, spending, and taxes go up over the past several years, we would actually get a budget that is finally focused not on growing the government but on growing the economy. But the Senate Democratic budget does exactly that—it grows the government, not the economy.

Their proposal contains more of the same big spending and big government policies that have led to a dismal average economic growth rate of just eight-tenths of 1 percent over the past 4 years. That has been the economic growth on average for the first 4 years of President Obama's first term, eight-tenths of 1 percent. Less than 1 percent is what the economy has grown over that time period.

A better approach when it comes to putting forward a budget would be to advance a budget that actually is focused on growing the economy, not the

government. Over the next few days we are going to have an opportunity to debate and improve this budget proposal on the Senate floor. I look forward to that debate.

As it stands today, the Senate Democrats' budget increases spending by 62 percent over the next decade; it raises taxes by $1.5 trillion—and that is in addition to the $1.7 trillion in tax increases we have already seen enacted under President Obama. Even with the enormous tax increase, the Senate Democrats' budget would result in $7.3 trillion in new debt over the next decade. So you have a 62-percent increase in spending, you have $1.5 trillion in new taxes, and a $7.3 trillion debt, in addition to the debt we hand down to our children and grandchildren.

The amazing thing about that, even with this enormous tax increase, is the budget would never balance, which begs the question: What is balanced about a budget that never balances?

You hear the Democrats come here on the floor of the Senate and talk about, We need a balanced approach. The President of the United States gets up all the time and talks about, We need a balanced approach. What is balanced about a budget that never balances? That is a fundamental question I would expect the American people to ask.

In contrast, the House Republicans will be enacting a budget this week through the House of Representatives. Hopefully, eventually something like it will get enacted. But it balances in 10 years. I think 10 years is a responsible, reasonable timeline to achieve a balanced budget, and I think most Americans who balance their budgets month in and month out would agree with that proposition.

The budget put forward by Senate Democrats also fails to target waste, fraud, and inefficiencies across the Federal Government. For each of the past 2 years, the Government Accountability Office has outlined hundreds of billions of dollars of wasteful and duplicative spending throughout the Federal Government. The Federal Government is a $3.6 trillion enterprise, and there is plenty of waste to target and reform—low-hanging fruit most would agree is a complete waste of taxpayer dollars—but Senate Democrats have failed even to make an attempt at reining in this waste with their budget plan.

Budgets are a reflection of values. As Vice President BIDEN once said:

> Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value.

It seems from the Senate Democrats' budget that they value the same big spending and big government policies of the past 4 years that have prolonged this period of slow economic growth and high unemployment.

In contrast, the budget proposed by the Republicans in the House would balance the budget in 10 years—again, something I believe we ought to be able to do—and it grows the economy. It starts by cutting wasteful spending, which is not an extreme proposition and something we ought to be able to do.

The House Republican budget also reforms our broken Tax Code to promote economic growth, which will mean more jobs, better pay, and more opportunities for hard-working Americans and middle-class families.

The House budget also recognizes that if Washington fails to take action, Medicare and Social Security are headed toward bankruptcy in the not too distant future.

I commend my colleagues in the House for the vote that they will have this week, and for recognizing that reality, that our seniors across this country and those who are nearing retirement age and those of younger generations of Americans are not going to be protected when it comes to the programs that someday they will rely upon if we don't make the changes and the reforms that are necessary to align those programs with the present and future demographics of this country. So the House budget strengthens those priorities.

The budget debate for fiscal year 2014 that we are going to have on the Senate floor this week presents an opportunity, an opportunity to solve our fiscal challenges, to move past the job-destroying policies of the past few years, and to grow the economy.

As I said earlier, average economic growth under this President has been 0.8 percent—eight-tenths of 1 percent—of the overall share of the economy. This is a reflection of the negative impacts high levels of spending and high annual deficits have had during President Obama's tenure.

Unfortunately, the proposal that will be before the Senate this week only continues and doubles down on those policies. In fact, there is evidence this is the opposite of what we should be doing.

Harvard Professors Alberto Alesina and Sylvia Ardagna have studied economies around the world and various fiscal adjustments that have taken place in some of these countries. They found targeted spending cuts have led to economic expansions, while tax increases have been recessionary.

According to these Harvard economists:

> Spending cuts have a positive effect on private investment while increases to taxes . . . hurt investment through the labor market and firms' profitability.

The evidence is there. Growing the government will not solve our economic challenges. If that were true, we would have a much stronger economy today, because with the massive health care plan that passed a few years ago, with the trillion-dollar stimulus program that was put into place early on during the President's first term, and all the additional runup in discretionary spending that we have seen, we still have slow growth, high unemployment, massive amounts of debt, and many Americans who are struggling with their own personal economies and lower take-home pay.

The focus should be on growing our economy. That starts with passing a budget that cuts spending and reforms the Tax Code in a way that promotes economic growth.

Again, I believe there is a better approach out there. The House of Representatives has put forth one. It is unfortunate that the Senate Democratic budget fails to address the long-term spending and economic problems facing this country and, instead, focuses once again on growing government.

In fact, the Washington Post editorial board had this to say of the Democrats' budget proposal:

> In short, this document gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan—or even a responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

Failure to act and solve our fiscal challenges could result in another damaging credit downgrade, thanks to the out-of-control spending, and such a downgrade would have a very negative effect on the American people. A credit downgrade would drive up interest rates across the board on everything from student loans to home mortgages. That means it would be more expensive to buy a home or a car, to send a child to college, or to pay down personal debt.

So as we get ready to debate the majority's proposed budget for fiscal year 2014 on the floor this week, I hope the Senate will take an honest look at the relationship between spending and economic growth. We need to put the Federal Government on a stable fiscal path in order to create the kind of economic certainty and the economic conditions we need to grow our economy and to create jobs.

The majority's budget goes in the opposite direction. It grows government instead of growing the economy. We need to be talking about a budget here in the Senate whose primary focus is to grow the economy, not to grow the government.

So this will give us a chance over the course of the next few days to present two very different visions for the future of this country: one that is based upon higher spending, higher taxes, more debt, and one that is focused on putting in place a responsible spending plan that protects and saves important programs such as Social Security and Medicare, that reforms our Tax Code in a way that encourages and promotes economic growth, and that puts policies in place that will actually get this economy growing and expanding again, get more Americans back to work, and increase the standard of living and the quality of life for future generations of Americans.

We can't do that if we can continue to borrow and spend like there is no tomorrow, and that is precisely what the Democrats' budget would do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I was not planning to come down here. I was at several meetings. As we all have in our offices, I have the screen view of the floor to figure out what action might be occurring or not occurring. I kept looking. The floor was empty. The floor was empty. And I know that earlier this afternoon, the majority leader asked that we get on the budget so it is not an empty zone here.

I know people sitting up there behind me are wondering what is happening. What is happening is, the way these procedures work, which are ridiculous, you sit around and burn up time, let the clock just tick, tick, with no action because for some reason some people think this is strategic. It is not. It is what people are fed up with in this country.

The leader came down and said: Let's get on with the budget. I come down, it seems every day or so, and see the charts of how many days the budget hasn't passed or how many days we have not had a budget. Here we come and offer to get onto the budget, and the other side objects. It is probably the most frustrating thing for me to see and for my constituents to see in the conference room.

They say: What is happening on the floor?

And I have to say: Nothing, because they are not allowing us to get to the budget.

They complained for the last 2½ or 3 years, we never get to a budget. Here we have a chance. The budget will have lots of amendments and a lot of debate. Some have said: Let's wait until after Easter. I am not waiting until after Easter. I know it is tough for people because they want to get back and fundraise and all the other stuff they do, but, you know what? They wanted us to get to the budget, and we are ready to get to the budget. Let's get to the budget and have this debate.

But here we are. The camera is on me, one person, but the room is empty. It is amazing. The people behind me, quietly sitting up there observing because they are not allowed to say anything, are wondering what is going on, as are many of my constituents.

As a former member of the Budget Committee, I can tell you budgets are not easy. This budget—it doesn't matter where you may be on it—starts to cut the budget, starts reducing the deficit, and starts dealing with it. I am happy to debate it. I am not sure where I am going to be at the end of the day on this budget, but I am happy to debate it. Anytime today would be good. But instead, what people want to do, through a parliamentary procedure, is just burn off hours. So people sit around waiting for the time to end. Then we come down and debate.

Mr. President, I know you are new. I am kind of new but not as new as you are, and it is probably what you hear back home, as I still do today, the frustration level at how this place operates. Here we are. We had a chance earlier this morning—earlier this afternoon to move forward on the budget, and they objected because they didn't want the two times between the CR and the budget—I know this is a little process thing, a little wonky—to simultaneously run. The fact is, we could have done that because obviously they care so much about the budget? They are not down here.

Maybe if we get to the budget, they would come down and talk about their objections, as I have. I said publicly that I am going to look at the budget that has come forward. I want to make sure there are enough cuts in there, make sure they are real cuts that last a long time because we have to get this budget under control, this deficit under control. We want to make sure we continue to move this economy forward with the right kind of sustainable budget over the long haul. I am happy to debate it. I am looking forward to it. My poor staff didn't know I was coming down here, and I said I am coming down anyway and walked down the hall and got frustrated because we could be doing this.

Here is what is going to happen. I can see it already. Come Thursday, we will be in a mad dash around here, turning around, working double time—which is fine—rushing amendments. Instead, we could have a deliberative process right now—right now on the budget. That is what we should be doing. That is what the American people want. That is what Alaskans tell me every day: Debate it and debate the issues.

I am anxious. Maybe we will ask again to get consent by the other side to get on with the budget, but they have already objected to that. I am shocked. I think the American people would be shocked. But no one is down here, so it is hard not to be shocked when there is no debate.

I wanted to come down here in a little bit of frustration and make my point heard, that we have a chance—we could have had a chance earlier today to start this budget debate. We did not. Now we are just waiting for the clock to tick. It is really somewhat embarrassing, as someone said in the Senate, that I came here to get stuff done, not to sit around waiting for time to run out because people want to use the process to drag on their political desires rather than what we should be doing here: getting on with getting this economy moving, making sure jobs are created, and doing everything we can to get the budget under control and make sure the long-term sustainability of the government continues.

I thank the Chair for the indulgence, allowing me a couple of minutes down here to maybe rant and complain about a process that I thought was going to start at 2:30—and yet nothing. My guess is that they will not consent. They will burn the time. The American people will get frustrated. Then we will finally get into the debate, it will be rushed instead of having a long, good, positive deliberation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, Republicans have spent the last 2 years attacking Democrats for ''not bringing up a budget resolution in the Senate,'' despite the fact—I would add—that we had the Budget Control Act which took the place of the budget and the fact that those attacks were not very persuasive to the American people. Nonetheless, Republicans invested a lot of time, energy, and money pushing for a budget for a very long time. They could not agree amongst themselves on a lot of things, but they at least agreed the Senate should pass a budget.

The Senate Budget Committee has now passed a progrowth budget resolution out of committee which was strongly supported by every Democrat and every Independent on the committee from the moderates to the progressives. They took a balanced approach that put jobs and the economy first. It tackles our debt and deficit responsibly and keeps the promises we all made to our seniors, families, and our communities.

Democrats know we are on the right side of this issue when it comes to policy. We know we are on the right side when it comes to what the American people want. We know our budget resolution reflects the values and priorities of the vast majority of the American people, and we are looking forward to a debate. We are confident that when we lay out our balanced and responsible approach and the House lays out their extreme approach—which actually doubles down on the failed and rejected policies of the past—the contrast will be clear and the American people will continue to stand with us as we work toward a balanced and bipartisan deal.

The reason I am here is because I am so disappointed we cannot start this debate and move the process so we can offer amendments and get going. This is an issue the American people want to hear about and deserve to hear about. Senators should be able to come to the floor so they can debate and offer amendments. Based on what I heard from Republicans over the last 2 years, I thought they wanted this debate too.

So I am kind of surprised we are here running the clock on a continuing resolution. There is no one out here, no one talking, and we are twiddling our thumbs waiting for the clock to run out on time. We could be here having the debate the Republicans called on us to have so we can move it forward. We could do it tonight, tomorrow, Thursday, and probably be done by Thursday or Friday. Because of this delay, we now get to wait and watch the time run out until Thursday night.

We will be here Friday, Saturday, and Sunday doing this debate. I am sure our Republican colleagues will say: We should be doing this during the week when everybody is watching. We are here and ready to go. We want to have this debate. We want to have this discussion. I want to hear what they have to say. I would hope they want to hear what we have to say and then vote on a budget and move it out. But, no, we are here waiting, time running out, once again.

We are proud of our budget. We are ready to debate. I would hope our Republican colleagues would say: Yes, it is time to debate. Let's move this budget forward. We have been talking about it forever. Let's move this forward, and let's get this budget process going.

I am ready as chair of the Budget Committee. I know we as Democrats are ready to go. Let's yield back the time. Everyone knows what the end is going to be. Let's get it done. Let's get moving. Let's have the debate that is critically important to every family, every community, and to the future.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, let me thank the chair of the Budget Committee, my friend and colleague from the State of Washington, Senator MURRAY, for her remarks and, even more, for her excellent work on putting together a terrific budget. That may be the reason our colleagues want to delay.

For 4 years, they have had a great time saying: You don't have a budget. You don't have a budget.

It was perhaps the only thing they had to say because the actual confines of their budget are so far away from what the American people want, they couldn't get into the details. After all, nobody wants to end Medicare as we know it. Nobody, as in the Ryan budget, wants to reduce taxes dramatically on the wealthiest Americans—39 percent to 25 percent—and then take away deductions for middle-class people, good deductions that make sense, such as the mortgage deduction, the charitable deduction, the retirement deduction, and the health care deduction. No, no one wants to do that. And no one wants to eat our seed corn—cut money dramatically for things such as investment in education, in infrastructure, and in scientific research—in order to cut taxes on the very wealthy or keep existing narrow loopholes open, deductions for moving businesses overseas, stuff for the oil companies. They don't want to debate that, I guess. But now we have a budget because of the leadership of the chair of the Budget Committee and the members of her committee.

By the way, this is not a small group of Democrats. It runs from our most liberal Members to our most conservative Members, all united around a budget that is fiscally responsible. It meets the Simpson-Bowles restraints, the budget targets, it invests in jobs and the economy, and it closes loopholes and preserves the middle class's ability to grow and proceed.

So we now are in this 30-hour thing. We could actually be debating a budget while those 30 hours tick by. We don't have to be sitting here doing nothing. One of our colleagues said he would like to debate the budget 2 weeks from now. Why is he putting things off? Well, I guess if I had their budget and looked at it compared to our budget, that is what I would want to do, but that is not fair and it is not right.

So I just came to the floor to join my colleague from Washington in pleading with our colleagues: Let's have a real debate on the budget. The lines are sharply drawn. Our budget and their budget contrast. Let the American people hear the debate and decide what they like. We are pretty confident they will like ours better. They no longer have the talking point that we don't have a budget. Instead, they are now preventing us from actually talking about our budget. It is not fair. It is not fair, and it doesn't really help the process.

I know there are some Members on the other side of the aisle who have some objections to the CR in certain areas. We are all hurt by the CR, by the way, I would say to my colleagues. If we want to get rid of things such as the horrible things that are happening in the air traffic towers, vote on our budget. We do not do sequestration. We undo sequestration, and it might pave the way to doing more things this year. But to sit here and let the clock tick makes no sense.

One thing I can tell my colleagues: I know my good friend HARRY REID, and we are not going to kick the budget can down the road for 2 weeks. We will be here, whether it has to be Saturday night and Monday and Tuesday. We will be here. So they may as well let us debate the budget. There is 50 hours. We can have a nice, full, open debate and then do our votes.

It is a logical request. I don't think there is any good argument against it. I haven't thought of one.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—we would say, Mr. Republican leader, Mr. Republicans, let's debate the budget. Tear down the wall of not debating, and let us show our budget, you show yours, and let the American people decide.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I wish to add my words to those eloquently spoken by our Budget Committee chairman PATTY MURRAY and by one of our leaders here, the able Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER.

We have been waiting for hours and hours. I can only imagine what the public thinks when they look down on this floor and absolutely nothing is happening.

I came down here not knowing my friend and colleague was going to be here. I guess we both had the same sense of it, that we had to explain to the American people why this is happening. There is only one reason: Republicans are stalling and stalling and stalling and filibustering and filibustering and filibustering. But they are not doing a talking filibuster; they are just letting the clock tick. They are filibustering a very important bill to keep this government open. They say they want to keep the government open and they don't want to shut down, so why not get that vote done with?

Senator MIKULSKI has led us, in a beautiful way, with Senator SHELBY, in a very bipartisan fashion—let's vote on that bill, keep the government open, and, as Senator MIKULSKI said, show the country we can work together and get to the one thing the Republicans have been saying not for months but for years; that is, a budget.

The truth is, instead of doing a budget, we did the Budget Control Act, so of course we did a budget. As a matter of fact, the Budget Control Act was actually in many ways more specific than a budget.

But setting that aside, they went out on the campaign trail and attacked Democrats: Where is your budget? Where is your budget? Well, guess what. Under the able leadership of my friend from Washington Senator MURRAY, there is a budget, and it is well done, and it has strong deficit reduction and strong investments. It is balanced in a way the Ryan plan is not. It saves Medicare where he destroys it. It invests in education and infrastructure where he destroys that. His budget is a wrecking ball. Our budget, under the able leadership of Senator MURRAY, is an optimistic path to our future, not the pessimistic, painful plan Mr. RYAN put forward in the name of the Republican Party.

Now the people are witnessing a filibuster. It is possible that we could end it, but I will tell my colleagues this: We are trying for some friendship and comity across the aisle right now. We want to keep the government open.

The Senator from Kansas stood here last night and said the reason he is filibustering—he never used that word, but the reason he is insisting that we spend 30 more hours, 40 more hours, 50 more hours on this last year's business, which is last year's appropriations bill, is because he demands to have a vote

on his amendment, about which he feels very strongly. It has to do with making sure the sequester doesn't hit our air traffic control towers, meaning they can stay open. I agree with the Senator from Kansas; we should keep those air traffic control towers open. But I want to say to him—and maybe we have a chart here, if I can get to it—I want to say to my friend who isn't here who is leading the filibuster that this is where we are.

We want to restore those air traffic controllers. But I will tell my colleagues what I want to restore in addition to the air traffic controllers and the towers—he is right—I want to restore Head Start for 70,000 children. I want to restore 10,000 teacher jobs. I want to restore 7,200 special education teachers who are working with kids who desperately need help. I want to restore the title I funds that impact 1 million kids. I want to make sure we can conduct 424,000 HIV tests that are administered by the CDC. How does it make us a better country when people don't know if they are HIV positive and they spread that virus? How about the 25,000 breast and cervical cancer screenings that are not being done? These are the consequences of the sequester, in addition to the terrible consequences to the FAA.

I was here when the Republicans shut down the FAA, if my colleague remembers that. They shut it down, but suddenly they care about it. Good. I am glad they care about it. I care about it too. I haven't talked about the 804,000 outpatient visits to Indian health centers or 2,100 food inspections that are going to save lives. These are not happening because of sequester: 4 million meals served to seniors; 600,000 women and children who are not getting nutrition assistance because of sequester; national science grants cut, 1,000 of them; and $902 million cut from loans to our small businesses, which are the job creators; and even 1,000 FBI agents and other law enforcement personnel.

So, yes, I say to my friend who is not here who is leading the filibuster, the Senator from Kansas—I hope he comes and shows up—I hear him. I feel the pain he feels for his State. I have a list I won't bore my colleagues with that just shows the cuts to my State. It is painful. But how do we solve it? Not by amendment after amendment after amendment on a must-pass bill that the House has said to keep simple or the government shuts down—not that way but by turning to the Democratic budget, where Senator MURRAY and colleagues on her committee have restored those cuts, and they have found other ways to cut, better ways to cut, sensible ways to cut.

So I call on my friends on the other side of the aisle: If you want to wait 10 hours, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80 hours, it is your call. We will be here. We will be here. But we are not going to put off the passage of the budget. It is too important. We will be here until it is done.

I yield back the remainder of my time. I thank my colleague Senator MURRAY so much for her leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I wish to thank the Senator from California, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Alaska, who was here just a short time ago expressing the same frustration.

We are ready to go. We have a budget, and we want to debate it. We believe, when the American public sees the values in our budget and what we are fighting for to make sure the middle class has an opportunity, that we balance our budget in a responsible way and work to manage our debt in a responsible way, that we can do that and build on the promise of hope that this country has always had, we are going to have a solid budget passed. We want to get started.

Where are our Republican colleagues on this empty floor? They are filibustering. They are counting down the hours so that sometime late Thursday night we can finish the continuing resolution after silence, silence, and more silence. It will pass. It has to pass. They all know that. We all know that. None of us love it, but we all recognize the situation we are in. We are ready to move to the budget tonight, tomorrow morning, have the debate, full and open, do the amendment process, or we are going to be doing it Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Fine with us. We are ready to do it.

But for all of our Republican colleagues who said we do not have a budget, we do have a budget. We are ready to debate it. We are ready to talk about it. We are proud of it. We are ready to go. I would just ask our Republican colleagues, yield back the time, vote the way we are going to vote—everybody knows how they are going to vote at this point—give us an opportunity to get on the budget and to move it forward in a responsible way because at the end of the day, the clock is ticking on our country as well. We have families who want to know whether they are going to be able to have the ability to send their kids to college or pay their mortgage. We have communities that want to know whether section 8 housing is going to be there for families who are struggling today. We have men and women in our military today who are wondering whether they are going to be furloughed. We have military hospitals that are telling soldiers who are coming home in the next few months that they may have to wait for appointments because of the furloughs that are taking place.

We are ready to move the budget. We are ready to get the country moving again. We are ready to get past this managing by crisis and shutdown and CRs and all these things and get back on the right path, but we cannot do it when there is a filibuster going on on the floor and we are not allowed to bring up our budget for debate and we are sitting here ticking off the clock in an empty, silent Senate.

I urge our colleagues to allow us to move forward on this. We are ready to go.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, all across America people are calling their cable providers and they are asking if they can get a refund for C–SPAN coverage of the Senate. There seems to be some concerns that there is no serious debate underway, no serious votes being taken, and the hours just continue to flow by.

I can understand the frustration of the American public watching this Chamber. We are going through a 30-hour interval. The Senate is kind of designed on 30-hour intervals, and this is the 30-hour interval before we enter the next 30-hour interval in the hopes that we will ultimately get to a vote. Does it have to be this way? Of course not. It should not be this way.

I understand the depth of feeling some Senators have about a variety of issues, and they have come to the floor to express them. In fact, I even agree with some of their positions. But there comes a point where you have to say: All right, I did not win my battle today. I am not going to get my day in court. Let's at least go on with the business of the Senate because, you see, we have an important responsibility ahead of us.

Senator MURRAY just spoke before me. She is chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. She has a Herculean task, and she is up to it. In fact, she has shown herself to be a very able leader of the Budget Committee in producing a budget proposal for the next fiscal year. It is a balanced proposal. It is one that I think is sensible.

I have some background in this, at least by way of avocation. Having been a member of the Simpson-Bowles Commission, I sat through a year of committee hearings and debates that led to a vote on a proposal to reduce the budget deficit. So I have heard some of the arguments that have been made on both sides. I then joined a bipartisan group of Senators, the so-called Gang of 8, and we sat down to try to do the same, and we spent over a year doing exactly that. So I kind of know where this comes down.

My approach to this—an approach that is being followed by Senator MURRAY with her proposed Democratic budget resolution—is, yes, the deficit is a serious problem, the debt of America is a serious problem. When you borrow 40 cents of every $1 you spend, it is

unsustainable. So we have to deal with that issue and deal with it honestly. But first and foremost, let's do it in a fashion that builds the American economy, that creates good-paying jobs. If you want to find your way out of a deficit, put people to work first. When they are paying taxes as opposed to drawing benefits, that really tips the scales in the right direction in dealing with the deficit.

So what the Murray budget does, the Democratic budget resolution will do is make investments in what does produce jobs in America, and it is very obvious.

Education. Who is going to argue with that one? Is there a person standing in the Senate who did not rely on their own education and training to progress in life? And didn't you tell your son and daughter the same thing when they were making their life choices? Stay in school. Get a good education. So education is an investment. It is part of the Democratic budget resolution.

Secondly, the notion of research and innovation. One of the most heartbreaking parts of sequestration to me was when we took $1.6 billion away from the National Institutes of Health. That is the organization that does the medical research to find new cures, new vaccines, new medical devices so people can survive when they have a diagnosis that could be fatal, to make sure children have a chance at a full life. We are cutting that in the name of budget deficit reduction, and that is troubling.

The third area is infrastructure. I spent the entire day with contractors from my State of Illinois, people who represent road builders, for example, bridge builders. They believe—and I do too—that investment in infrastructure pays off over generations. We just had a meeting on the waterway system, the Mississippi River, which is such an important part of national commerce. We need to improve the dams and the locks on the Mississippi and the adjoining rivers, such as the Illinois.

So the Murray budget deals with investments—investments to build the economy, investments to spark economic growth—but then it goes on to seriously reduce the deficit. The goal in this, of course, is to not only meet but surpass the goal of the Simpson-Bowles budget commission in terms of deficit reduction. The way Senator MURRAY does it, of course, is in a balanced approach, which includes spending cuts, which must be part of it, as well as revenue. I think that is the sensible approach to it.

Unfortunately, on the other side, the argument is made that we just cannot raise any more revenue. I know better. Anyone who has taken a close look at the Tax Code in America realizes that we literally forgive tax obligations of over $1 trillion a year in our Tax Code, some of them very worthy—the deduction for a home mortgage, for example; deductions for charitable contributions, for example. These things are worthy of our Tax Code. But there are other things that cannot even be explained. Why in the world would we put in our Tax Code a provision which says that if an American business wants to move jobs overseas, we will give them a tax break to do it? I do not think so. That should be a decision, if they make it, with no encouragement from our Tax Code. Rather, let's encourage businesses to stay in the United States.

Similarly, Senator CARL LEVIN of Michigan has really made a concerted effort to investigate and expose the offshore tax havens that cost us over $300 billion a year in taxes owed to the United States. People who park their money in faraway places with strange-sounding names end up escaping tax liability. Why do we let that happen? The average family across America, the average business across America cannot escape and does not even try to escape this liability. Yet we built into the Tax Code these Cayman Islands, little fiascos in Bermuda and all the other places they head to. We could put an end to that in a hurry and bring revenue back to the United States to reduce the deficit.

So what Senator MURRAY and the Budget Committee talk about is generating revenue to reduce the deficit and making spending cuts.

In addition, Senator MURRAY and the Budget Committee will face the entitlement issues. They are important. If you just left the entitlements without change, the cost of health care would lead us to further bankruptcy in America. They are addressing it, as we should. While protecting the integrity of the programs, they are finding ways to save money to reach the goal.

Wouldn't this be a great debate to have on the floor of the Senate, to have that budget resolution before us, to actually have some votes on amendments? Well, it would be. But, unfortunately, because of the objection of several Republican Senators, we cannot get to it. So the clock is continuing to turn. We are watching hours slip away, and now we are facing the possibility of a weekend session because one or two Senators do not want us to bring this matter to a vote. That is unfortunate. It may be their right to exercise that kind of power in the Senate, but it is not fair. It is not fair to this institution or to the American people who count on us to do more than just waste time on the Senate floor. They count on us to use our time to solve problems.

So I urge my colleagues on the Republican side who are holding up these votes, who are engaged in this filibuster, for goodness' sake, let's move on, let's vote on the continuing resolution, and let's start the debate, the important debate on the budget resolution. Let's get this done.

For the longest time, we were preached to by Members on the other side about no budget resolution. I even heard a speech today by my friend from Texas, the senior Senator, talking about how derelict we have been in not bringing up a budget resolution. We want to. We are being stopped by Republican Senators. They are the ones who will not let us bring this to a vote. I hope they will change their minds, and soon. I would like to spend next week back in Illinois and with my family, as most Senators would, during the Passover and the Easter seasons. More importantly, I would like to get my job done before that happens. To do that, we ought to be working on the floor right now. Instead of an empty floor, it should be a floor filled with Senators debating the issues and voting on them. I think that is what we were elected to do, and I think the people watching on C–SPAN would like to see some activity on the Senate floor.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I was puzzled earlier today when the Senate majority leader came to the floor to propose a unanimous consent request that we move forward with this continuing resolution. He is right, we should move forward with this. But I was puzzled by the fact that he said we have been standing around here looking at each other and we are not doing anything. We have not done anything on the Senate floor for the past 36 hours while we are trying to figure out who has the right to offer an amendment and whether that amendment will be agreed to in part of this unanimous consent request limiting the time. The problem here is that we came to the Senate believing each Senator had the right to offer an amendment. That is what we are here to do, debate that amendment, then take a vote on that amendment and pass the amendment. It is not a question of I will not offer my amendment unless it passes. Let's debate it, see how each of us votes, and then go forward.

But the majority leader has essentially said he would decide how many amendments will be offered and which amendments will not be offered, denying Senators the opportunity to bring their amendment to the floor. There is an objection to the majority leader's request to move forward, because Senators have been denied that opportunity. That is not what the Senate is all about. That is not what people elected us to do. We have been in an empty Chamber talking to no one, or at best to each other, and not moving forward with funding this government for the next 6 months in this fiscal year. We are all ready to go forward, but we wish to have the right, particularly as the minority, to offer our

amendments to this resolution which provides for this funding. I do not know how I am going to vote on all of these, because on some of them I am not sure what would be brought forward. But we are here to evaluate those, to make our best judgment, to vote our yeas or nays, to be able to explain to the people back home why we voted that way.

Apparently the majority leader has problems with some of these proposed amendments. Maybe he does not want his Members to have to vote on them because it is a tough vote politically. Well, what are we here for? We are not here to find consensus on everything that goes forward. We have different points of view. We will not always have consent to pass everything that is brought forward. We ought to be debating that. There are different visions here about how we ought to go forward. The solution to the problem of moving forward and getting this spending bill in place, which we obviously have to do, is to simply give Members the opportunities to propose their amendments, debate, vote on them, and move on.

Over these last 36 hours, how many of these amendments could we have been debating and voting on? We probably could have cleared out all of the amendments that were proposed by various Members in half that time or much less. And that is why we are here. We are a divided government, so there are going to be two sides to each issue. Standing around and having one person, the majority leader, decide whether he will subject his Members to a vote because he thinks that might put them in a difficult political situation. His side can offer their amendments, we can offer our amendments. Hopefully, we are offering amendments for the good of the country and not for some political gain or ''gotcha'' amendments. But nevertheless, that is the right of a Senator, to offer whatever amendment he or she deems best in his or her own estimation.

We are sitting here facing a serious debt crisis. Some have said this debt crisis isn't here yet so we have more time to deal with it. I reject that. If $16.7 trillion in debt isn't a crisis, I don't know what is. And at the rate we are going here in Washington, we don't have more time to waste.

But don't take my word for this. Just last week, we had a hearing in the Joint Economic Committee on the debt crisis. In the hearing, we found widespread agreement from witnesses across the ideological spectrum on a variety of issues, including the vital importance of dealing with our long-term debt in a timely fashion and reforming health and retirement security programs to rein in spending and preserve much-needed benefits. I am going to relate some of their testimony, because I think it's important to establish that there is some consensus here on how to move forward. Former Senator and former Senate chairman of the Budget Committee, Judd Gregg, who now serves as the co-chair of the Campaign to Fix the Debt, stated this:

> On our current path, this nation goes bankrupt.

A similar statement to the one made by Judd Gregg, a Republican, was made by a Democrat, Erskine Bowles, who headed up the President's own fiscal commission, former Governor Bowles and former Chief of Staff to former President Clinton. He said about the looming debt crisis:

> This is the most predictable financial crisis in the history of the country.

That was several years ago and nothing has gotten better since then. We just careen closer and closer to that tipping point. Senator Gregg says on our current path this Nation goes bankrupt. He also noted that mandatory spending is the primary driver of the debt when he said:

> Unfortunately, all of the measures put in place have ignored smart entitlement reforms to control spending over the long-term and comprehensive tax reforms to make the tax code more efficient.

We have all heard that before from people all across the political spectrum. There is a growing consensus these elements must be addressed if we are to address our long-term debt problem.

Douglas Holtz-Eakin, former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, noted:

> The level and projected growth of federal debt is a drag on current U.S. economic growth and a threat to future prosperity. . . . the Nation, despite claims to the contrary, remains on a damaging debt pathway.

Dr. Holtz-Eakin countered arguments that reducing the debt is not urgent because the crisis is a distant threat by pointing out the following:

> . . . the U.S. is already paying an economic price for the excessive federal debt.

He was referring to terms of slow job creation and growth. He went on to say:

> The obvious conclusion is that additional deficit reduction is needed to avoid debt-driven economic stagnation.

He called for the following action:

> . . . a strategy that shifts the focus of spending control to the needed entitlement reforms and shifts the debate on taxes away from harmful higher marginal tax rates in favor of pro-growth tax reform.

Alice Rivlin, the first Director of the Congressional Budget Office and co-chair of the Debt Reduction Task Force for the Bipartisan Policy Center as well as a former resident of Indiana, insisted on the importance of a long-term budget plan that will halt the projected rise in debt. She said:

> The prospect of debt growing faster than the economy for the foreseeable future reduces consumer and investor confidence, raises a serious threat of high future interest rates and unmanageable Federal debt service, and reduces likely American prosperity and world influence.

She stressed in her testimony the urgent need to act now to get the Federal debt under control before events overtake us.

A sense of urgency was unmistakably present during this hearing. We read about it in the paper every day. We read about it from columnists and hear it on the radio and television: Why can't you get together and get this thing solved and resolved so we can move forward? You are holding down the growth of the economy. You are keeping people out of work. We are at stagnant growth—half our historic average coming out of a recession.

We all know a significant percent of the money we spend here has to be borrowed from China, Saudi Arabia, from foreign entities. This is no way to sustain and maintain a healthy fiscal situation in this country.

Our final witness at the hearing, Simon Johnson, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, called for significantly more long-term debt reduction than has been contemplated in many of the proposals thus far, suggesting that the U.S. should aim at a national debt in the range of 40 percent to 50 percent of GDP.

Let me repeat that. Simon Johnson said that more long-term debt reduction than has been contemplated in many of the proposals so far needs to be looked at, suggesting the United States should aim at a national debt in the range of 40 to 50 percent of GDP rather than our current 90 to 100. When discussing how much time we have to act, Dr. Johnson said:

> We have no idea . . . We should start now.

We absolutely should start now. We should be spending each day here working on a long-term debt reduction plan, because unlike the haphazard, rushed legislation we have seen over the past few years, a real, credible, long-term fiscal plan cannot happen overnight. It requires bold spending reforms. It must include a way to restructure programs like Medicare and Social Security so we can prevent them from going bankrupt and preserve benefits for current and future retirees.

Let me state that again. Those of us who have stood up and taken a stand on dealing with these so-called political suicide issues—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security—are saying we need to do something now to prevent these programs from becoming insolvent, to prevent benefits from having to be reduced or massive tax increases on the next generation to be imposed in order to keep them solvent. We want to deal with that now so we don't undermine these programs.

Those who say we should not touch Medicare are not being truthful with current and future beneficiaries of that program. The same is true for Social Security. They are saying, we don't want to make the tough decision now to address some of these problems and make sensible reforms. We will be gone when this comes undone. What they are saying to people is that we are going to turn our heads to the plight of future beneficiaries, and even to current beneficiaries of these programs by not doing anything.

It is time we worked together to find a solution to this. I think there is a consensus that comprehensive tax reform—an area that I believe both sides can find common ground. Comprehensive tax reform is absolutely essential, as our witnesses all stated, to providing the growth element so this country and this economy can begin to grow. Additional revenue will come in from a more prosperous nation and from a greater rate of growth, and that will help us reduce our deficit spending, it will help us move toward a balanced budget, and keep us from continuing the plunge into more debt and more deficit.

Comprehensive tax reform is the best way to reduce the debt, grow the economy, and make America more competitive. Grow the economy—not more government. That is what makes us more competitive and puts more people back to work. That is what puts us on a path to American prosperity.

These things will not be easy. It will require time and it will demand political will courage. So let's get moving. The Senate majority leader needs to stop wasting time, allow Members to offer and vote on amendments so we can get to regular business of the Senate done and focus on the larger priority—growing this economy. Your Members, our Members—ones we like, ones we don't like. We are sent here to make the tough choices, to make our yes or our no and represent people back home. That is what the Senate is all about.

So instead of standing here speaking to an empty Chamber and letting the clock run down so these amendments can be closed out and never offered under this bill, we should be debating these issues. In doing so, we can get to the point where we will have our final vote and, hopefully, we will be funding the government going forward. It is called regular business and that ought to be our focus.

Growing this economy and strengthening it for future generations is the challenge before us. It is the challenge of our time. We need political will and courage and boldness to go forward, but it is absolutely essential for the future of this country. I suggest that instead of standing around doing nothing, we begin to address these issues.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I noted last week the Republican leader came to his desk and spoke about the budget and described our Democratic budget as a leftwing manifesto.

We have done $1.8 trillion in spending cuts already. We raised $600 billion—one-third of that—in revenue by restoring the Clinton-era tax rates for families earning over $450,000 a year. So in the balance between spending cuts and new revenues, it is already 3 to 1 in favor of spending cuts. In our budget, we propose to fill the gap of the remainder with 50 percent spending cuts and 50 percent revenue and that is a leftwing manifesto.

The Republican budget changes Medicare into a voucher program. The Republican budget cuts nondefense discretionary spending to levels lower than at any time since OMB started keeping track a half century ago. The Republican budget would set annual domestic spending at rates lower than 1962, when there were no Pell grants at all, when 30 percent of American seniors lived in poverty. But that is not extreme. A Democratic budget that is 50–50 spending cuts and revenues, that is a leftwing manifesto.

The Democratic budget has $975 billion in new spending cuts and it has $975 billion in new revenue in order to close that budget gap 50–50. That means, including the deficit reduction we have already done of $1.8 trillion, we will be, in total, at $4.3 trillion in deficit reduction, which is probably just a little bit over the target that most of the experts have given us to hit. About $2.8 trillion of the $4.3 trillion will come in spending cuts, $600 billion has come in new tax revenue, and $975 billion will come from loopholes, for a total of $1.6 trillion coming from new revenues. Some leftwing manifesto, $1 trillion more in spending cuts than revenue at a time when billionaires in America are paying lower tax rates than brick masons. If that is a leftwing manifesto, then the leftwing needs to fire its manifesto writers. That is some pretty high rhetoric.

We know where the word ''manifesto'' comes from, of course. It comes from the Cold War and the Communists—50 percent spending cuts, 50 percent revenue—and the rhetorical hint is that we Democrats with our budget are a bunch of Commies. That is high rhetoric indeed, and it is not coming from some fringe Senators in their rank and file. This is the Republican leader of the Senate.

In the face of the obvious facts of the balance of our budget, why might the rhetoric be getting so high? What might the Republicans be getting so touchy about? Let's look at where we get the rest of our revenue for our 50–50 budget.

We got the first $600 billion from restoring the Clinton-era tax rates, a time of huge economic success for our country for folks over $450,000 in income. Where do we get our $975 billion in new revenue? We go to the Republican treasure trove. We go to Ali Baba's cave for corporations and the rich. We go to the tax earmarks and the special deals that special interests have, year after year, squirreled away in the Tax Code.

People think: How much can that be? What can it mean when we have money going through the Tax Code and out but not coming to the government in revenues? What is in Ali Baba's cave? How big is the treasure trove? Have a look.

This is the amount of money the U.S. Government collects in taxes from individuals—$1.09 trillion. Here is how much goes back out the backdoor of the Tax Code to people who have loopholes, special rates, deductions in the Tax Code that helped them: $1.02 trillion—virtually the same. For every $1 of revenue the United States collects in actual revenues from individual taxpayers every year, another 94 cents goes back out through the loopholes and the deductions and the special rates, a grand total every year of more than $1 trillion. Since we budget over a 10-year period, it is $10 trillion in this budget period.

On the corporate side, for every $1 of revenue the United States collects in actual revenues from corporations, another 87 cents goes back out the backdoor of the Tax Code through loopholes and special rates and deductions. Again, because we do this over—every year, $157 billion. Again, because we do this over 10 years, that is more than $1.5 trillion. If we add these two together, it is more than $11.5 trillion in the budget period. If we presume some modest growth in the economy over those 10 years, that number gets to about $14 trillion.

So Ali Baba's Tax Code cave of tax spending is very big. There is lots of treasure squirreled away in it, and that doesn't even count the billions of dollars that corporations and wealthy tax avoiders hide offshore so it never even gets into the tax equation. The IRS has pegged that recently at about $385 billion a year.

There is one little building in the Cayman Islands that Chairman Conrad used to refer to regularly when he was chairman of the Budget Committee. One little building in the Cayman Islands, maybe 5 stories tall, where over 18,000 companies claim to be doing business. One can imagine what kind of business they are doing there. That is how $385 billion a year never even appears in the tax equation.

This spending that gets done through the Tax Code that does not get reviewed by annual appropriations, it gets squirreled away in there and it is there to stay. It is a big treasure trove indeed—not counting offshoring, probably $14 trillion in a 10-year budget period for those who are clever and connected enough to get their special deals, their tax earmarks, into the Tax Code.

We take out of that, call it $14 trillion—at a minimum $11.5 trillion—$975 billion, about 7 percent. That is how

much of it, this little red slice, is what we take to balance the budget for deficit reduction. The problem is the Republicans do not want us to look into their treasure trove. Ali Baba's cave of tax tricks is where the juicy earmarks are for special interests. Do you want to know why Mitt Romney had to fiddle his taxes to get up to a 14-percent tax rate—which, by the way, is a lower tax rate than a solitary hospital orderly pays walking down the halls of Rhode Island Hospital at night. How does he get it so he has to fiddle his taxes to get up to a rate lower than a hospital orderly pays? How do Romney and the hedge fund billionaires pull off that trick? Look in Ali Baba's cave for the carried interest exception.

Do you want to know where ExxonMobil, which is the richest and most profitable corporation in the history of the world—where ExxonMobil gets its hands into the American taxpayers' pockets? Look at the Big Oil subsidies in Ali Baba's cave.

Do you want to know how corporate jets get special favored tax treatment compared to the commercial jets that ordinary mortals fly? Look at the accelerated depreciation schedules in Ali Baba's cave of tax tricks. If using the phrase ''leftwing manifesto'' seems a little strident, a little exaggerated about a budget proposal for 50 percent spending cuts and 50 percent revenues and you want to inquire why, look no further than the Republican treasure trove of corporate and special interest tax earmarks heaped up in Ali Baba's cave.

We are knocking at the door. We are knocking on the door of Ali Baba's cave, which so far has been untouched. We have done all spending cuts and a little bit of tax rate increases for families over $450,000 back to the Clinton-era rates. We have not touched, yet, Ali Baba's cave. What we are saying as Democrats is that Americans paid in deficit reduction spending cuts what they are going to lose in services and in benefits, $1.8 trillion, and they will pay in another $975 billion in cuts under our Democratic proposal. We are saying that folks earning over $450,000 a year income saw their tax rates go up to Clinton-era levels, and they are paying in another $600 billion in deficit reduction. Now we want to go into Ali Baba's cave of tax earmarks and out of at least $11.5 trillion, probably more like $14 trillion, and if you throw in the offshoring that takes you up to $17 trillion, $18 trillion—we want to take less than $1 trillion out over 10 years to help reduce our budget deficit.

So the Republicans are getting anxious. The alarms are ringing in the special interests and the Republicans are rushing to the trenches to defend their special interests and their cherished tax earmarks. The best defense being a good offense, that is how a balanced deficit reduction plan that in sum has $1 trillion more in spending cuts than in revenues suddenly becomes a leftist manifesto.

We just had the hearings in the Budget Committee on our budget. If you listened on that committee, the Republicans said it plainly. They did not mince words: Not a penny of tax loopholes, not a penny from Ali Baba's cave of tax treasures can go for deficit reduction—not a penny. That is their rule.

They will say they are willing to move the treasure around a little bit in Ali Baba's cave so long as it all gets used for corporations and the wealthy. Again, that is not a guess. That is in the Republican budget—none of the goodies squirreled away by the special interests over the years in Ali Baba's cave for deficit reduction—none; all of it to lower tax rates for corporations and the rich, the ones who mostly benefit from the treasure in Ali Baba's cave to begin with. They are willing to spread the treasure around a little as long as it stays in the hands of big corporations and the rich.

We are at the gates of Ali Baba's cave, this treasure trove of Tax Code special deals and earmarks for the rich and the well connected. We are at the place where the lobbyists wheel the sweet corporate tax deals. We are knocking on the door of a $14 trillion tax spending area that has been, so far, left completely untouched in deficit reduction and so our Republican friends are getting a little twitchy.

Come on, tell us, out of nearly $14 trillion in tax spending and earmarks, can't we just put a little bit toward the deficit? Just 7 percent? Under their own budget, they take 41 percent of it and give it back in the form of lower high-end tax rates, lowered rates for big corporations and the rich. Can't we do just 7 percent for deficit reduction? I thought the deficit was so important, but maybe not when it comes to our friends protecting the interests of the big corporations and the rich.

Madam President, I also wish to speak about the continuing resolution and its provisions relating to Commerce, Justice, and Science appropriations. Specifically, I want to highlight how the continuing resolution will support continuing advances in the field of digital forensics.

The continuing resolution is accompanied by a series of explanatory statements that detail Congress' intent behind the raw numbers of the resolution itself. The explanatory statement for the Commerce, Justice, and Science provisions in turn incorporates portions of the Appropriations Committee report on the earlier Commerce, Justice, and Science bill. ''[L]anguage included in . . . Senate Report 112–158,'' the explanatory statement provides, ''that is not changed by this explanatory statement or this Act is approved.'' Neither the explanatory statement nor the continuing resolution change language from Senate Report 112–158 regarding computer forensics. The language from Senate Report 112–158 therefore states the intent behind this portion of the continuing resolution.

This is what Senate Report 112–158 says:

> Cell Phone Digital Evidence—As smartphones and the Internet have become integral parts of daily life, these technologies have also become an integral part of a majority of criminal acts and enterprises, from drug deals by text to child pornography websites. Because more than 95 percent of all criminal cases are investigated and prosecuted at the State and local levels, the Committee is concerned that without the Department's support, the ability of State and local law enforcement to effectively investigate and prosecute cases involving digital evidence and computer-based crimes will diminish. The Committee encourages the Department to prioritize State and local assistance toward computer forensics and digital evidence training and investigations surrounding drug and violent crimes, and crimes against children.
>
> Collaborative Efforts To Fight Cybercrime—According to the Norton Cybercrime Report 2011, more than 69 percent of online adults have been a victim of cybercrime in their lifetime, resulting in an annual price of $388,000,000,000 globally. The Committee is aware of the important progress that has been made in the fight against cybercrime by collaborative efforts that bring together prosecutors, researchers, and DOJ in a multidisciplinary effort to identify and prosecute cybercrimes such as 'phishing.' These collaborative efforts involve experts in computer forensics that help to identify the source of phishing, train prosecutors in the intricacies of the crime and how best to prosecute cybercriminals, and conduct research to stay ahead of cybercriminals and their ever changing tactics. The Committee believes these collaborative efforts have made good progress against cybercrime and encourages the Department to continue funding these important initiatives.

I applaud Chairwoman MIKULSKI for stressing the importance of computer forensics training and research, first as the Chairwoman of the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Subcommittee and now as chairwoman of the full Appropriations Committee. I am very grateful for her leadership on this important issue.

The report clearly identifies the need for continued Justice Department attention on this subject. This is particularly the case in light of the severe cybersecurity threats facing our Nation. Like the Norton report cited by the committee, a recent report by the security firm Mandiant highlighted the growing threat to our national economic security posed by cyber attacks launched by criminal organizations and foreign countries. Every day, sophisticated hackers are attempting to steal America's secrets, its intellectual property, and the identities of our citizens. As FBI Director Robert Mueller has stated, ''[w]e are losing data, we are losing money, we are losing ideas and we are losing innovation. Together we must find a way to stop the bleeding.'' Digital forensics tools that help attribute the source of an attack and the extent of the damage caused will be an important element of any cybersecurity solution.

Digital forensics tools also help law enforcement investigate and prosecute

more traditional crimes. Criminals use smartphones and computers to engage in all kinds of criminal acts and enterprises, from drug dealing to child pornography. Even when criminals do not use modern electronics in the commission of the crime, digital forensics can provide useful evidence relative to, for instance, the whereabouts and intent of the offender, or the participants in a conspiracy. Federal, State, and local law enforcement thus must have access to digital forensics tools and appropriate training to investigate and prosecute these crimes effectively.

For the last decade, the Justice Department has funded extremely important research in these areas. For example, its National Institute of Justice, or NIJ, has funded research on tools for scanning for child pornography; forensic tools for mobile cellular devices; data forensics for cloud computing; technologies to identify and defeat encryption methods used by criminals; and forensic tools for seizing digital evidence in a forensically sound way. NIJ also has funded invaluable training that equips state and local law enforcement to tackle the cybercrime and digital forensics issues that they encounter in their criminal investigations. I believe that NIJ and the Justice Department more broadly must support this research and training going forward. I am very pleased that the continuing resolution we are considering today likewise prioritizes this important work.

Again, the fact that the continuing resolution does this is a testament to Chairwoman MIKULSKI's leadership in this field. She has been a champion of effective law enforcement for a long time. She now is bringing the same leadership to bear on cybersecurity and criminals' use of emerging technologies. I also would thank Senator SHELBY, who is the ranking member of both the full Committee and the Commerce, Justice, and Science Subcommittee, for his work on this important issue. As a result of their collaboration, the continuing resolution will support a broad range of important Federal initiatives. It is very good news that research and training on digital forensics will be one of them.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Medium Air Defense System is a NATO program we jointly develop with the Germans and Italians. They have made clear if the United States does not fulfill its funding commitment for 2013, Germany and Italy would interpret this as a unilateral withdrawal, and they have stated this in writing to Congress.

The Memorandum of Understanding among the U.S., Germany and Italy clearly states that a ''withdrawing Participant will pay all Contract modification or termination costs that would not otherwise have been incurred but for the decision to withdraw.''

This is a standard clause for cooperative international agreements. In fact, it is usually included at the insistence of the U.S. to ensure long-term commitment of our Allies so they do not withdraw on joint programs, leaving the U.S. to pay the bills. It is included in agreements on the Excalibur program; technologies and systems for AEGIS-equipped ships; and the Global Positioning System. It will also be included when the U.S. and Israel enter an agreement on the Iron Dome missile defense program.

There is precedent. Following its withdrawal from the NATO Alliance Ground Surveillance Memorandum of Understanding, Canada was assessed a fiscal penalty, even though a development contract had not yet been awarded. The MEADS program has contracts with industry that, if canceled, will require the payment of termination liability. To think that we would get out for free is unrealistic. If we take the funding out of this program, we leave the Army a bill that it will have to pay.

MEADS is not a ''missile to nowhere.'' Last November, MEADS conducted a successful intercept test that demonstrated advanced technologies for air defense. The Department of Defense has informed us the missile used in the MEADS program will be incorporated into the aging Patriot system next year.

The United States has not paid more for the program than what was agreed to in the MOU. The U.S. share of the program is $2.32 billion in 2004 dollars, which when adjusted for inflation is closer to $2.9 billion in today's dollars.

Finally, premature withdrawal from MEADS sends the wrong signals to our allies when the U.S. has been asking them to do more on missile defense. Secretary Panetta sent the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee a letter last June, echoed by a letter from Secretary Clinton in September, which specifically asks Congress not to terminate MEADS at this time, as it would undermine a new and fragile consensus achieved by the U.S with its NATO Allies in Chicago last spring.

I agree with my colleague from New Hampshire now, more than ever, we need to be vigilant about how and where federal defense dollars are spent. Prohibiting funding for this final installment of MEADS research is the wrong way to approach this, but I look forward to working with her and other Senators as we develop the fiscal year 2014 spending bills.

Mr. REED. Madam President, before I begin, I want to thank Chairwoman MIKULSKI. She has demonstrated both leadership and resolve in her new role and in assembling this bill under very challenging circumstances.

Overall, this bill provides a total of $1.043 trillion for discretionary spending, and it reflects a number of reductions that the Appropriations Committee had to make in order to accommodate the $4 billion cut to the discretionary spending caps mandated by the January agreement on the so-called ''fiscal cliff.'' In addition, because of a point of order raised by Senator TOOMEY last year, the emergency designation was removed for $3.5 billion in disaster and mitigation funding in the Superstorm Sandy appropriations bill. I opposed this point of order because I believe disaster funding should be treated as an emergency, as it has been in disasters past. Because we fell three votes shy of the 60 needed to waive the point of order, we must now absorb $3.5 billion in cuts in this bill. That will have real impacts on critical programs.

Moreover, I am deeply disappointed we have not been able to come up with a commonsense and balanced solution to turn off sequestration. These crippling across-the-board spending cuts 7.8 percent for defense programs and 5 percent for domestic discretionary programs will be applied to virtually every discretionary program in this bill. If left unaddressed, they will translate into an estimated 750,000 fewer jobs across this country, including in my home State of Rhode Island, where the unemployment rate is just under 10 percent.

I was one of a majority of Senators who voted for a reasonable solution to replace sequestration with a balanced mix of revenues and spending reductions. I am frustrated that a minority in this Chamber blocked this plan, which would have prevented the self-inflicted job losses and economic pain of sequestration. Now, in order to avoid a government shutdown on March 27, we must forge ahead and pass the best appropriations bill we can, despite these limitations.

Even in the face of these limitations, the Senate bill represents a better path because it makes responsible investments and saves jobs.

Without the funding provided in this bill to meet the funding levels promised in MAP–21, last year's transportation authorization bill, we would lose an additional 25,000 jobs. As chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I worked to provide $2.4 billion in funding for clean water and drinking water projects, $336 million more than the President requested. This investment, when combined with state matches and leveraging, will support 849 projects and 130,000 jobs.

Let me turn to the Interior title of this continuing resolution in more detail. The CR provides $29.8 billion, which is an increase of $650 million over the Subcommittee's FY 2012 allocation.

While that amount is a 2 percent increase, most of it, approximately $600 million, is needed to fully fund the 10-year average for fire suppression. In addition, we must also absorb the cost of $423 million appropriated as part of the September continuing resolution to repay fire borrowing that occurred in FY 2012.

Even though the subcommittee's allocation rose, so did the costs of programs we must fund. The House was able to avoid tough decisions for the

Environmental Protection Agency and Interior funding in its CR because it had an even larger allocation for this title. But it only accomplished that by shortchanging other important investments in other titles, including transportation, child care, education, health research, police, and firefighters.

Lest anyone be confused by the House's new-found commitment to the EPA and other environmental priorities, one should only review the devastating cuts it made to these programs in its initial FY 2013 committee-reported Interior Appropriations bill.

With the resources available and the challenges we face, I believe we in the Senate have funded all agencies in the Interior Appropriations title fairly, and we have still been able to achieve a number of important environmental goals.

As I have already noted, we have been able to provide a solid level of funding for infrastructure through the clean water and drinking water State revolving funds.

We were able to hold funding levels steady for grants that help States run their environmental programs at $1.1 billion. These funds create jobs at the State level and provide for enforcement of our Federal pollution control laws.

As I mentioned, we also fully funded the 10-year average of fire suppression for both the Interior Department and Forest Service, in anticipation of a tough fire season.

We were able to include $53 million in new funding to hire doctors, nurses, and support staff at newly constructed Indian Health Service facilities. These funds will allow seven facilities to open their doors to patients that would otherwise sit vacant.

I am pleased to say this bill also includes language to extend the authorizations of 12 national heritage areas so they will continue to receive their partnership grant funding from the National Park Service.

We want to make sure these heritage areas continue to thrive, so I am proud we were able to extend their authorizations in this bill. And it is worth noting that these grants don't require new funding they are already paid for within the existing National Park Service budget.

This is important in my State, with the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, but for many others, as well.

Finally, land and water conservation funding is sustained at the FY 2012 level of $322 million.

Of course, there are tradeoffs within this bill, and places where we had to sustain cuts below the FY 2012 enacted level.

This is in part due to the hand we were dealt by the President in the budget he submitted for FY 2013. We accepted cuts proposed by the administration for several programs, including construction programs and Superfund.

The Senate bill funds the EPA at $8.34 billion, which, while a reduction of $107 million from the FY 2012 level, is the amount requested by the President for FY 2013. Additionally, the Senate bill spares the agency from the debilitating cuts set in the FY 2013 House Interior bill, which funded the EPA at a level that is $1.29 billion less than FY 2012. Yes, that is a billion.

Unfortunately, however, those reductions alone were not enough to meet our obligation to provide an approximately $1 billion increase for fire. We had to make cuts to other operating programs in the bill cuts that I know will only be more difficult because they will come in addition to sequestration.

Before I conclude, I want to address a few other aspects of this bill and the consequences of continuing resolutions and the sequester.

A major reason we are now confronting such huge deficits is the utter collapse of our financial markets beginning in 2008. Some of this collapse occurred because parts of our financial system were either lightly or barely regulated such as our derivatives and subprime mortgage markets.

However, we also learned the severe costs of having an under-resourced and outmatched Securities and Exchange Commission and Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

I still remember an April 2008 hearing with former SEC Chair Christopher Cox, in which he stated the SEC didn't need more resources meanwhile Bernie Madoff was scamming more and more victims in the largest Ponzi scheme in history, and Lehmann Brothers was levered 30–1 and hiding its precarious financial condition through repurchase agreements.

By starving the SEC and CFTC of resources, we are repeating the mistakes of the recent past.

The CFTC is already suspending its examinations of key market participants and ''shelving'' enforcement actions because of budget constraints. The impact of static funding along with the sequester will further erode its oversight. Indeed, under the CR, the CFTC will operate with a budget that is 37 percent less than the administration says it needs.

The case of the SEC is more disturbing. While subject to appropriation, the SEC has no impact on the deficit since its expenditures are offset by transaction fees applied to the industry. With the impacts of the sequester, the SEC will operate at 20 percent less than the administration has requested. This failure to appropriately fund the SEC will do nothing to improve the fiscal situation. At the same time, our economy and our capital markets will be more vulnerable. That makes no sense.

If we want American markets to be the most liquid, transparent, efficient, and orderly in the world, we need to provide the cops on the beat—the SEC and CFTC with an adequate and stable source of funding.

I also want to speak about the impacts CRs can have on specific programs because they offer no nuance or flexibility. That has been shown to be the case this year with the Weatherization Assistance Program, a program that creates jobs and helps provide energy efficient retrofits to low-income individuals and families.

President Obama described the program this way in a 2009 interview: ''[Y]ou're getting a three-fer. Not only are you immediately putting people back to work but you're also saving families on [their] energy bills and you're laying the groundwork for long-term energy independence. That's exactly the kind of program that we should be funding.''

Under the Recovery Act, we invested $5 billion in this program, which annually received only $175 to $200 million. As the program worked through this infusion, funding for the regular program was scaled back. In FY 2013, funding will be only $68 million even before the sequester is applied. Since there will no longer be carry-over from earlier years, there will not be enough funding to mount a viable program in all 50 states. That's not only regrettable, it is also counterproductive to our goals to create jobs and increase energy efficiency. I hope we can work with the Department of Energy to find ways to sustain the program in 2013 as we seek to address the shortfall in 2014.

Finally, while this should be the case for all of our spending priorities, I want to note that this package includes a full defense appropriations bill that provides DOD with the funding for programs it needs. I am particularly pleased that the bill provides funding to build two Virginia-class submarines in FY 2013 and to purchase equipment for two submarines in FY 2014, which will ensure that we will have the capital resources and workforce in place to move forward. This also retains thousands of good paying jobs for highly skilled workers in my State and elsewhere.

There is much to comment on about the tough choices we have had to make in this bill and the sequester cuts that loom over every discretionary program. Given the very challenging circumstances we face, Chairwoman MIKULSKI has done her best to craft a bill that can clear the Senate and hopefully get to the President's desk so that we can avoid a government shutdown, which would be even more disastrous.

TRIBAL SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I rise today to discuss tribal school construction funding—an issue that is central to the academic wellbeing and intellectual development of tribal children across the country.

It goes without saying that all kids need clean, safe places to study.

And making sure that every child gets a good education, in a safe, clean environment will benefit our economy and our society as a whole. Unfortunately, many Indian kids attending

schools run by the Bureau of Indian Education are forced to study in aging facilities that should be replaced.

As Senators, we have responsibilities to all children in our States to ensure that they all have access to safe and clean school buildings. The Federal Government has a particular responsibility to the tribes that includes taking care of tribal schools. That is why I offered an amendment to the continuing resolution with Senators TOM UDALL, TIM JOHNSON, KLOBUCHAR, HEITKAMP, and HEINRICH, to secure funding for tribal school buildings that need to be replaced.

In these times of tight budgets, everyone is making sacrifices. Programs across the Federal Government are forced to make difficult cuts and to do more with less. School construction is one small but vital program that I believe should continue to be funded. I was disappointed that the administration's fiscal year 2013 budget did not include funding for Indian school replacement construction.

I ask the Senator if it would be fair to say that the absence of funding for tribal school construction replacement in this CR should not be seen as a lack of support for this activity in future appropriations bills?

Mr. REED. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. FRANKEN. The continuing resolution we are now considering is needed to get us through the last 6 months of this fiscal year. It is my hope that as we return to a more regular appropriations process for fiscal year 2014, we can refocus on this important priority to support Indian school construction. I ask the Senator, would he be willing to work with me and our colleagues on that?

Mr. REED. Yes, I will welcome the opportunity to work with the Senator and our colleagues here in the Senate on priority needs within the Interior bill, including American Indian and Alaska Native health and education issues, to the extent possible given the overall budget constraints we face.

Mr. FRANKEN. I thank the Senator for committing to work with us.

WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. REED. Madam President, I would ask my colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, Chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, if she would join me and our colleague Senator COLLINS in a colloquy on the Weatherization Assistance Program.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I would be pleased to join my colleagues.

Mr. REED. I thank the Chairwoman.

I know a major reason that the Chairwoman wants to get back to regular order is that continuing resolutions are blunt instruments that do not allow for the adjustments for specific programs. One place where that has played out is in the Energy and Water Development bill, specifically with respect to the Weatherization Assistance Program.

I know the chairwoman has long supported the weatherization program, which helps provide energy efficient retrofits to low-income individuals and families. It also provides jobs, which is so important given the continuing challenges in our economy.

President Obama described the program this way in an interview in 2009, ''[y]ou're getting a three-fer. Not only are you immediately putting people back to work but you're also saving families on [their] energy bills and you're laying the groundwork for long-term energy independence. That's exactly the kind of program that we should be funding.''

Under the Recovery Act, we made a one-time investment of $5 billion in this program, which has historically received $175 to $200 million in annual appropriations. As the program worked through this infusion, funding for the regular program was temporarily scaled back. In FY 2013, funding for the program will be only $68 million even before the sequester is applied. Since there will no longer be carry-over funds available, there will not be enough funding to mount a viable program in all 50 States. That is regrettable, particularly when the Senate bill contained $145 million, $6 million more than the budget request. It is also counterproductive to our goals to create jobs and increase energy efficiency.

I would ask the Chairwoman if she would work with us and the Department of Energy to find ways to sustain the program through appropriate reprogramming so that it does not cease to be a 50-State program. I would also ask if she would work with us in fiscal year 2014 to see how we can support this important initiative. Before I yield to the Chairwoman to respond, I would ask Senator COLLINS if she would like to comment.

Ms. COLLINS. I would like to echo Senator REED's comments and thank the Chairwoman for her support of the Weatherization Assistance Program.

This program is currently facing significant funding challenges and its viability in many States is threatened. Weatherization plays an important role in permanently reducing home energy costs for low-income families and seniors, lessening our reliance on foreign oil, and training a skilled workforce. The current funding level represents a substantial reduction for the program, and the ability of the program to continue to deliver services is in serious jeopardy.

I too would like to ask the Chairwoman if she would work with us and the Department of Energy to find ways to sustain the program through appropriate reprogramming, so that low-income families and seniors in every State can continue to receive the energy savings from the weatherization of their homes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senators for their comments and would be pleased to work with them on this important issue and ways to maintain a 50-State weatherization program.

Mr. REED. I thank the Chairwoman for that response. I look forward to working with her, Senator COLLINS, and others to support this program in fiscal year 2013 and during the fiscal year 2014 funding cycle.

PLANT PROTECTION ACT

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I wish to engage my colleague, Chairwoman MIKULSKI, in a colloquy. I thank the Senator for her important work in bringing this bill to the Senate.

However, I would like clarification on Section 735 of Division A of the bill. This provision requires that the Secretary of Agriculture, if requested, issue temporary permits or temporary deregulation in the event a genetically engineered crop deregulation is set aside or vacated as unlawful. As you know, I oppose this provision and have deep concerns about its impact. I wish to confirm my understanding, even though this provision does not operate through a restriction of funds in this act, it is in effect only for the duration of the continuing resolution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TESTER. I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11:15 a.m. tomorrow, all postcloture time on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment be considered expired, the Durbin second-degree amendment to 115 be withdrawn with no other second-degree amendment in order; that the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Toomey amendment No. 115; that upon disposition of the Toomey amendment, the Senate then proceed to vote on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment, as amended; that upon disposition of the substitute amendment, the Senate proceed to the cloture vote on the underlying bill; finally, if cloture is invoked, the 30 hours postcloture begin to run as if cloture were invoked at 1 a.m. on Wednesday, March 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING LAWRENCE E. NEWMAN

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, the enduring imprint of a life well lived is the positive impact one has on those closest to them. The way you live your life and the people you touch along the way speak convincingly long after we are gone. Such is the case with Lawrence Newman. By all accounts, he was a loving husband and family man; a strong Christian who devoted much of his time to his church, Hartford Memorial Baptist; and a proud Postal employee for more than 30 years. It is with this in mind that Senator STABENOW and I celebrate his life.

Lawrence Newman was a Detroiter through and through. He was born on May 22, 1935, in Detroit and spent much of his life there. He graduated from Cass Tech in Detroit in 1957 and then went on to study at the University of Detroit. Soon after, he was drafted into the Army and served his Nation honorably until his discharge in 1964.

After serving his country, Lawrence secured employment with the U.S. Postal Service. He would go on to spend three decades helping to ensure the Postal Service continues to meet its obligation to provide efficient service to the people of Detroit and Michigan. In addition to working for the Postal Service, Mr. Newman served as a member of the board of directors of the Detroit Postal Employee Credit Union and of the National Association of Postal Supervisors for many years.

It is clear Lawrence Newman held his Christian beliefs dear. He not only spent four decades as a member of Hartford Memorial, he also served on Hartford Memorial's board of trustees, eventually earning the distinction of trustee emeritus, and as the church's official photographer.

And so we take this moment to remember Lawrence Newman. He leaves behind a wonderful family, including his loving wife of 51 years, Shirley Jane, and 2 sons, David and Daryl. He will be dearly missed, and Senator STABENOW and I are honored to recognize a man who has meant so much.

TRIBUTE TO MELISSA DORE

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today in celebration of my staff member, Melissa Dore, who is retiring after working with me throughout most of my years in the U.S. Senate.

Melissa started as a staff member in my East Lansing office and immediately impressed us with her ability to connect with people when they called. Hers was often the first voice constituents heard when contacting me and her natural ability to be compassionate and empathetic made their first impression a good one.

Melissa's compassion and tenacity made her a natural choice to work with those who contacted me for help with their Social Security or Medicare benefits. Time and time again, I have seen her go to bat for people and get answers about their cases and resolve very tough problems. Melissa is someone who cares deeply and her commitment shows in the results she gets for people. There probably isn't a week that goes by where we do not receive a thank you note or I don't get stopped by someone who tells me about the difference her advocacy has made.

My staff and I will miss her presence in the office and her passion for helping others. I also know that the many families in Michigan whose lives she touched as well as those she worked with in agencies and in my office will miss her.

After leaving the Senate, Melissa looks forward to spending more time with her family and dogs, traveling and going to her cottage in Northern Michigan. She is very creative and I know her passion for quilting will result in many beautiful creations.

I am sad because I am losing a valued member of my staff, but I am happy to see her move on to new life experiences, and I wish her the best of everything.

RECOGNIZING PRICE OF FREEDOM MUSEUM

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the Price of Freedom Museum in China Grove, NC. The Price of Freedom Museum strives to pay tribute to those Americans who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the fight for freedom.

Bob Mault began collecting and preserving uniforms and military artifacts from all branches of the armed forces more than 40 years ago. These artifacts were first showcased in Mr. Mault's gas station in the 1970s, with the hope that others who saw these artifacts might be able to truly understand the price of freedom.

Thanks to the efforts of Mr. Mault's friend Frank Albright, many volunteers and donations, these military artifacts have now found a home at the Old Patterson School Complex, and I understand the historical collection now consists of more than 5,000 military artifacts—each representing a very unique and individual story. This collection now provides an educational and patriotic experience for all who see it.

It is always inspiring to hear of the efforts made by American citizens to pay tribute and give life to the stories of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in service to their country. We must always endeavor to remember those who have died so that we may live in freedom.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING VICTIMS FROM CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNITY

• Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Jeremiah MacKay, Michael Crain, Monica Quan, and Keith Lawrence—four extraordinary members of Southern California's public safety community who were tragically killed by the same deranged gunman. It is heartbreaking to lose these brave heroes, who dedicated their lives to protecting our families and our communities.

Jeremiah MacKay, a San Bernardino County sheriff's deputy, was a 14-year veteran of the force. He served at the Yucaipa sheriff's station and was a bagpiper and officer in the Inland Empire Emerald Society, which provides financial assistance for the families of fallen law enforcement officers. A native of San Bernardino and a graduate of Rim of the World High School in Lake Arrowhead, Jeremiah was a proud husband and father known for his love of family and his infectious laugh.

Michael Crain was a Riverside police officer who served as a patrol officer and a member of the Special Weapons and Tactics, SWAT, Team. During his 11-year tenure with the Riverside City Police Department, Officer Crain also served on the University Neighborhood Enhancement Team and as a Helicopter Observer, Field Training Officer, and Firearms Instructor. A decorated retired Marine sergeant, Officer Cain is remembered by his colleagues as a consummate family man who loved nothing more than coaching his son's baseball team or attending his daughter's dance recitals.

Monica Quan was the daughter of attorney Randal Quan, a former captain with the Los Angeles Police Department who had represented the shooter during his unsuccessful appeal of dismissal from the Los Angeles Police Department. Monica, a former high school and college basketball star, was the assistant women's basketball coach at California State University, Fullerton.

Keith Lawrence, Monica Quan's fiancé, was a public safety officer at the University of Southern California who had attended the Ventura County Sheriff's Academy and trained with the Oxnard Police Department. He and Monica met when both played basketball at Concordia University, and they had recently become engaged.

On behalf of the people of California, whom they served with such valor and distinction, I send my deepest condolences to the families and friends of

Jeremiah MacKay, Michael Crain, Monica Quan, and Keith Lawrence.●

REMEMBERING LORAN BAKER AND ELIZABETH BUTLER

● Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Loran ''Butch'' Baker and Elizabeth Butler, two members of the Santa Cruz Police Department who were recently killed in the line of duty. These extraordinary officers dedicated their lives to their family, community, and Nation. Their courage and dedication inspired all who were lucky enough to know them, and they will be deeply missed.

A 28-year veteran of the Santa Cruz Police Department, Detective Sergeant Baker was one of the most experienced and respected officers in Santa Cruz. He loved his job and served as a friend and mentor to many Central Coast law enforcement officials, including his son, Adam, who in 2010 joined the department as a community service officer. Detective Sergeant Baker was in turn inspired by his son, noting that he saw in Adam glimpses of himself when he had first started police work. Father and son relished working together. Adam called his dad ''Sarge'' at work, and the two had mailboxes next to each other marked ''Baker'' and ''A. Baker.''

Detective Sergeant Baker, a graduate of San Jose's Bellarmine College Preparatory and Fresno City College, patrolled Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz's downtown strip and he was easy to spot. As one friend noted, ''Even in the dead of winter, he always wore his signature shorts.'' Detective Sergeant Baker also worked in community services and hostage negotiations, served as a field training officer, and was one of the founding members of the DUI Enforcement Team. He was well known for his fantastic sense of humor, his infectious laugh, and his commitment to the community that loved him so much.

Detective Butler, a 10-year veteran of the Santa Cruz Police Department, grew up in Los Angeles and moved to Santa Cruz in 1992 to attend UC Santa Cruz, where she graduated as a community studies major. Filled with idealism and a passion for helping others, she first focused her talents on community development lending with the nonprofit Opportunity Fund and then Wells Fargo Bank, before settling into her career with the Santa Cruz Police Department. During her tenure, she worked as a patrol officer, hostage negotiator, downtown foot and bike officer, and agent assigned to the Santa Cruz County drug task force.

Detective Butler dearly loved living and working in Santa Cruz. She savored the morning buns rolled in sugar from Kelly's French Bakery and the sweeping views of Santa Cruz from atop a roller coaster at the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk. ''I enjoy living and working in Santa Cruz because one can enjoy the ocean, the mountains, interesting people, and a healthy lifestyle all in one spot,'' she once wrote. Detective Butler was known by friends and family as warm, caring, and funny. Above all, she loved spending time with her partner and two young sons.

On behalf of the people of California, whom they served so valiantly, I extend my deepest sympathies to Detective Sergeant Baker's wife, Kelly, and three children, Adam, Ashley, and Jillian; Detective Butler's partner, Peter, and two sons, Joaquin and Stellan; and their extended families, colleagues, and friends.●

REMEMBERING ALBERT ''CAP'' LAVIN

● Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Albert ''Cap'' Lavin, a high school and college basketball star, dedicated English teacher, and loving husband, father, and grandfather. Cap passed away on February 10, 2013 at the age of 82.

Cap Lavin was a San Francisco Bay Area native through and through. Growing up in San Francisco's Richmond District, Cap played pickup basketball games at Rochambeau Playground before becoming a star player and All-City guard on St. Ignatius College Preparatory's basketball team. He was so good that he was named St. Ignatius's player of the decade for the 1940s. He continued to hone his basketball skills at the University of San Francisco, where he played for two Hall of Fame coaches in the early 1950s and was later inducted into the USF Dons Hall of Fame.

Following college, Cap turned his love of reading into a 43-year-long career as an English teacher at the University of California Berkeley, San Francisco State University, Dominican University, and Drake High School in San Anselmo, his true home, where he taught English for 40 of those 43 years. Though his students at Drake kept him busy, Cap also found the time to author 19 books and co-found the Bay Area Writing Project at UC Berkeley. After inspiring generations of students, Cap retired from Drake in 1997.

In retirement, Cap and his wife, Mary, enjoyed exploring the Bay Area, hiking, biking, taking tai chi classes, and going to the opera, the symphony, and lectures in San Francisco. Those who knew Cap will always remember him as a generous, inspiring, and passionate man full of zest for life. His contributions to the sports world, academia, and the San Francisco Bay Area community will never be forgotten.

I extend my deepest condolences to Cap's loving wife, Mary; his children Rachel, John, Mark, Ken, Suzanne, and Steve; and his many grandchildren.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR NATHAN KLINE, RETIRED

● Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I wish to acknowledge the remarkable lifetime commitment of a Pennsylvania constituent to our Nation's security and veteran community. Maj. Nathan Kline, United States Air Force, Ret., has a total of 42 years of active and ready reserve service. His military career began at the age of 18 when he enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Forces in November 1942. During the war, he served as a B–26 Marauder bombardier and navigator who saw action during the D-day Invasion and the Battle of the Bulge. Serving on 65 missions, his aircraft was shot down twice. His actions during the war earned him a Distinguished Flying Cross, 10 Air Medals, and 4 Battle Stars for the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal. Years later, the French Ambassador would welcome Major Kline into the Legion of Honour as recognition to his endeavors that contributed to the liberation of the people of France.

After experiencing war firsthand, no one would have blamed Major Kline if he had withdrawn from service to live a quiet life in peace. Instead, he remained active in the military and continues to work hard to promote a society that respects its veterans and the sacrifices that they have made. Even in his advanced age, he continues to serve as an advocate on behalf of veterans and their families. As a founding member of the Lehigh Valley Military Affairs Council, LVMAC, he has raised money and created scholarships to help the families of those deployed, organized the assembly and shipment of care packages to deployed servicemembers, and assisted veterans in finding meaningful employment.

Major Kline helps veterans of all generations. He fights for the well-being of today's veterans and recognizes the challenges they face, including PTSD and TBI. Our veterans have paid a high price for our American ideals and freedom. Major Kline has never forgotten what he fought for when he enlisted in the service over 70 years ago. The reason why he fought for his country above the skies of Normandy is the same reason why the young servicemember today fights for his Nation in the hills and mountains of Afghanistan. I cannot express this sentiment any better than Major Kline when he said, ''the Greatest Generation will always be embodied in the hearts, minds, and souls of whoever our fighting troops are and wherever they might be.''

I share the story of Major Kline not just because of his heroic actions during the Second World War, but also because of his continued commitment to service. The commitment that a member of our military makes is usually not limited to service during war, but is often for life. Major Kline is a shining example of these principles.

Sequestration and budgetary constraints threaten our defense budget and our support for veterans. We as a nation must ensure that we do not drastically affect the pay, medical care, and family programs of our active, reserve, and retired veterans.

These men and women have served us before, and if Major Kline is any indication, they will continue to serve our communities for generations to come. For this reason and many others, we owe it to our Nation to ensure that our veterans are always supported and never forgotten.●

REMEMBERING MARIELLA POSEY

● Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to pay tribute to an inspired community leader, a passionate political activist and a tireless public servant to the great State of Washington, Ms. Mariella Posey.

Mariella was born June 23, 1936, in Hammond, IN. She was a graduate of Northwestern University, where she took night classes during her 20-year tenure working at World Book in downtown Chicago.

In 1984, Mariella's passion for politics took flight when she began volunteering with Paul Simon's campaign for the U.S. Senate. After a successful election, Mariella packed her bags and moved to Washington, D.C. where she served in the newly minted Illinois Senator's office until December 1996.

Then, in November 1997, Mariella joined my staff as our office manager, where she served the people of the Evergreen State for 12 excellent years until 2009. In the office, she was best known for her meticulous oversight of the budget while relying on her trusty typewriter and adding machine.

However, what she may be most remembered for was her steadfast commitment to the city of Alexandria, serving on the NorthEast Citizens' Association since 1986 and on the board since 1991. Mariella also served as NECA's co-secretary, co-treasurer, co-chair of the Land Use Committee, vice president and as their president. She took on issues large and small—including the location of a new stadium for the Washington Nationals and the Potomac River coal plant.

While she lived a private life, Mariella was not shy about her love for her cats and dogs and could always be found in front of the television at three o'clock watching her favorite show, As the World Turns.

Mariella passed away on Jan. 28, 2013 at the age of 76. She is survived by her long-time friend and roommate, Sylvia Sibrover. She will be missed dearly by not only myself, but by my staff—both former and current.

I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in paying homage to Mariella Posey. She lived a long and full life and I will always be grateful for her service in the U.S. Senate.●

REMEMBERING FRED KARL

● Mr. NELSON. Madam President, last week the State of Florida lost a dear friend, Fred Karl. I was honored to be asked by Fred's family to participate in his service and would like to share with you what I shared with them:

Listen to what some of the people of Florida have said about Fred Karl . . .

''His word was his bond . . .''

''No one questioned his integrity . . .''

''He was always helping others . . .''

''He was a legislative reformer who fought but genuinely liked his nemesis, Senator Dempsey Barron . . .''

''He was idealistic, but a realist . . .''

These are the thoughts of Floridians who knew and loved Fred Karl and appreciate his exceptional public service.

His smooth, lilting baritone belied the fact that he was a tank commander in World War II in the fierce Battle of the Bulge.

He ran for Governor—as a champion of education—but he couldn't amass the funds to beat Haydon Burns. Education was a passion. No wonder. His mother, Mary Karl, was an educator. Her school, Mary Karl's Vocational School, later became the community college and today is Daytona Beach State College.

He almost died because of medical mistakes in a hospital. The irony was later, when another hospital got into trouble; it was Fred who rescued them.

He was a smart savvy lawyer for almost everyone, more often than not turning around their near destruction toward success.

When Hillsborough County called upon Fred to be their attorney, he was able to restore honesty and integrity to a local government that had suffered from the corruption of its commissioners and judges.

He has been a blessing to the people of Tampa Bay—just as he has been a blessing to the people of Florida while serving in the Legislature and then on the High Court.

I remember Fred running for our state's Supreme Court.

At the time he was campaigning for himself, he was also promoting a constitutional amendment to have justices appointed instead of elected.

He later recalled ''on one hand, I was saying please elect me to the court, [on the other] I was saying vote for the amendment that does away with this election.'' To Fred, it was demeaning to see our judges out there raising campaign money.

He would later say: ''Here was somebody aspiring to sit on the Florida Supreme Court and making decisions about life and death and about constitutional matters . . . and I was out glad-handing and back-slapping like I was running for dog catcher.''

Well there's no doubt, Fred Karl was rare. And he always saw public service as one of the highest callings.

He was a public servant we could trust—a man who personified honesty and integrity . . .

So much so, his counsel was sought from the governor's mansion to the mayors' offices to the suites of Florida's newspaper publishers.

''There's no higher form of public service than the honest practice of politics,'' Fred said.

And Fred practiced what he preached!

And in so doing, he made a magnificent and cherished contribution to Florida's history.

To so many of us here today, he was our friend. He was our confidant.

But above all he was a devoted husband; a loving father; and, a beloved grandfather and great-grandfather.

May the family be granted strength to bear their loss. And let all of us all be forever grateful that Fred Karl touched our lives.●

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY JACKRABBITS

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I wish to honor the South Dakota State University men's and women's basketball teams on winning their respective 2013 Summit League Championships. This marks the Jackrabbits fifth consecutive women's Summit League Title and the men's basketball team's second consecutive Summit League Title. The Jackrabbits are also the only team in Division I to have both their men's and women's teams repeat as conference tournament champions this year.

The SDSU women's basketball team has a long history of success, including winning all five Summit League Tournaments since moving up to NCAA Division I. South Dakota State University, which concluded the regular season with a 22–7 overall record, won the Summit League Conference with a 14–2 record. With the tournament victory the Jackrabbits will go to their fifth NCAA Tournament in as many years.

Certainly, this successful season would not have been possible without the hard work of the players. The members of the 2012–2013 South Dakota State University women's basketball team are: Anne Aamlid, Gabrielle Boever, Mariah Clarin, Chloe Cornemann, Leah Dietel, Ashley Eide, Jessica Hart, Tara Heiser, Katie Lingle, Steph Paluch, Hannah Strop, Megan Stuart, Rachel Walters, and Megan Waytashek.

Although this accomplishment was truly a team effort, I would like to pay special recognition to their coach Aaron Johnston, who in his 13th season recorded his 300th win and became SDSU's all-time winning head coach. Coach Johnston's current record is 315–106. I also would like to congratulate assistant coaches Katie Falco, Mike Jewett, and Carissa Nord.

The SDSU men's basketball team has seen much recent success of its own. The Jacks posted a regular season record of 22–9 en route to its first regular season Summit League Conference championship, with a conference record of 13–3. Also, following a 73–67 win over rival North Dakota State University in the tournament championship, the Jacks have reached the NCAA tournament for the second year in a row.

SDSU's successful season could not have been possible without the dedication and determination of the players. The members of the 2012–2013 South Dakota men's basketball team are: Jake Bittle, Brayden Carlson, Connor Devine, Matt Donlan, Jordan Dykstra, Joey Feilmeier, Tony Fiegen, Marcus Heemstra, Zach Horstman, Cory Jacobsen, Taévaunn Prince, Ruben Silva, Chad White, Joshua White, and Nate Wolters.

Finally, I would like to congratulate Coach Scott Nagy on winning his first Summit League Conference regular season title as well as his second consecutive tournament championship as head coach of the Jackrabbits. I also would like to congratulate assistant coaches Brian Cooley, Austin Hansen, Rob Klinkefus and graduate assistant Nick Goff.

The coaches and student athletes of SDSU's men's and women's basketball team should be very proud of all of their remarkable achievements this season. On behalf of the State of South Dakota, I am honored to congratulate the Jackrabbits on their impressive seasons and wish them the best of luck in the NCAA Tournaments. Go Jacks!●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–831. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''U.S. Department of Transportation's Report to Congress and the National Transportation Safety Board Responding to Issues on the National Transportation Safety Board's 2013 Most Wanted List''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–832. A communication from the Director of Industry Analysis, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Steel Import Monitoring and Analysis System'' (RIN0625–AA93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–833. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anchorages; Captain of the Port Puget Sound Zone, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA01) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0159)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–834. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Artificial Island Anchorage No. 2 Partial Closure, Delaware River; Salem, NJ'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–835. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Updates to Standards Incorporated by Reference; Reapproved ASTM Standards; Technical Amendment'' ((RIN1625–AB98) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0866)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–836. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Inland Waterways Navigation Regulation; Sacramento River'' ((RIN1625–AB95) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0952)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–837. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; Reporting Requirements for Barges Loaded With Certain Dangerous Cargoes, Inland Rivers, Ninth Coast Guard District; Stay (Suspension)'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0019)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–838. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; Housatonic River, Bridge Replacement Operations; Stratford, CT'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0824)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–839. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone, Potomac and Anacostia Rivers; Washington, DC'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0938)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–840. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; MODU KULLUK; Sitkalidak Island to Kiliuda Bay, Alaska'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1088)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–841. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Grain-Shipment Vessels, Columbia and Willamette Rivers'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0010)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–842. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Woldenburg Park, Mississippi River, New Orleans, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1013)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–843. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Long Island, New York Inland Waterway from East Rockaway Inlet to Shinnecock Canal, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2012–1040)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–844. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Indian Street Bridge Construction, St. Lucie Canal, Palm City, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0828)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–845. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Pacific Northwest Grain Handlers Association Facilities; Columbia and Willamette Rivers'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2013–0011)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–846. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Bridge Demolition Project; Indiana Harbor Canal, East Chicago, Indiana'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2012–0904)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–847. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of a delay in the completion of a report relative to the Fiscal Year 2014 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA) procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–848. A communication from the Associate Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Iranian Financial Sanctions Regulations; Final Rule'' (31 CFR Part 561) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–849. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–850. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–851. A communication from the Chair of the Medicaid and CHIP Payment Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on

Medicaid and CHIP''; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Mary Jo White of New York, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 2014.

*Richard Cordray of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection for a term of five years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 602. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BURR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COATS, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 603. A bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 604. A bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 605. A bill to improve Federal dairy programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 606. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to loans made from a qualified employer plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 607. A bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 608. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve coverage for colorectal screening tests under Medicare and private health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 609. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land in San Juan County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHANNS (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BURR, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 610. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 611. A bill to make a technical amendment to the T'uf Shur Bien Preservation Trust Area Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 612. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to remove social security account numbers from Medicare identification cards and communications provided to Medicare beneficiaries in order to protect Medicare beneficiaries from identity theft; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 613. A bill to increase the mileage reimbursement rate for members of the armed services during permanent change of station and to authorize the transportation of additional motor vehicles of members on change of permanent station to or from nonforeign areas outside the continental United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 614. A bill to require the continuation of tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces for the remainder of fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 615. A bill to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 616. A bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 617. A bill to provide humanitarian assistance and support a democratic transition in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 80. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 2013 as ''National Middle Level Education Month''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHANNS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 81. A resolution commemorating March 19, 2013, as the 40th anniversary of National Ag Day; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Con. Res. 9. A concurrent resolution recommending the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor to Sergeant Rafael Peralta; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 20

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 20, a bill to repeal the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 132

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of New Columbia into the Union.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to enhance the energy security of United States allies, and for other purposes.

S. 232

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 232, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 296

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 296, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate discrimination in the immigration laws by permitting permanent partners of United States citizens and lawful permanent residents to obtain lawful permanent resident status in the same manner as spouses of citizens and lawful permanent residents and to penalize immigration fraud in connection with permanent partnerships.

S. 330

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 330, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

S. 336

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from South Carolina

(Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 336, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from approving the introduction into commerce of gasoline that contains greater than 10-volume-percent ethanol, and for other purposes.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty.

S. 370

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to improve and expand geographic literacy among kindergarten through grade 12 students in the United States by improving professional development programs for kindergarten through grade 12 teachers offered through institutions of higher education.

S. 395

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 395, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 419

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 419, a bill to limit the use of cluster munitions.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 427, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to provide flexibility to school food authorities in meeting certain nutritional requirements for the school lunch and breakfast programs, and for other purposes.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that the Purple Heart occupy a position of precedence above the new Distinguished Warfare Medal.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 554, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 582, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

S. 597

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 597, a bill to ensure the effective administration of criminal justice.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding conditions for the United States becoming a signatory to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, or to any similar agreement on the arms trade.

S. RES. 60

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 60, a resolution supporting women's reproductive health.

S. RES. 65

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 65, a resolution strongly supporting the full implementation of United States and international sanctions on Iran and urging the President to continue to strengthen enforcement of sanctions legislation.

AMENDMENT NO. 55

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 55 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 74

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 74 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 82

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 82 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MORAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 82 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, supra.

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 82 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 607. A bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act of 2013—a bill to strengthen the privacy protections for email and other electronic communications. Last year, the Judiciary Committee favorably reported substantially similar legislation with strong bipartisan support. I thank Republican Senator MIKE LEE for cosponsoring this important privacy bill. Senator LEE and I understand that protecting Americans' privacy rights is something that is important to all Americans, regardless of political party or ideology. I hope that all Senators will support this bill and that

the Senate will pass this privacy legislation this year.

Like many Americans, I am concerned about growing and unwelcome intrusions into our private lives in cyberspace. I also understand that we must update our digital privacy laws to keep pace with these threats and the rapid advances in technology.

When I led the effort to write ECPA 27 years ago, email was a novelty. No one could have imagined the way the Internet and mobile technologies would transform how we communicate and exchange information today. Three decades later, we must update this law to reflect the realities of our time, so that our Federal privacy laws keep pace with American innovation and the changing mission of our law enforcement agencies.

My bill takes several important steps to improve Americans' digital privacy rights, while also promoting new technologies, like cloud computing, and accommodating the legitimate needs of law enforcement. First, the bill requires that the government obtain a search warrant based on probable cause to obtain the content of Americans' email and other electronic communications, when those communications are requested from a third-party service provider. There are balanced exceptions to the warrant requirement to address emergency circumstances and to protect national security under current law.

Second, the bill requires that the government promptly notify any individual whose email content has been accessed via a third-party service provider, and provide that individual with a copy of the search warrant and other details about the information obtained. The bill permits the government to seek a court order temporarily delaying such notice in order to protect the integrity of ongoing government investigations. In addition, the bill permits the government to ask a court to temporarily preclude a service provider from notifying a customer about the disclosure.

The bill contains several important provisions to ensure that the reforms to ECPA do not hinder law enforcement. The bill adds a new notice requirement to the law that requires service providers to notify the government of their intent to inform a customer about a disclosure of electronic communications information at least three business days before giving such notice. Furthermore, to help law enforcement investigate and prosecute corporate wrongdoing, the bill adds civil discovery subpoenas to the existing tools that the government may use to obtain non-content information under ECPA.

In addition, the bill makes clear that the government may also continue to use administrative, civil discovery and grand jury subpoena to obtain corporate email and other electronic communications directly from a corporate entity, when those communications are contained on an internal email system. Lastly, the bill also provides that the search warrant requirement in the bill does not apply to other Federal criminal or national security laws, including Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1986, commonly known as the Wiretap Act, and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, 50 U.S.C. § 1801, et seq., commonly known as FISA.

Since I first put forward proposals to update ECPA in early 2011, I have worked to make sure that these updates carefully balance privacy interests, the needs of law enforcement and the interests of our thriving American tech sector. During the past 2 years, I have consulted with many stakeholders from the Federal, state and local law enforcement communities, including—the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies, and the National Sheriffs Association. I have also consulted closely with many leaders in the privacy, civil liberties, civil rights and technology communities who support these reforms.

The 113th Congress has an important opportunity to address the digital privacy challenges that Americans face today. We should do so by enacting the commonsense privacy reforms contained in this bill.

When the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably reported the Electronic Communications Privacy Act on September 19, 1986, it did so with the unanimous support of all Democratic and Republican Senators. At the time, the Committee recognized that protecting Americans' privacy rights should not be a partisan issue.

In that bipartisan spirit, I am pleased to join with Senator LEE in urging the Congress to enact these important privacy reforms without delay. Senator LEE and I are joined in this effort by a broad coalition of more than 50 privacy, civil liberties, civil rights and tech industry leaders from across the political spectrum that have also endorsed the ECPA reform effort. I thank the Digital Due Process Coalition, the Digital 4th Coalition and the many other individuals and organizations that have advocated for ECPA reform for their support. I hope that all Members of the Senate will follow their example, so that we can enact this digital privacy bill with strong, bipartisan support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 607

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. CONFIDENTIALITY OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 2702(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(3) a provider of remote computing service or electronic communication service to the public shall not knowingly divulge to any governmental entity the contents of any communication described in section 2703(a), or any record or other information pertaining to a subscriber or customer of such service.''.

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION OF 180-DAY RULE; SEARCH WARRANT REQUIREMENT; REQUIRED DISCLOSURE OF CUSTOMER RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following:

''(a) CONTENTS OF WIRE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS.—A governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in electronic storage with or otherwise stored, held, or maintained by the provider only if the governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure.

''(b) NOTICE.—Except as provided in section 2705, not later than 10 business days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not later than 3 business days in the case of any other governmental entity, after a governmental entity receives the contents of a wire or electronic communication of a subscriber or customer from a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service under subsection (a), the governmental entity shall serve upon, or deliver to by registered or first-class mail, electronic mail, or other means reasonably calculated to be effective, as specified by the court issuing the warrant, the subscriber or customer—

''(1) a copy of the warrant; and

''(2) a notice that includes the information referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) of section 2705(a)(4)(B).

''(c) RECORDS CONCERNING ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE OR REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), a governmental entity may require a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to disclose a record or other information pertaining to a subscriber or customer of the provider or service (not including the contents of communications), only if the governmental entity—

''(A) obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure;

''(B) obtains a court order directing the disclosure under subsection (d);

''(C) has the consent of the subscriber or customer to the disclosure; or

''(D) submits a formal written request relevant to a law enforcement investigation concerning telemarketing fraud for the name, address, and place of business of a subscriber or customer of the provider or service that is engaged in telemarketing (as defined in section 2325).

''(2) INFORMATION TO BE DISCLOSED.—A provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service shall, in response to an administrative subpoena authorized by Federal or State statute, a grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena, or any means authorized under paragraph (1), disclose to a governmental entity the—

''(A) name;

''(B) address;

''(C) local and long distance telephone connection records, or records of session times and durations;

''(D) length of service (including start date) and types of service used;

''(E) telephone or instrument number or other subscriber number or identity, including any temporarily assigned network address; and

''(F) means and source of payment for such service (including any credit card or bank account number), of a subscriber or customer of such service.

''(3) NOTICE NOT REQUIRED.—A governmental entity that receives records or information under this subsection is not required to provide notice to a subscriber or customer.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or in section 2702 shall be construed to limit the authority of a governmental entity to use an administrative subpoena authorized under a Federal or State statute or to use a Federal or State grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena to—

''(1) require an originator, addressee, or intended recipient of an electronic communication to disclose the contents of the electronic communication to the governmental entity; or

''(2) require an entity that provides electronic communication services to the officers, directors, employees, or agents of the entity (for the purpose of carrying out their duties) to disclose the contents of an electronic communication to or from an officer, director, employee, or agent of the entity to a governmental entity, if the electronic communication is held, stored, or maintained on an electronic communications system owned or operated by the entity.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2703(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''A court order for disclosure under subsection (b) or (c)'' and inserting ''A court order for disclosure under subsection (c)''; and

(2) by striking ''the contents of a wire or electronic communication, or''.

SEC. 4. DELAYED NOTICE.

Section 2705 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 2705. DELAYED NOTICE.

''(a) DELAY OF NOTIFICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A governmental entity that is seeking a warrant under section 2703(a) may include in the application for the warrant a request for an order delaying the notification required under section 2703(b) for a period of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

''(2) DETERMINATION.—A court shall grant a request for delayed notification made under paragraph (1) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the warrant may result in—

''(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

''(B) flight from prosecution;

''(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

''(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

''(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

''(3) EXTENSION.—Upon request by a governmental entity, a court may grant 1 or more extensions of the delay of notification granted under paragraph (2) of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

''(4) EXPIRATION OF THE DELAY OF NOTIFICATION.—Upon expiration of the period of delay of notification under paragraph (2) or (3), the governmental entity shall serve upon, or deliver to by registered or first-class mail, electronic mail, or other means reasonably calculated to be effective as specified by the court approving the search warrant, the customer or subscriber—

''(A) a copy of the warrant; and

''(B) notice that informs the customer or subscriber—

''(i) of the nature of the law enforcement inquiry with reasonable specificity;

''(ii) that information maintained for the customer or subscriber by the provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service named in the process or request was supplied to, or requested by, the governmental entity;

''(iii) of the date on which the warrant was served on the provider and the date on which the information was provided by the provider to the governmental entity;

''(iv) that notification of the customer or subscriber was delayed;

''(v) the identity of the court authorizing the delay; and

''(vi) of the provision of this chapter under which the delay was authorized.

''(b) PRECLUSION OF NOTICE TO SUBJECT OF GOVERNMENTAL ACCESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A governmental entity that is obtaining the contents of a communication or information or records under section 2703 may apply to a court for an order directing a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to which a warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive under section 2703 is directed not to notify any other person of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive for a period of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

''(2) DETERMINATION.—A court shall grant a request for an order made under paragraph (1) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive may result in—

''(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

''(B) flight from prosecution;

''(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

''(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

''(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

''(3) EXTENSION.—Upon request by a governmental entity, a court may grant 1 or more extensions of an order granted under paragraph (2) of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

''(4) PRIOR NOTICE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Upon expiration of the period of delay of notice under this section, and not later than 3 business days before providing notice to a customer or subscriber, a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service shall notify the governmental entity that obtained the contents of a communication or information or records under section 2703 of the intent of the provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to notify the customer or subscriber of the existence of the warrant, order, or subpoena seeking that information.

''(c) DEFINITION.—In this section and section 2703, the term 'law enforcement agency' means an agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law, or any other Federal or State agency conducting a criminal investigation.''.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to apply the warrant requirement for contents of a wire or electronic communication authorized under this Act or an amendment made by this Act to any other section of title 18, United States Code (including chapter 119 of such title (commonly known as the ''Wiretap Act'')), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), or any other provision of Federal law.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 608. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve coverage for colorectal screening tests under Medicare and private health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Supporting Colorectal Examination and Education Now, SCREEN, Act. This legislation promotes access to colon cancer screenings in an effort to help prevent colorectal cancer, save lives, and reduce costs for families, the Medicare program, and the health care system. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this critical piece of legislation.

Colorectal cancer affects far too many Americans. The rate of colon cancer deaths is shocking—taking the lives of over 50,000 people this year alone, according to the American Cancer Society.

Fortunately, colorectal cancer is highly preventable with screening, and colon cancer screening tests rank among the most effective preventive screenings available. A recent study in the New England Journal of Medicine found that removal of precancerous polyps during a screening colonoscopy may reduce colon cancer deaths by over 50 percent. Early detection and intervention are key to preventing colon cancer. Colonoscopy screenings are different from other types of preventive or screening services because pre-cancerous polyps found during a screening are removed during the same visit, thus preventing a potential cancer from developing and helping to ensure detection, intervention, and prevention.

Congress recognized the value of colon cancer screenings and, through bipartisan legislation that I authored in 1998, established a Medicate benefit for screening. The problem is that only half of individuals coveted by the Medicare program receive a screening colonoscopy, even though a Medicate

colorectal cancer screening benefit is available. According to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, CMS, Medicare claims show that only 52 percent of beneficiaries have had a colorectal cancer screening test. Many barriers account for this, including patient education on screenings and operational issues within the Medicare program, but colorectal cancer has become too widespread and we have reached the time to take action to promote prevention and save lives. Ensuring that individuals receive colorectal cancer screening tests is critical to this goal.

In addition, detection and intervention through proper colonoscopy screening should reduce costs to the Medicare program and health care system overall. Once colon cancer develops, the direct costs of treating colon cancer are starting—reaching $4 billion in 2010. A recent study published in the New England Journal of Medicine concluded that colorectal cancer screening has been shown to reduce Medicare long-term costs.

Congress must help promote access to colorectal cancer screenings and help increase the number of persons receiving these life-saving screening tests. The SCREEN Act takes many steps to increase the rate of colorectal cancer screenings and help prevent colon cancer, while also reducing Medicare costs.

The SCREEN Act first waives cost sharing for Medicare beneficiaries receiving colorectal cancer screenings where precancerous polyps are removed during the visit. Currently, Medicare waives cost-sharing for any colorectal cancer screening recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force, USPSTF. Colorectal cancer screens have a grade ''A'' recommendation by USPSTF. However, if the doctor finds and removes a precancerous polyp during the visit, the procedure is no longer considered a ''screening'' for Medicare purposes—and the beneficiary would be forced to pay the Medicare coinsurance. In February 2013, the Administration announced that private insurers participating in State-based health insurance exchanges must waive all cost sharing for colon cancers screenings where a polyp is removed. This bill promotes a similar policy by waiving Medicare cost sharing for diagnostic and screening colorectal cancer tests.

Additionally, the SCREEN Act extends Medicare coverage to include an office visit or consultation so that a Medicare beneficiary may sit down and discuss the screening with a doctor prior to the colonoscopy procedures. One of the major barriers to increasing colorectal cancer screening rates is a patient's lack of knowledge and the ''fear of the procedure.'' This pre-procedure visit is not only good clinical practice but also would help increase patient utilization of colorectal cancer screening. This visit allows the individual to ask questions about the procedure, assures selection of the proper screening test, and increases beneficiary education and test preparation. There is no reason for a Medicare beneficiary to be seeing his or her physician for the first time only just before being sedated for the procedure.

The SCREEN Act also provides incentives for Medicare providers to participate in nationally recognized quality improvement registries so that our Medicare beneficiaries are receiving the quality screening they deserve. Congress and other organizations can look to the SCREEN Act as a model for Medicare reimbursement reform as the bill reimburses providers in a budget neutral manner based on the quality of the procedure and not volume of services.

Promoting access to colorectal cancer screening will help ensure detection and intervention of this highly preventable disease and reduce costs to the health care system. I ask my colleagues to join in support of this fight to end colorectal cancer by cosponsoring this important legislation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 612. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to remove social security account numbers from Medicare identification cards and communications provided to Medicare beneficiaries in order to protect Medicare beneficiaries from identity theft; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I join my colleague, Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, to introduce the Social Security Number Protection Act of 2013, a bill that would remove Social Security numbers from Medicare cards to address a leading cause of identity theft among our Nation's seniors.

It is estimated that 11.6 million Americans were victims of identity theft in 2011, up from 10.2 million in 2010. We know that the misuse of Social Security numbers is one of the primary drivers of this crime. In many of these cases, identity thieves obtain them from Medicare cards.

Today, over 49 million beneficiaries carry their Medicare cards with them in their purses and in their wallets. These cards display a Medicare identification number, which consists of their Social Security number with a one- or two-digit code at the end, leaving beneficiaries particularly vulnerable to identity theft should a card be lost, stolen, or left in plain sight.

With identity theft on the rise, we can't make it this easy for thieves. Unfortunately, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Service, CMS, has fallen behind many other public and private organizations in better protecting seniors from identity theft by continuing to display Social Security numbers on Medicare cards. The Department of Defense, the Veterans Administration, and private insurers have all figured out how to transition to individual identification cards that don't include Social Security numbers.

In 2005, I offered an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2006 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill to require CMS to remove Social Security numbers from Medicare cards. Although my amendment was adopted with a rollcall vote of 98 to 0, the final bill directed CMS to report to Congress on the steps necessary to remove the numbers. CMS provided that report in October 2006.

Six and a half years have passed since CMS first explored taking steps to remove Social Security numbers from Medicare cards. The Inspector General of the Social Security Administration took CMS to task in 2008 for its inaction and confirmed the risk that display of the numbers on Medicare cards poses to seniors. The Social Security inspector concluded that ''immediate action is needed to address this significant vulnerability.'' CMS has since issued another report, but it has failed to take action.

The Social Security Number Protection Act of 2013 establishes a reasonable timetable—3 years—for CMS to begin removing Social Security numbers from Medicare cards. It also gives CMS flexibility in determining the method by which it makes this change, enabling it to pursue an option that minimizes burdens while maximizing cost effectiveness. The bill also prohibits CMS from displaying Social Security numbers on all written and electronic communications to Medicare beneficiaries.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation and work with me to advance this long overdue change. CMS already requires that beneficiaries receiving benefits through Medicare Part C and Part D do not display individuals' Social Security numbers. Further, it has 6 years' worth of reports and cost data that it can use as tools to make these changes happen. We should extend this protection to all beneficiaries and help safeguard our Nation's seniors from becoming victims of identity theft in the future as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 612

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Social Security Number Protection Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. REQUIRING THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES TO PROHIBIT THE DISPLAY OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBERS ON MEDICARE IDENTIFICATION CARDS AND COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDED TO MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish and begin to implement procedures to eliminate the unnecessary collection, use, and display of social security account numbers of Medicare beneficiaries.

(b) MEDICARE CARDS AND COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDED TO BENEFICIARIES.—

(1) CARDS.—

(A) NEW CARDS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall ensure that each newly issued Medicare identification card meets the requirements described in subparagraph (C).

(B) REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING CARDS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall ensure that all Medicare beneficiaries have been issued a Medicare identification card that meets the requirements of subparagraph (C).

(C) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements described in this subparagraph are, with respect to a Medicare identification card, that the card does not display or electronically store (in an unencrypted format) a Medicare beneficiary's social security account number.

(2) COMMUNICATIONS PROVIDED TO BENEFICIARIES.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prohibit the display of a Medicare beneficiary's social security account number on written or electronic communication provided to the beneficiary unless the Secretary determines that inclusion of social security account numbers on such communications is essential for the operation of the Medicare program.

(c) MEDICARE BENEFICIARY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Medicare beneficiary'' means an individual who is entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act or enrolled under part B of such title.

(d) CONFORMING REFERENCE IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.—Section 205(c)(2)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(c)(2)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(xii) For provisions relating to requiring the Secretary of Health and Human Services to prohibit the display of social security account numbers on Medicare identification cards and communications provided to Medicare beneficiaries, see section 2 of the Social Security Number Protection Act of 2011.''.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 80—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 2013 AS ''NATIONAL MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION MONTH''

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 80

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Association for Middle Level Education, the National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform, and the National Association of Elementary School Principals have declared March 2013 to be ''National Middle Level Education Month'';

Whereas schools that educate middle level students are responsible for educating nearly 24,000,000 young adolescents between the ages of 10 and 15, in grades 5 through 9, who are undergoing rapid and dramatic changes in their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, and moral development;

Whereas those young adolescents deserve challenging and engaging instruction, knowledgeable teachers and administrators who are prepared to provide young adolescents with a safe, challenging, and supportive learning environment, and organizational structures that banish anonymity and promote personalization, collaboration, and social equity;

Whereas the habits and values established during early adolescence have a lifelong influence that directly affects the future health and welfare of the United States;

Whereas research indicates that the academic achievement of a student in eighth grade has a larger impact on the readiness of that student for college at the end of high school than any academic achievement of that student in high school; and

Whereas, in order to improve graduation rates and prepare students to be lifelong learners who are ready for college, a career, and civic participation, it is necessary for the people of the United States to have a deeper understanding of the distinctive mission of middle level education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and recognizes the importance of middle level education and the contributions of the individuals who educate middle level students; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Middle Level Education Month by visiting and celebrating schools that are responsible for educating young adolescents in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 81—COMMEMORATING MARCH 19, 2013, AS THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL AG DAY

Mr. JOHANNS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 81

Whereas, in 1973, the National Ag Day program was established to increase public awareness of the vital role of agriculture in the United States;

Whereas the agriculture industry is part of the very fabric of the United States, driving the economy, fostering ingenuity, and preserving the deepest values of the people of the United States;

Whereas the average farmer in the United States today feeds nearly 150 people, a dramatic increase from just 25 people per farmer in the 1960s;

Whereas the agriculture industry in the United States produces an incredible variety of meats, grains, fruits, vegetables, dairy, beans, nuts, seeds, and other important foods;

Whereas more than 2,000,000 farmers and ranchers contribute more than $300,000,000,000 to the United States economy every year; and

Whereas farmers comprise less than 2 percent of the population of the United States, yet produce more than enough food for the people of the United States and hundreds of millions of people around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the National Ag Day program for its annual celebration of agriculture in the United States;

(2) honors the researchers, entrepreneurs, businesses, and innovators who support farm families in the United States and help drive the agriculture economy; and

(3) celebrates family farmers and ranchers, who are the backbone of food production in the United States and produce the safest, most abundant, and most affordable food supply in the world.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9—RECOMMENDING THE POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO SERGEANT RAFAEL PERALTA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. CON. RES. 9

Whereas, in November 2004, the Marine Corps led combat operations to retake the insurgent stronghold of Fallujah, Iraq, as part of Operation Phantom Fury;

Whereas Marine Corps Sergeant Rafael Peralta and thousands of other Marines entered the city of Fallujah, coming into immediate contact with the enemy and engaging in some of the most intense combat in the entire Iraq war;

Whereas Sergeant Peralta, serving with 1st Battalion, 3rd Marines, cleared scores of houses for days, and on November 14, 2004, asked to join an under-strength squad;

Whereas, the following morning, a close-quarter fight erupted as Sergeant Peralta and his squad of Marines cleared their seventh house of the day;

Whereas Sergeant Peralta, attempting to move out of the line of fire, was hit in the back of the head by a fragment from a ricocheted bullet;

Whereas the insurgents, in the process of fleeing the house, threw a fragmentation grenade through a window, landing directly near the head of Sergeant Peralta;

Whereas Sergeant Peralta reached for the grenade and pulled it to his body, absorbing the blast and shielding the other Marines who were only feet away;

Whereas, on November 15, 2004, Sergeant Peralta made the ultimate sacrifice to save the lives of his fellow Marines;

Whereas Sergeant Peralta was posthumously recommended by the Marine Corps and the Department of the Navy for the Medal of Honor;

Whereas 7 eyewitnesses confirmed that Sergeant Peralta smothered the grenade with his body, with 4 of the accounts, taken independently, stating that Sergeant Peralta gathered the grenade with his right arm;

Whereas the historical standard for awarding the Medal of Honor is 2 eyewitness accounts;

Whereas, in 2008, the nomination of Sergeant Peralta for the Medal of Honor was downgraded to the Navy Cross after an independent panel determined that Sergeant Peralta could not deliberately have pulled the grenade to his body due to his head wound, despite 7 eyewitness accounts to the contrary;

Whereas, in 2012, new and previously unconsidered evidence, consisting of combat video and an independent pathology report, was submitted to the Department of the Navy;

Whereas based on the new evidence, a review of the case was initiated;

Whereas, in December 2012, the upgrade from the Navy Cross to the Medal of Honor

for Sergeant Peralta was denied, despite an announcement of the support of the Department of the Navy for the upgrade;

Whereas the citation for the Navy Cross awarded to Sergeant Peralta states, ''without hesitation and with complete disregard for his own personal safety, Sergeant Peralta reached out and pulled the grenade to his body, absorbing the brunt of the blast and shielding fellow Marines only feet away'';

Whereas Sergeant Peralta wrote to his brother in the days preceding his death, saying, ''I'm proud to be a Marine, a U.S. Marine, and to defend and protect the freedom and Constitution of America. You should be proud of being an American citizen'';

Whereas Sergeant Peralta, who was born in Mexico and immigrated with his family to San Diego, California, enlisted in the Marine Corps on the same morning he received his proof of permanent residence, commonly known as a green card; and

Whereas Sergeant Peralta and his fellow Marines are an inspiration for their service, selflessness, and sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) honors Sergeant Rafael Peralta, a Mexican-American who enlisted in the Marine Corps on the same day he received his permanent residence status, for his dedication to the Marine Corps and the United States, and for upholding the highest standards of military service;

(2) recognizes that the courage and selfless actions of Sergeant Peralta in combat saved the lives of his fellow Marines;

(3) concurs with the Marine Corps and the Department of the Navy that the actions of Sergeant Peralta are in the spirit and tradition of the Medal of Honor;

(4) maintains that eyewitness accounts confirm that Sergeant Peralta deliberately pulled the grenade to his body and, consistent with previous Medal of Honor awards, the eyewitness accounts should be the leading and deciding factor in evaluating the nomination of Sergeant Peralta for the Medal of Honor; and

(5) recommends that Sergeant Peralta posthumously be awarded the Medal of Honor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today with Senator RUBIO to submit a resolution recommending the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor to Sergeant Rafael Peralta, United States Marine Corps.

My friend and colleague from California, Representative DUNCAN HUNTER, will introduce this resolution in the House and I am proud to work with him on this important matter.

Our resolution recognizes that Sergeant Peralta's courageous and selfless actions in combat saved the lives of his fellow Marines.

Our resolution concurs with the Marine Corps and the Department of the Navy that Sergeant Peralta's actions are in the spirit and tradition of the Medal of Honor; maintains that, consistent with previous Medal of Honor awards, the eyewitness accounts confirm that Sergeant Peralta deliberately pulled the grenade into his body and that eyewitness accounts should be the leading and deciding factor in evaluating Sergeant Peralta's Medal of Honor nomination; and recommends that Sergeant Peralta be posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor.

Sergeant Peralta was a true American hero.

He was born in Mexico and immigrated as a young child with his family to San Diego, CA.

He embraced his new life and anxiously awaited the opportunity to serve his adopted country and give something back.

In fact, on the very day he received permanent legal resident status in the United States, he joined the United States Marine Corps.

Sergeant Peralta deployed to Iraq as a scout team leader assigned to Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 3rd Marine Regiment.

In November 2004, Sergeant Peralta and his battalion were involved in intense house-to-house fighting in an effort to reclaim Fallujah, Iraq from insurgents.

After clearing scores of houses for days, he asked to join an understrength squad.

Upon entering their seventh house of the day, Sergeant Peralta's squad came into direct contact with insurgents and he was hit in the back of the head by a fragment from a ricocheted bullet.

As insurgents fled the house they threw a grenade through a window which landed near Sergeant Peralta's head. Despite his wounds, he was able to reach for the grenade and pull it under his body to absorb the blast.

He was killed instantly but his sacrifice saved the lives of his fellow Marines.

For his selflessness and heroism, Sergeant Peralta was recommended for the Medal of Honor by his local commanders, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Now, the historical standard for awarding the Medal of Honor is two eyewitness accounts. Sergeant Peralta has seven.

Seven eyewitnesses gave sworn statements attesting that Sergeant Peralta smothered the grenade and placed it under his body in order to absorb the explosion.

Four of those accounts, taken independently, state that he pulled the grenade to his body with his right arm.

Nevertheless, an independent panel formed by then Secretary of Defense Robert Gates determined that Sergeant Peralta could not have deliberately pulled the grenade to his body because he was immediately incapacitated after being shot in the head.

Secretary Gates agreed with its conclusions and Sergeant Peralta was awarded the Navy Cross instead of the Medal of Honor.

Yet, despite the panel's findings, the citation for the Navy Cross agrees with the eyewitness accounts and states that ''without hesitation and with complete disregard for his own personal safety, Sergeant Peralta reached out and pulled the grenade to his body, absorbing the brunt of the blast and shielding fellow Marines only feet away.''

In fact, his family has refused to accept the Navy Cross and has worked tirelessly to ensure that Sergeant Peralta's actions are not forgotten and properly recognized with the Medal of Honor.

In 2012, Representative HUNTER submitted new and previously unconsidered evidence, including combat video and an independent pathology report, to the Department of the Navy.

Dr. Vincent DiMaio of San Antonio, Texas volunteered to review the case for Sergeant Peralta's family and submitted the report.

He concluded that, in all medical probability, Sergeant Peralta was not immediately incapacitated after being shot, and, in fact, reached for the grenade and pulled it under his body.

After a new review of the evidence, the Department of the Navy once again recommended Sergeant Peralta for the Medal of Honor.

Unfortunately, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta denied the request.

I have the utmost respect for the judgment of Secretary Gates and Secretary Panetta. On this matter, I just take a different view and I urge our new Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, to take another look at this matter.

I do not take the awarding of the Medal of Honor lightly. Indeed, the Medal of Honor is our country's highest and most prestigious military award.

It says something to me that seven eyewitnesses verified that Sergeant Peralta absorbed the blast of the grenade and saved the lives of his fellow Marines.

It says something to me that the citation for the Navy Cross backs up the eyewitness accounts.

It says something to me that Sergeant Peralta was recommended for the award by his local commanders, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It says something to me that the Secretary of the Navy has even publicly stated that he believes Sergeant Peralta deserves the Medal of Honor.

Sergeant Peralta gave his life for our country and his fellow Marines. His actions in combat and the evidence make it clear to me that he has gone above and beyond the call of duty and is deserving of the Medal of Honor.

In the days before his death, he wrote to his brother saying ''I'm proud to be a Marine, a U.S. Marine, and to defend and protect the freedom and Constitution of America. You should be proud too of being an American citizen.''

Let us honor this American hero and show our pride in being Americans by passing this resolution.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to advise you that the Senate

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold a business meeting on Thursday, March 21, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider the nomination of Sally Jewell to be the Secretary of the Interior.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224–7571 or Abigail Campbell at (202) 224–4905.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct an executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Bipartisan Solutions for Housing Finance Reform?''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The President's 2013 Trade Agenda.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Can We Do More to Keep Savings in the Retirement System'' on March 19, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Judicial Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The American Airlines/US Airways Merger: Consolidation, Competition, and Consumers.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS, ATMOSPHERE, FISHERIES, AND THE COAST GUARD

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and the Coast Guard of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 10:30 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''Developments and Opportunities in U.S. Fisheries Management.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EASTERN AND SOUTH AND CENTRAL ASIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2012, at 10 a.m., to hold a Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, ''Syria's Humanitarian Crisis.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCES, AND INVESTMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2013, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Streamlining Regulation, Improving Consumer Protection and Increasing Competition in Insurance Markets.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL AG DAY

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 81 submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 81) commemorating March 19, 2013, as the 40th anniversary of National Ag Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 81) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2013

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 20, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use until later in the day, and that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 933, the continuing appropriations bill, with the time until 11:15 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, there will be three rollcall votes in relation to the CR tomorrow at about 11:15 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 20, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

PATRICIA E. CAMPBELL–SMITH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LAWRENCE BASKIR, RETIRING.

ELAINE D. KAPLAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE CHRISTINE O. C. MILLER, TERM EXPIRED.

MICHAEL KENNY O'KEEFE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE JOAN Z. MCAVOY, RETIRED.

ROBERT D. OKUN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LINDA KAY DAVIS, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

THOMAS EDWARD PEREZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE HILDA L. SOLIS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CATHERINE M. RUSSELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. SUSAN J. HELMS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID L. MANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. ERIK C. PETERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. BRENTLY F. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTIE L. NIXON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL JEFFREY L. BANNISTER
BRIGADIER GENERAL SCOTT D. BERRIER
BRIGADIER GENERAL GWENDOLYN BINGHAM
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOSEPH A. BRENDLER
BRIGADIER GENERAL CLARENCE K. K. CHINN
BRIGADIER GENERAL EDWARD F. DORMAN III
BRIGADIER GENERAL TERRY R. FERRELL
BRIGADIER GENERAL CHARLES A. FLYNN
BRIGADIER GENERAL GEORGE J. FRANZ III
BRIGADIER GENERAL CHRISTOPHER K. HAAS
BRIGADIER GENERAL THOMAS A. HORLANDER
BRIGADIER GENERAL THOMAS S. JAMES, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL OLE A. KNUDSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL JONATHAN A. MADDUX
BRIGADIER GENERAL THEODORE D. MARTIN
BRIGADIER GENERAL KEVIN G. O'CONNELL
BRIGADIER GENERAL BARRYE L. PRICE
BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES M. RICHARDSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL MARTIN P. SCHWEITZER
BRIGADIER GENERAL RICHARD L. STEVENS
BRIGADIER GENERAL STEPHEN M. TWITTY
BRIGADIER GENERAL PETER D. UTLEY
BRIGADIER GENERAL GARY J. VOLESKY
BRIGADIER GENERAL DARRYL A. WILLIAMS
BRIGADIER GENERAL MICHAEL E. WILLIAMSON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES M. GURGANUS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN E. WISSLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RONALD L. BAILEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STEVEN A. HUMMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH J. GLUECK, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. TERRY J. BENEDICT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOSEPH W. RIXEY

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JONATHAN F. POTTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

HILARIO A. PASCUA
GERARDO C. RIVERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JAMES D. PEAKE
ALI K. SONMEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JOHN D. PITCHER

To be lieutenant colonel

CHRISTINA M. CAWLEY
JEANNE C. DILLON
JOHN T. MCDONNOLD

To be major

CHARLES E. CLARK
DEREK A. WOESSNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

MARK L ALLISON
RICHARD J. AMOTT
DOUGLAS H. FLEISCHFRESSER
ANTHONY V. JACKSON
RANDALL V. SIMMONS, JR.
JOSEPH J. STREFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

PHILLIP E. APPLETON
KEVIN C. BERKMAN
JAMES R. CHAPIN, JR.
CHRISTOPHER W. LUHMAN
FRANCIS P. POLASHEK
KENNETH S. PONS
ERIC C. RIVERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JAMES ACEVEDO
ROBYN L. ACKERMAN
MELINDA J. ACUNA
JI E. AHN
STEVEN D. AKERS
OLUWEMIMO AKINBAYO
DEAN H. ALEXANDER
DEATAE A. ALLEN
KENNISHA N. ALLEN
CATHY G. ALSTON
RORI N. ALSTON
JUAN A. AMADOR
ALEXANDER J. AMATO
GREGORY B. ANDREWS
XKOSHAN L. ARNOLD
DEREK L. ASHE
TIMOTHY S. ATKINSON
TERA S. AUTREY
JARROD C. BAILEY
TYRONE E. BALLARD
AUSTIN J. BANFORD
AMEICA L. BANKS
STEPHEN A. BARAN
JAMES J. BARR
RANDALL S. BARTEL
MARCUS J. BARTLETTE
JOSHUA L. BASTMAN
JOSEPH P. BAUMBACH
STEVEN J. BEAM
HERNANDO BELLO
MICHAEL B. BENDER
SARAH R. BENNETT
JUSTIN T. BERGEN
DENNIS W. BERNACKI
DAVID A. BETANCOURT
THOMAS A. BEYERL
CLARENCE M. BLACKBURN
ADAM G. BLEVINS
PAUL R. BLUMENHAGEN
BRANDON D. BOATWRIGHT
TAMMY S. BOGART
SCOTTY BOLER
ANITA R. BOONE
TARA J. BOWMAN
CORINTHIA A. BOWSER
EARLGLENN A. BOWSER
JOSTIN A. BOYD
GEORGINIA S. BRADSHAW
BRIAN L. BRAITHWAITE
THOMAS D. BREWINGTON
ZACHERY A. BRISCOE
ANDRE O. R. BROWN
JEREMY P. BROWN
JOSEPH L. BROWN
JOSEPH W. BROWN
KEITH W. BROWN
KYLE W. BROWN
PAUL A. BROWN
KEVIN L. BRUMMETT
GERALD L. BRYANT
WILLIAM F. BRYSON, JR.
HERNAN D. BUENO
ROBERT D. BURGER
JOHN W. BURNETT
ALICIA M. BURROWS
MICHAEL R. CALDWELL
JOEL CALOFIGUEROA
THOMAS M. CAMPEAU
JOSE G. CARDENAS
TONY CARODINE
MICHAEL J. CARROLL
TED L. CHA
NICK J. CHAISSON
TREVOR L. CHAMBERS
JONATHAN C. CHEEK
THOMAS A. CHO
MICHAEL H. CHON
MONICA K. CLAYTONROJAS
PAUL E. CLUVERIUS
MICHAEL S. COATS
DANIEL W. COLE
MELISSA C. COMISKEY
CHRISTOPHER D. COOK
COREY A. COOKS
ROBERT M. COOKSEY
BRADLEY J. COOPER
BRICE A. COOPER
CORBIN E. COPELAND
FRANCISCO J. CORDERO

ALBERTO CORDOVA
NATHANIEL P. COSTA
ANA M. COWAN
ALAN CRABTREE
ROBERT A. CRAPANZANO
RYAN M. CROSBY
DANIEL E. CROSS
PATRICIA D. CRUZ
JOSEPH H. CULLINGFORD
MARCIA L. DAILEY
DEBORAH A. DALEY
JONATHAN A. DANIELS
ANDREA B. DARLING
MICHAEL G. DAVIDSON
MANDOLYN R. DAVILA
EDGAR DAVILARIVERA
BRENT L. DAVIS
LASHELL Y. DAVIS
OLIVER E. DAVIS
TIMOTHY G. DAVIS
NGOYE N. DAYO
RYAN M. DEBONIS
JENNIFER L. DENNIS
CHRISTOPHER J. DENTON
SHANE D. DERING
GUSTAVO DIAZ
TIMOTHY C. DICK
JOEL A. DICKEY
GERARD J. DOW, SR.
TRAVIS S. DRAYTON
NICHOLAS R. DRURY
CHRISTOPHER A. DUCKWORTH
MARK B. DUDLEY
MYRON T. DUNFORD
BENJAMIN R. ECKLOR
THOMAS H. EDDY
MEGHAN V. EDERLE
DANA G. EISENMAN
JOHN A. ELKO
PAUL J. ELLIOTT
JARED S. ELLISS
MICHELLE L. ELWOOD
JONATHAN P. EMERY
ENRIQUE A. ENRIQUEZ
NKECHUKWUKU U. ENWEFA
JENNIFER M. ERNEST
PATRICK O. ESSENBERG
DANIEL S. EUSEBIO
JAMES E. FAGER
NATHAN L. FAHIE
DARRELL W. FAIR
ROBERT L. FARMER, JR.
KEVIN M. FEFFERMAN
AARON M. FEGLEY
JONATHAN FERNANDEZ
LENORA T. FERNANDEZ
BRIAN C. FIDDERMON
BOBBY L. FIELDS, JR.
WILLIAM P. FISHER
SHEREE L. FITTS
NOKENS FLEURIJEAN
CHRISTOPHER L. FLORES
JOSHUA W. FORD
FELICIA L. FOSTER
JAIME S. FOSTER
CHERYL FOSTON
KENNETH B. FOWLER
TROY F. FOX
KARENSA D. FOXX
EVAN H. FRANCHITTI
CHRISTOPHER R. FRANKLIN
MOSI L. FRANKLIN
WALTER J. FRAZIER
LAURAJANE R. FREELAND
ROBERT E. FREEMAN, JR.
JULIA M. FURMAN
ROBBY J. GABEHART
GUSTACIA A. GABRIEL
MICHAEL V. GALLUCCI
MICHAEL A. GALVIN
TANIA S. GARCIA
PHILLIP A. GARNER
FRANKLIN D. R. GARRETT II
MICHAEL R. GARRETT
NEWTON GASSANT
CHRISTIAN L. GATBONTON
LESTER S. GEBSKI
ALEJANDRO I. GENTRY
JAMES E. GERLING
NATHANIEL B. GILL III
DESMOND M. GITTENS
SCOTT D. GLIDDEN
MICHAEL A. GODDARD
TIMOTHY G. GODWIN
DANIEL P. GOEHL
ANTINITA R. GRAHAM
JOSE A. GRANT
DUSTIN R. GRAY
MICHAEL B. GRAY
ALEXANDER C. GRAZIANO
CHARLES T. GREENE
TOMETRIUS GREER
DAVID M. GREGORY
SCOTT M. GUM
WILLIAM P. GUMABON
JESSICA L. GUTIERREZ
KIMBERLY L. HALE
MARSHAL K. HAMMEL
ALISHA C. HAMMETT
BRADLEY C. HAMRICK
PETER J. HAN
YUNSONG HAN
JEFFREY D. HANCE
TYWIN M. HANDSON
SHAUNA N. HANN
ERIK M. HANSEN
JEREMY W. HARLAN
BRIAN W. HARPER
JONATHAN C. HATHAWAY
MARCUS Q. HATHORN
JOHN C. HATLEY
JAMES E. HAYES
LAKENDRA J. HAYES
DONALD A. HAYFRON
JAVA A. HENDERSON
NATHAN D. HENDRIKS
EMPERATRIZ HENRIQUEZ
JUSTIN R. HERBE
KRISTINE M. HINDS
TIFFANY N. HINES
LARRY W. HIRT
MELISSA L. HOAGLIN
CHAUNCEY K. HODGE
KEVIN L. HOFFMAN
BRIAN L. HOLLANDSWORTH
CRISTOFFER S. HONAN
DAVID K. HONG
AMY N. HOOD
KEVIN A. HOWELL
JAMES D. HUBBARD
MICHAEL J. HUBER
MAURICE L. HUDSON
RYAN T. HULSE
WARREN G. HUMMEL
RYAN P. HUNT
DERRICK G. JACKSON
LOUIS J. JACKSON
JARED M. JACOBSEN
IAN J. JARVIS
RUSTIN S. JESSUP
CHRISTOPHER C. JO
HARDY O. JOHNSON
MARY E. JOHNSON
ROBERT L. JOHNSON
JERRY L. JONES
MICKII D. JONES
RICHARD E. JONES
VERSHUNDA J. JONES
JACQUELYNN D. JORDAN
JONATHAN W. JUDY
LAURA L. KEENAN
JOANN M. KENNEDY
AARON M. KIA
JASON S. KIM
KENNETH M. KIM
COLTON D. KINNINGER
JONATHAN E. KIRKLAND
BOBBY W. KIRKPATRICK
THOMAS A. KNOTHE
JOSEPH D. KNOWLTON
LAUREN A. KOBAN
MICHAEL G. KOFOD
EDWIN L. KOLEN
DANIEL L. KOSTERS
WENDALL R. KRIEGER
JOHN C. KUMP
SEAN S. KWOUN
BART S. LAJOIE
CHARLES S. LAWRENCE
DONALD M. LEE
JUNG S. LEE
SHAWANDA N. LEE
JIMMIE B. LEONARD
HELEN L. LILLY
JONATHAN H. LINDSLEY
LUKE A. LISELL
FELIX LOPEZ
LENORE LOPEZ
SERGIO O. LOPEZGARCIA
BENJAMIN T. LOVING
ENRIQUE LOY
DERRICK E. LUCARELLI
NICHOLAS J. LUCAS
PETER G. LUFT
MARLON J. LYLES
DONALD C. MACHEN
ERIC M. MAIA
RYAN R. MAIN
CHRISTOPHER G. MANGANARO
MARISSA B. MANTANONA
CHRISTOPHER R. MARK
HARRY MARS
MICHAEL J. MARTIN
MICHAEL J. MARTIN
MICHAEL W. MARTIN
MICHAEL A. MARTINEZ
MICHELLE E. MARTINEZ
RAPHAEL T. MARTINEZ
CARLOS J. MARTINEZNIEVES
ROGELIO A. MATA
HILDRED S. MATHEWS
TROY E. MATHIS
SHANE T. MATLOCK
MARK A. MAULDIN
JOHN R. MAURO
LORRAINE S. MAURO
CHRISTOPHER R. MAY
SHAWN P. MCANIFF
WENDI L. MCBRIDERENTSCHLER
DAVID E. MCCORMICK
MCFERRIN D. MCDONALD
HEATHER A. MCDOUGALL
PHILIP M. MCDOWELL
JENNIFER A. MCINTYRE
SCOTT M. MEDLIN
LUKE V. MEDVEGY
BILLYJAY N. MERCADO
ZACHARY C. MERRILL
TIMOTHY E. MESSER
AMY C. MILLER
ERICA L. MILLER
JASON M. MILLER
LADSON F. MILLS
ANTHONY P. MINDERMAN
ALFREDO P. MIRANDA
REGINALD J. MITCHELL
THOMAS M. MOHLER
CHRISTINE G. MOORE
DAVID B. MOORE
IZAR MOORE
NICHOLAS L. MORGAN
GEOFFERY G. MOSLEY
BRANDON G. MOTTE
PETER O. MOUSSEAU
SHARONDA E. MOZEE
KEITH M. MUEHLING
JEREMY T. MUELLER
JONATHAN R. MULDER
HEATH A. MULLINS
ROBERT J. MULLINS
STEVEN M. NACHOWICZ
MELISSA A. NAIRNE
EDINA NASONGKHLA
ALTON T. NATSON
BETH A. NELSON
KEVIN N. NELSON
NICHOLAS R. NETHERY
DANIAL L. NEWLON
MINH V. NGUYEN
CLYDEADRIAN NICKYSON
LONNIE G. NIPPER II
PAUL A. NOCE
STEPHEN K. NOEL
JI H. OH
ROMAN OLESNYCKYJ
JOHN K. OMOHUNDRO
RONALD W. OPPERMAN
JASON M. ORADAT
MARY E. PACHECO
MICHAEL A. PACHUCKI
ERIC R. PAHNKE
GRAHAM C. PARKER
TAMMY F. PARKER
EMMA PARSONS
DAVID S. PATERSON
JEREMY C. PAUL
GUSTAVO A. PAULINO
JONATHAN R. PEIFER
WADE PERDUE, JR.
ANTWON L. PERSON
JANET PETEFOX
TIMOTHY PETERSEN
SHAWN O. PEYNADO
THOMAS H. PFARR
LUCIANO F. PICCO
WINFIELD S. PINKSTAFF
JAVIER F. PLA
KRISTEN M. PLASSMEYER
JONATHAN E. L. PLOTKIN
DEHAVEN W. POLLARD
EMILY S. POOLE
RIECHARDE T. PRENELL
PEGGY T. PROCTORMATOS
ROBERT J. PUENTE
EDUARDO PUMAREJO
MICHAEL T. QUIGLEY
JACOB J. QUINN
SEAN J. QUINN
GERSON S. RAMIREZ
STEVEN A. RAVEIA
DEAN R. RAY
WILLIAM T. REASONER
JIMOS E. REESE
CHINEKA R. REID
ANDY REYES
JULIO J. REYES
ANTONIO L. REYNOLDS
MARCELLA A. REYNOLDS
KIRBY D. RICE
JOHN J. RICH, JR.
ROBERT J. RICHARD
BRYAN E. RIDDLE
ALPHONSE T. RIDEAU
ANDREW D. RIECK
CARLOS J. RIVERA
JUANTONIO R. RIVERA
OLGA L. ROBERSON
CLEONUS A. ROBERTS
JOE K. ROBERTS
SHAWN G. ROBERTSON
BRANDON K. ROBINSON
DANIEL B. ROBINSON
BRUCE U. ROETT, JR.
DOUGLAS G. ROGERS
DAVID W. ROLEN
JOHN R. ROOD
JASON T. ROOT
MARIANO ROSARIO
BRYSON R. ROSSOL
ORANDE S. ROY, SR.
TRAVIS W. RUDGE
MICAH P. RUE
ARDREANNA M. RUIZ
JESSICA L. RUSSELL
PRESTON J. RUTHERFORD
TROND S. RUUD
AMBER L. RYDER
SUN RYU
THEODORE P. SAGER
ARACELIS SALADIN
ADAM A. SALAZAR
LAMAR S. SALES
MANUEL D. J. SANCHEZDIAZ
JOSHUA M. SANDLER
MARK A. SCHAUMBURG
CARISSA A. SCHESSOW
STEVEN M. SCHNURR
JULIANE C. SCHWETZ
ALLISON R. SCOTT
MARK L. SCOTT, JR.
CASEY M. SECKENDORF

GARRY L. SEEBURGER
KODY W. SESSIONS
AAMER SHEIKH
JAROD H. SHELTON
DOUGLAS R. SHONK
MISHENDA S. SIGGAL
DANIEL A. SIMONS
TAYLOR R. SIMPSON
XEON O. SIMPSON
MICHAEL J. SKIFF
SHANNON M. SMART
JOHN D. SMITH, JR.
KYLE A. SMITH
KIMBERLY A. SOER
JOHN T. SOMMERVOLD
BRADLEY B. SON
MICHAEL SPEARS
RITA E. SPEIGHT
NICHOLAS J. STACHLER
JODY E. STACY
THOMAS K. STAGNARO
MELISSA J. STEELE
KEVIN J. STEIN
JOHN P. STEPNIEWSKI
SARAH E. STEVENSON
OLIVER STOLLEY
JAMES E. STRICKLAND
BILLY W. STROUTH
EDWARD P. STRZALKOWSKI
RYAN D. SUNDERMAN
JASON A. SUPNET
DARRELL K. SUTTON
ANDREW R. SVILOKOS
HOWARD M. SWANSON, JR.
ROBERT L. SWEARINGEN
ABRAHAM T. SWEENEY
KHAMOY SYSENGCHANH
HUNG J. TA
BONITA A. TAPLIN
LIONEL A. TAYLOR
CARSON L. TENNEY
MARK A. TERWILLEGER
ANTHONY S. THACKER
EBONY S. THOMAS
RYAN S. THOMAS
ADAM R. THOMPSON
KELLY L. THOMPSON
RICHARD N. THORNBERG
RICHMOND P. THORNTON
WENDA THROCKMORTON
DANIEL E. TORRES
LAWRENCE TORRES
LAKISHA D. TOUSSAINT
DANIEL F. TOVEN
KIMBERLY R. TRICE
PATRICK A. TURNER
PHILIP T. TURNER
DAVID A. VANAKIN
NICKLAS J. VANSTRAATEN
VINCENT E. VASSAR
SHILO S. VELASQUEZ
EMANUEL VELEZ
JUDE T. VERGE
GARY P. WADE
HOWARD F. WADE
CHARLES G. WAITES
BENJAMIN J. WALKER
MICHAEL C. WALLET
CARLOS G. WANDEMBERGH
DAWN M. WANDEMBERGH
JOHNNY B. WARD
AMANDA D. WATKINS
ADRIAN N. WATTS
MATTHEW E. WERNERT
SU C. WHETSELL
JOHN C. WHITEHEAD
SAMUEL L. WIGGINS
AARON A. WILLIAMS
BRANDON C. WILLIAMS
BRYAN F. WILLIAMS
CHRISTOPHER M. WILLIAMS
GLANDIS E. WILLIAMS
JOHN M. WILLIAMS II
JUNDI J. WILLIAMS
KATHERINE R. WILLIAMS
MORTISHA M. WILLIAMS
SHARRON D. WILLIAMS
TOBY M. WILLIFORD
BRENT J. WILSON
DANIEL C. WILSON
TAMLA A. WILSON
ANDRE D. WINDING
MARK J. WINKER
MATHIS F. WRIGHT
MICHELLE R. WYLIE
LINDA S. WYNN
LAWRENCE C. YARNALL III
JAMES H. YAW, JR.
NICHOLAS P. YERBY
SHAWN YONKIN
JOON S. YOON
PETER S. YOON
LARRY H. YU
JEDIDIAH M. ZAFFKE
THEODORE L. ZAGRANISKI
MATTHEW A. ZAYD
D011118
D011138
D011141
D011602
D010946
D011647
D011129
D011313
D010660
D011666

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

GARLAND A. ADKINS III
FRIEDLANDER R. Z. ALESSI
CHRISTOPHER M. ALEXANDER
JESSE R. ALLGEYER
ROBERT F. ALTMAN
CRAIG ANDERSON
JEFFREY G. ANDERSON
SCOTT T. ANDERSON
TALON G. ANDERSON
ANGELEE M. ANDOE
CREESY V. ANTOINE
ALEXANDER N. APOSTLE
MICHAEL I. APTAKER
MATTHEW C. ARABIAN
LUIS F. ARRIOLA
MATTHEW P. AUBRY
FRANK C. BAEZ
TRAVIS R. BAILEY
ALAN M. BAIRLEY
CHRISTOPHER J. BALDWIN
JOHN L. BANNISTER
HECTOR BARAJAS
JAVAN A. BARKER
ANNE M. BARLIEB
JOHN W. BARLOW
BRIAN L. BARNETT
MICHAEL L. BARNETT
JACOB E. BARTON
ALIJA BASIC
STEPHANIE L. BAUGH
DAVID S. BECKNER
DAVID W. BELL
STEVEN C. BELL
JASON L. BENESH
JOHN I. BENNER
BARBARA P. BENSON
DAVID W. BERGERON
JOSEPH L. BILLINGSLEY
ANDREW T. BLICKHAHN
JAMES M. BLUE
SIRIUS T. BONTEA
BRIAN P. BOSSE
MARK A. BOTTORFF
BRIAN J. BOURQUE
CHRISTINA M. BOWSER
EDWARD P. BOYD
GERALD G. BRADEN
LAVONE S. BRADSHAW
AARON S. BRAGG
ODENE C. BRATHWAITE
CHRISTOPHER J. BRAUNSTEIN
CLEOPHUS K. BRELAND
CAROLYN B. BRONSON
DAWN E. BROOKS
GLORIA L. BROWN
JUSTIN A. BROWN
NATHAN E. BROWN
SPENCER BROWN
KERRY K. BRUNAIS
BLAKE D. BRYANT
MATTHEW L. BRYANT
CORTIS B. BURGESS
ALEXANDER D. BURGOS
SAMMIE J. BURKES
ROBERT S. BURNETT
RUSSELL J. BURNETT
VALENCIA L. BURNS
DAVID R. BUSTAMANTE
CHANTALINE P. CABAN
RYAN J. CALDWELL
IAN A. CAMPBELL
MILTON A. CAMPBELL, JR.
JASON F. CANO
CHRISTOPHER J. CARBONE
VICTOR J. CARRERAS
AMELIA D. CARTER
CASEY Y. CARTER
DONALD P. CARTER
RANDALL L. CARTNER
GARY W. CARTY
LELAND S. CASE
ANTHONY R. CATO
JOSE F. CEPEDARAMOS
MARLA G. CHAN
SOKHOM CHHIM
BEN H. CHOE
ADAM R. CHRISTENSON
AARON B. CHRISTIAN
SCOTT A. CHRISTMAN
AGNES C. M. CHU
STEPHEN W. CHU
DONALD W. CINNAMOND
JERMAINE A. CLARE
WYLIE K. CLOUGH
KIMBERLY D. CLUVERIUS
JABBAR N. COLBERT
CLAIRE L. COLONGONZALEZ
JOHN T. COOLEY
JOSEPH A. COSCI, JR.
JEFFREY R. COULTER
ADAIR L. COX
CHET W. CRAW
JAMES M. CREASON
SAKURA CREEDON
PENNY S. CROMWELL
CHRISTOPHER M. CROOKSHANKS
ANTONIO CRUCET III
ANGELIC CRUTCHFIELD
DENNIS M. CURRY
TODD E. DAHMANN
GARY A. DALES
RACHELLE L. DANIELS
CHRISTOPHER R. DARLING
ERIK M. DAVIS
JONATHAN M. DAVIS
JEREMIAH L. DEARING
DANIEL S. DEATRICK
CYNTHIA L. DEHNE
SHALANDA K. DELRIO
RYAN P. DELANEY
JOSEPH J. DEMERATH
LESLY J. DENIS
BRADLEY D. DENISAR
MICHAEL T. DENISON
JASON C. DEROSA
SETH N. DESILETS
SHERINA D. DIAMOND
RENE DIAZ
BRADLEY W. DIEBOLD
IAN M. DIETZ
SHAWN W. DILLINGHAM
ANTHONY C. DIMMICK
CHRISTOPHER M. DISHONG
ANDREW D. DONOVAN
ANDREW J. DORNSTADTER
ANDREA G. DOVER
JACOB R. DRESSEL
ROBERT L. DROLET
NOAH M. EBAUGH
ANTHONY E. EBBING
MAC H. ECHIPARE III
MARQUAY EDMONDSON
MICHAEL D. EDWARDS
ALEX J. EISIMINGER
ALBERT G. ELAM III
SUZANNE M. ELDRIDGE
SANQUANETTA L. ELLIS
EDWARD T. ENGLAND
JOEL C. EVANS
ANDREW P. FABER
EFFEBY A. FALL
LUCAS B. FALLOT
MATTHEW S. FECHTER
STEVEN N. FEIGH
JARED N. FERGUSON
KAREEM Y. FERNANDEZ
MICHAEL C. FISH
BRADLEY R. FISHER
NEAL J. FISHER
SALVATORE A. FORLENZA
KRISTOFER D. FOSMOE
MICHAEL O. FREELAND, JR.
JEREMY W. FREEMAN
KENNETH R. FRENCH
THERESA N. FULLEN
MINDI C. FURNIER
JAMES G. FYFFE
WALDO D. GALAN
JACQUELYN R. GALLIHER
GREGORY S. GALSTAD
NANCI L. GANDY
GERARDO GARCIAGUTIERREZ
TRACY N. GARDNER
EMMET J. GARIEPY
CARLOS G. GARTH
JOHN A. GAYDA
JOSEPH A. GIBSON
RICHARD W. GIBSON
JAMES S. GILL
CHRISTOPHER M. GIN
MATTHEW K. GIVENS
DANIELLE N. GONZALEZ
RICHARD A. GONZALEZ
NICHOLAS D. GOSHEN
FRANCESCA A. GRAHAM
WILLIAM D. GRATE
RYAN M. GRAY
CHRISTOPHER K. GREEN
KEVIN E. GREEN
CHRISTIAN M. GREGOIRE
ADAM R. GREGORY
JOSHUA J. GRIGG
BRENDAN M. HAGAN
JONATHAN D. HALEY
JASON K. HALUB
LISA R. HALVORSON
HENRY HAMA
RUSSELL W. HAMANN
ROBERT T. HAMILTON
PATRICK D. HANSON
PATRICK K. HARDIN
BRADLEY J. HARDY
TIMOTHY B. HARTNETT
BRIAN J. HATALLA
ETHAN F. HAYES
JAMES W. HAYES
CHRISTOPHER J. HAYMON
DOUGLAS C. HEALY
JASON R. HEHL
SAMUEL A. HEIDER
MICHAEL W. HEIN
RICARDO HENRY
NATHAN P. HEPLER
STEVEN E. HERR
STEVEN J. HERSHFELDT II
PETER D. HIGBIE
OLIVER B. HIGHLEY
JAMES C. HILL
NATHAN A. HILLEGAS
JACOB S. HINA
GREGORY R. HINNERSHITZ
BENJAMIN T. HOFFER
DAVID M. HOLBROOK
DAVID E. HOLBROOKS
BENJAMIN R. HOPPER
JESSICA E. HOUK
DION A. HOUSTON, SR.
JONATHAN P. HOWARD

RYAN A. HOWRY
MICHAEL S. HUBBARD
CLIFTON J. HUBBERT
MICHAEL R. HUDSON
BUCK HUGHES
DENNIS M. HUNT, JR.
GAYLE A. HUNT
DEMETRIUS A. HUNTSPON
WESLEY T. HUTCHINSON
NOAH S. HUTTO
STEPHEN S. HWANG
CLARENCE D. INGE, JR.
ELIJAH E. INGRAM
EVAN J. ISAAC
JAMES A. JABLONSKI
JESSICA E. JACCARDGORDON
CHANE R. JACKSON
RANDALL D. JACKSON
JASON D. JAMES
CHRISTOPHER P. JENKINS
LOUIS L. JENKINS
TIMOTHY M. JENKINS
RICHARD JIMENEZ
MICHAEL K. JOHN
AMANDA R. JOHNSON
CODY R. JOHNSON
DANIEL W. JOHNSON
DAVID W. JOHNSON
JASON M. JOHNSON
JOSHUA D. JOHNSON
PURVIS L. JOHNSON
LEVI C. JONES
RICHARD C. JONES
ELVIN JUARBE
GILBERT JUAREZ
CELIA JUDD
JOSEPH C. KACHMAR II
JIMMY R. KACKLEY
KEITH M. KACMAR
PANAGIOTI I. KALOGIROS
NOELANI N. KALUHIWA
DEREK M. KAMACHI
SEAN P. KAUBISCH
JONATHAN P. KAYL
JEFFREY D. KEENAN
JACKIE N. KELLEY
ROBERT L. KELLUM
FRANKLIN J. KESSLER
JOSEPH K. KIDDER
ROSALYN S. KING
LISA M. KIRBY
MICHAEL S. KLIPSTEIN
AQUILA KNOPF
OWEN W. KOCH
MICHAEL S. KOLTON
KELSEY L. KORNEGAY
JOSEPH J. KOSTURKO IV
NICHOLAS J. KRAMER
JAMES H. KRANICH
STEVEN D. KREEGER
HITOSHI KUMAGAI
KEITH B. LAMBERT
WALTER F. LANDGRAF
RODNEY A. LANDRUM
MICHAEL LANGAN
CLARENCE E. LANGLEY III
DONELL D. LANGLEY
JAMES G. LAPOINTE
STACY S. LARDIZABAL
MATTHEW A. LAROCCO
JASON R. LATHEY
MICHAEL J. LATHROP
LEA J. LATO
ZEROY LAWSON, JR.
JULIE A. LAYTON
MARYCATHERINE LEACH
SCOTT E. LEE
RICHARD A. LEHMANN
MICHAEL G. LEMAY
ZACHERY B. LEONARD
ANDREW G. LERCH
TODD R. LETELLIER
WAYNE S. LETT
WAIMAN LEUNG
KARI E. LEWIS
JEFFREY Z. LI
CHRISTIAN A. LIGHTSEY
DARIN C. LINDON
RANDALL A. LINNEMANN
SHAD K. LLOYD
SHAWN W. LONERGAN
ADAM S. LOUTZENHISER
JOHN E. LUCKIE
ERIK V. LUEDTKE
PHILLIP H. LUKENS
SERGEY L. LUZHANSKIY
JASON C. MACCONNELL
OMOLOLU O. MAKINDE
JAMES E. MALONEY
LAUREN R. MALONEY
MELISSA S. MANIGAULT
EINAR D. MANKI
JOHN P. MANN
JOSHUA A. MANTZ
BURKE A. MANWARING
RENE L. MARCHBANKS
DAVID C. MARLOW
HERIBERTO MARRERODELATORRE
JOHNATHAN P. MARTIN
ALBA N. MARTINEZRODRIGUEZ
JASON E. MARTOS
JOSEPH A. MARTY
ALICE M. MASON
TROY E. MASON
MOHAMED B. MASSAQUOI
DAVID A. MATTERS
KEVIN W. MATTHEWS
LEON H. MATTHIAS
KEVIN J. MCADOO
BRIAN W. MCCOY
SCOTT B. MCFARLAND
RORY M. MCGOVERN
NICHOLAS J. MCINTEE
BENJAMIN F. MCKINLEY
TAMEIKA MCNAUGHTEN
JONATHAN L. MECHAM
SCOTT F. MEENEN
RYAN K. MENTO
ANDREW J. MERCHANT
CHEAVIS J. MERITT
KEVIN T. MERRILL
MICHEAL W. MEYERS
JAMES K. MICK
DARRYL D. MIDDLEBROOK
TIMOTHY M. MIGLIORE
ADAM J. MILES
ADHIMA MILLER
DAVID T. MILLER
MARC W. MILLER
MATTHEW O. MILLER
MICHAEL A. E. MILLER
SETH MILLER
JASON N. MILLS
GEORGE MIRANDA
CHRISTIAN M. MITCHELL
LUKE C. MOEN
SARAH K. MOFFIT
MATTHEW D. MOGENSEN
DANIEL MONROY, JR.
BYRNISE M. MONTECLARO
DELANTE E. MOORE
NATHAN A. MOORE
ARTHUR V. MORGAN
BRYAN W. MORGAN
GEORGE D. MORRISON
JOSEPH H. MROSZCZYK
LAURA E. MUIRHEAD
JOSHUA P. MULFORD
ROBERT F. MURRAY
AMY L. NASH
JAMEY D. NEALY
ANTHONY C. NELSON
JESSE M. NESBITT
ADAM K. NESTOR
GLEN S. NETTROUR
BENJAMIN E. NEUSSE
JACQUELINE M. NEWELL
CHRISTINE Y. NGAI
EMANUEL D. NICHOLS
ANTHONY E. NOCCHI
MICHAEL A. NORMAND
JARED K. NYSTROM
MICHAEL C. OBAL
BRIAN C. OBMERGA
DAVID J. OGURA
KARL M. OLSON
RIKKI A. OPPERMAN
GINO R. OREZZOLI
JOSEPH A. ORR
JOSEPH O. OWOEYE
NICHOLAS B. PACE
MATTHEW J. PACHECO
MONICA I. PADEN
ANTHONY J. PALUMBO
ROBERT W. PARKER
DAVID M. PATTON
JOSHUA A. PATTON
COLBY PEPON
JONATHAN Q. PEREZ
DARIO PEREZBIRRIEL
THEODORE PERRY
ALEXANDER D. PERSCHALL
NYASANU M. PERSON
BRANDON M. PETRICK
ANTHONY J. PETROCCIA III
ROBERT D. PHILLIPS
SAYTHALA PHONEXAYPHOVA
DAVID M. PIERCE
AARON M. POE
DOUGLAS J. POLLOCK
NICHOLAS G. POPPEN
JACOB R. PRATER
WALTER E. PRATT
ALAN E. PUENTE
CONSTANCE G. QUINLAN
LUIS A. QUINTANA
MICHAEL A. RANADO
DAMONICA C. RAY
SHANNON W. REICKERT
ANTHONY P. REINHARDT
MAXIMILLIAN A. RENARD
KATHRYN R. REYNOLDS
RONALD R. REZAC
JENYA M. RHONE
HEATHER J. RICHARDS
JAY R. RICHARDSON
KOURTLAWN D. RICHARDSON
LUIS D. RIVERAFONSECA
ADRIAN H. ROBINSON
BEVERLY S. RODRIGUEZ
EDGAR R. RODRIGUEZ
WILLIAM RODRIGUEZ
PAUL RONDO
JASON P. ROSE
NANCY J. ROSEN
KAREN A. ROXBERRY
SEAN M. RUFOLO
NATHANIEL K. RUSHING
FORREST R. RYAN
JOSHUA B. RYKOWSKI
KEILA M. SANCHEZERAZO
JANET C. SAPATUELLIS
BENJAMIN L. SASS
LEON R. SATCHELL
ANDREW M. SAWYER
JEFFREY C. SCHIMIZZE
FRITZ J. SCHULTES
JOSEPH M. SCHULTZ
WILLIAM B. SCOTT
ERIK J. SEDLOCK
BLAINE S. SELLMAN
AARON D. SELPH
PRESTON J. SEXTON
JASON M. SHAFER
JUSTIN S. SHAFER
TEREMUURA T. SHAMEL
GARRETT A. SHANNON
ANDREW K. SHEALY
MATTHEW R. SHEFTIC
CLINTON A. SHELBY
BRANDON C. SHELLEY
CHAN Y. SHIN
MARK E. SHUMAN
NICHOLAS W. SIKES
JEREMY J. SIMMERMAN
WILLIAM K. SIMON
JAMES H. SIMPSON
DEONAND S. SINGH
JOSHUA C. SISSON
GARRETT W. SLACK
THOMAS M. SLYKHUIS
AARON T. SMITH
DANIEL J. SMITH
MORGAN M. SMITH
PAUL M. SMITH
RICHARD K. SMITH
SYLVAN A. SMITH
DWIGHT R. SMITHBARROW
JOHNPAUL A. SMOCK
STEPHEN T. SNYDER
JEFFREY S. SODERLING
LARON C. SOMERVILLE
VICTOR E. SOMNUK
JAMES A. SPANNAGEL
STEVEN S. SPEECE
MORGAN J. SPRINGGLACE
JAMAR M. STAGGERS
DAVID E. STATON
TIMOTHY K. STATON
SHARRON L. STEWART
BRIAN M. STIERITZ
KRISTINA L. STOKES
HENRY C. STRICKLAND, JR.
KYLE D. STRUNK
CHRISTOPHER J. STUBBS
ALEX J. SULLIVAN
MAIA M. SUSUICO
JARED D. SUTTON
JONATHAN R. SWOYER
VICTORIA S. SZILAGYI
MINNIE E. TANNER
GILL T. TATMANTYREE, JR.
MARLOW M. TAYLOR
RICHARD C. TELESCO
BRENT J. TEMPLE
DANNY P. THEBEAU II
RYAN S. THIEL
JOHANNA L. THOMPSON
MARK E. THOMPSON
OSCAR D. THOMPSON
EDWARD W. TIMMONS
SHAWN E. TOENYES
MICHAEL S. TOMSIK
JAMES M. TORRES
JOSE L. TORRES
CHRISTOPHER P. TOWNSEND
SHAUN M. TRINKLE
JASON E. TUCKER
JESSICA F. TURNER
LANCE C. TURNER
ERIC S. TY
RONALD C. UNDERWOOD
MATTHEW D. UTLEY
JOSEPH P. VALIMONT
SEAN S. VANDENDRIES
WILLIAM B. VAUGHN, JR.
THOMAS E. VELD
JEREMY K. VISKER
JOHN R. VOS
JESSTON R. WAGNER
MATTHEW N. WALENTA
AMBER M. WALKER
BENJAMIN S. WALKER
MERRILL W. WALKER
MICHAEL S. WALKER
CHARLES B. WALSH II
TRAVIS R. WALTER
JASON R. WARD
THOMAS B. WARD
JEFFREY D. WARSTLER, JR.
DONINE E. WATSON
JAMES R. WATSON IV
DANIEL S. WATTERS
JUSTIN R. WEHRHEIM
DANIEL L. WEISS
RAYMOND J. WELSH
WILLIAM S. WHITESEL
JUDY A. WICKENS
JOHN F. WIEBELD
SAMUEL R. WILBOURN
DAVID D. WILKINSON
ANNETTE Y. WILLIAMS
CHRISTIAN D. WILSON
JAMES C. WILSON
TIMOTHY C. WILSON, JR.
JERAMY A. WINK
BENJAMIN C. WISNIOSKI
WARREN A. WITHROW
JAMAR E. WRIGHT
EINAR J. WULFSBERG
KYLE M. YANOWSKI

SCOTTY J. YARBROUGH
SEAN M. YARROLL
DANIEL R. YOUNG
DEREK R. YOUNG
JONATHAN D. YOUNG, JR.
WOJCIECH ZAJAC
ANDREW P. ZAPF
JOHN D. ZEHNPFENNIG
JUSTIN ZEVENBERGEN
LEVI D. ZOK
D010655
D011362
D011552
D010239
D011483
D011366
G010163
G010045
G010093
G010107
G010188

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

STEVEN J. ACKERSON
ANDREA ACOSTAMORALES
AARON E. ADAMS
BRUCE D. ADAMS
STEVEN J. ADAMS
RICHARD O. ADANSI
CASANDRA Z. ADES
CHRISTOPHER C. ADKINS
NATHAN T. ADKINS
JOSHUA J. AESCHLIMAN
DAVID J. AHERN
LUIS D. ALBINO
LANE M. ALDINGER
CHAD T. ALEXANDER
SETH M. ALLEN
ERICH J. ALMONTE
PAULINA ALVAREZ
NEALY J. AMBRON
GLENN O. ANDERSON
JENNIFER K. ANDERSON
KRISTOFFER E. ANDERSON
KYLE W. ANDERSON
LUCAS R. ANDERSON
MICHAEL D. ANDERSON
THOMAS D. ANGSTADT
PETER A. ANZOVINO
NATHAN P. APPLEBAUM
CHRISTOPHER M. ARATA
GABRIEL A. ARAUJO
MELBOURNE J. ARLEDGE, JR.
JONATHAN B. ARMSTRONG
STEPHAN J. ARNOLD
ANDREW J. ARTIS
ROBERT L. ASHLEY
DANIEL J. ASHMORE
JAMES B. ASHTON
DAMION O. ATCHISON
ROGER ATES
MARK B. ATKINSON
DEREK C. AUSTIN
LONI R. AYERS
JUSTIN K. BAKAL
GREGORY B. BAKER
WILLIAM C. BAKER
MATTHEW W. BANDI
MATTHEW R. BARINGHAUS
JUSTIN D. BARNES
GARRETT A. BARR
SETH E. BARRETT
MICHAEL A. BARRY
CHRISTOPHER E. BATCHELOR
ROBERT T. BATTY
CORBETT W. BAXTER
JAMES D. M. BEALL
JAMES M. BEAN
REBECCA E. BEARD
DAVID J. BEAUDOIN
PAUL J. BENFIELD
JACK H. BENFORD
CHAD A. BENNETT
KEITH R. BENOIT
BIXLER C. BENSON
IAN H. BENSON
KRIS J. BERGEMANN
ALEXANDER M. BERTELLI
ADAM T. BET
ANDREW P. BETSON
GREGORY E. BEW
ROBERT J. BICKFORD
CHARLES G. BIES
LORI L. BIGGER
WILLIAM T. BIGGERS II
WILLIAM A. BIGGS, JR.
CHRISTOPHER M. BIGOTT
PATRICK BILLMANN
NICOLAI BIRCH
DANIEL B. BLANKENHORN
DOUGLAS A. BLEVINS
EDWIN H. BODENHEIM
JOHN M. BOEHNERT
ERIC S. BOENITZ
ANDREW R. BOISSONNEAU
PHILIP J. BOLDT
JOSEPH W. BORG
MARK S. BORN
RACHEL R. BOWERS
BRETT M. BOYLE
JOHN C. BOYLE
TODD F. BRADFORD
ZACHARY D. BRAINARD
DOUGLAS J. BRAZIER, JR.
MARK P. BREUGEM
OBADIAH H. BRIANS
BENJAMIN A. BRIDON
DAVID T. BRIGHT
JARED W. BRITZ
COLBY M. BROADWATER
DAVITT R. BRODERICK
NATHAN E. BROOKSHIRE
GREGORY S. BROWER
JASON C. BRUBAKER
GREGORY G. BRULE
RYAN T. BRUMMOND
CRAIG W. BRYANT
CARMEN T. BUCCI
RUSSELL A. BUCKHALT
JASON M. BUCKINGHAM
RYAN J. BUCKINGHAM
BRADFORD K. BUGADO
ANDY BUISSERETH
CHARLES B. BUNTIN
DONNA J. BUONO
JUAN J. BURGOSROSADO
KYLE D. BURKE
JAMES M. BURNETT
DAVID T. BURTON
RICHARD D. BUSTAMANTE
BRETT M. BUTLER
TIMOTHY A. BUTLER
DANIEL L. BYARS
JOSEPH M. BYERLY
JASON A. BYRD
MARCUS D. BYRNE
DANIEL P. CAFFAREL
RYAN A. CALHOON
DENNIS J. CALL II
PETER J. CALVELLO
MICHAEL T. CAMPBELL
SHAWN R. CAMPBELL
KATHLEEN R. CANDELA
TALGIN L. CANNON
WESLEY R. CANNON
BRIAN P. CANNY
HECTOR E. CANTILLO
JIMMIE L. CANUPP
NATHAN CAPESTANY
EDWIN E. CARCEDOMAZARIEGOS
JACOB T. CARLISLE
ORLANDO CARMONA
JAMES P. CARRIER
HENRY CARTAGENA
BRENT C. CARTER
DAVID W. CARTER
ROBERT D. CARTER
RYAN M. CASE
CHRISTOPHER P. CASPER
PAUL M. CASTILLO
GARRETT D. CATHCART
ROBERTO CELEDON, JR.
CHRISTOPHER W. CHAMBERS
SEAN C. CHANG
STUART C. CHAPMAN
SETH L. CHAPPELL
MATTHEW S. CHASE
ALAN K. W. CHEUNG
DAVID M. CHICHETTI
AARON W. CHILDERS
ASHLIE I. CHRISTIAN
MARK S. CHRISTIANSEN
JOHN W. CHRISTIE
JUSTIN C. CHRONISTER
FREDERICK L. CLAPP III
ALISSA L. CLARK
DANIEL W. CLARK
DAVID W. CLARK
DEREK M. CLARK
EDWARD CLARK III
JAMES A. CLARK
JOHN C. CLARK
MARK W. CLARK
ANTHONY M. CLAS
CORY R. CLAYTON
DAVID M. COCHRANE
BENJAMIN M. COHEN
SAMUEL T. COLBY
STEVEN A. COLEMAN
LOGAN P. COLLINS
CHRISTOPHER T. COLMAN
JAMES B. COMPTON
BRIAN E. CONNOLLY, JR.
HERBERT CONTRERAS
BRIAN S. COOK
CHAVESO L. COOK
CHRISTOPHER M. COOK
CRAIG V. COPPOCK
ALEXANDER B. CORBY
MATTHEW G. COSLER
CHRISTOPHER M. COUCH
DAVID P. COULOMBE
MICHAEL A. COURTRIGHT
BONNIE M. COWLES
DAVID B. COX
CHASE D. CRABTREE
ORLANDO N. CRAIG
PETER S. CROSTHWAITE
STEVEN E. CROWE
JOHN P. CRUZ
BENJAMIN D. CULVER
CAMILLE A. CUNNINGHAM
PATRICK T. CUNNINGHAM
BENJAMIN L. CURTIS
GEORGE H. CUSHMAN V
ZACHARY L. DADISMAN
JAMES D. DAILEY
TAM C. DAM
BRAD M. DANGELO
JAMES R. DANIELS
DAVID M. DARBY
MICHAEL J. DARGAVELL
PETER W. DAVIDOVITCH
ALPHEUS M. DAVIS
CODY S. DAVIS
DAMOND C. DAVIS
COURTNEY J. DEAN
JUAN P. DELGADO
JOHN B. DELOACH
THEODORE C. DEMARIA
JOHN W. DENNEY III
RUSSELL T. DESTREMPS
MICHAEL J. DIFABIO
CHARLES W. DICKHART
ROSS B. DICKMAN
SHAWN D. DILLON
THOMAS P. DIRIENZO
BRIAN C. DODD
JONATHAN E. DOIRON
JOHN R. DOLLARD
SCOTT J. DOLNY
JEFFREY W. DONAHUE
THOMAS A. DOUGLAS
ANDREW K. DOUGLASS
CHRISTIAN B. DRENNEN
JEREMY T. DUFF
JASON P. DUFFY
JOSEPH J. DUMAS
CHRISTOPHER C. DUNCAN
RICHARD W. DUNCAN
STEPHEN J. DUNSFORD
OWEN C. DURHAM
BRIAN J. DYER
MATTHEW G. EASLEY
TRAVIS J. EASTERLING
ELIZABETH S. EATONFERENZI
CASSIDY W. EAVES
FRANKIE A. EDENS, JR.
BRIAN T. EDWARDS
JONATHAN C. EDWARDS
RYAN L. EDWARDS
BURTON D. EISSLER
KYLE T. ELDRIDGE
THOMAS J. ELISON
EDWARD A. ELLINGSON
ERIC E. ELLIOTT
SCOTT T. ELLIOTT
PATRICK J. ENGLAND
JOSE D. ENRIQUEZ
PETER M. ERICKSON
BRETT D. EVANS
CHRISTOPHER D. EVANS
ERIC G. EVANS
MARK A. EVANS
PETER E. P. EVANS
RYAN N. EVANS
THOMAS B. EVERETT
BRIAN M. FALLON
RICHARD L. FARNELL
BRIAN FARRELL
MELODY L. FAULKENBERRY
BENJAMIN D. FEICHT
ERICH W. FEIGE
MICHAEL A. FENNELL
STEVEN R. FERENZI
DANIEL M. FERGUSON
ANTIONE C. FERNANDES
AMY E. FERRELL
RICHARD M. FERRELL
DANIEL P. FERRITER
SHAY W. FINLEY
JAMES R. FISCHER
CHAD W. FITZGERALD
BRYAN P. FITZPATRICK
SAMUEL R. FITZPATRICK
GARRY O. FLANDERS
JEFFREY P. FLEMING
JEREMY L. FLIGHT
DAVID B. FLINTON
RICHARD T. FLOER
THOMAS G. FLOOK
BRYAN D. FLYNN
ROBERTO R. FONSECA
MATTHEW T. FORD
RODERICK J. FORMAN
JONATHAN A. FORNES
DAVID P. FORSHA
CHERI J. FORSMAN
ADRIAN L. FOSTER
JOHN T. FOSTER
DANIEL J. FOX
DONALD E. FOX, JR.
SCOTT M. FREDERICK
MATTHEW W. FREEBURG
JACOB W. FRESHOUR
TROY S. FREY
BRADLEY N. FRYE
ANDREW A. FULLER
ANTHONY FUSCELLARO
MICHAEL R. GABRHEL
SCOTT D. GALE
ZANE M. GALVACH
SAMUEL B. GALYK
RONALD L. GARBERSON
VERONICA GARCIA
BERNARD R. GARDNER
KRISTOPHER J. GARDNER
JAMELLE A. GARNER
BRADLEY C. GATES
KYLE E. GAYLOR
LUIS N. GAYTAN
DEREK J. GEDMINTAS
THOMAS R. GEISINGER
GRAHAM C. GENRICH
CHRISTOPHER E. GEORGE
PETER A. GEORGE
CHRISTOPHER R. GHORBANI

JEREMY M. GIBBS
JAMES M. GIBSON
BENJAMIN J. GILLESPIE
MARK D. GILLMAN
CHRISTOPHER L. GILLULY
GORDON R. GIMSE
RYAN S. GLADDING
ANDREW S. GLENN
BRIAN K. GLENN
WILLIAM J. GOLEMBIEWSKI
BRENNAN S. GOLTRY
PETER GOMEZ
MATTHEW A. GONCALVES
BRIAN F. GRAHAM
TIMOTHY A. GRAHAM
JUSTIN C. GRANT
DANIEL R. GRAW
NELSON B. GRAY
DESHANE P. GREASER
COLIN J. GREATA
TIMOTHY N. GREEN
ADAM K. GREENE
BYRON N. GREENE
JANELLE M. GREENE
RYAN GREENING
CHARLES E. GREER
CHRISTINA L. GRIGGS
RANDALL S. GRIGGS
NICOLAS A. GUILLET
CHRISTOPHER M. HABERKAMP
HENRY HAMBLIN, JR.
PATRICK S. HAMEL
DEVIN K. HAMMOND
LOUISPHILIPPE L. HAMMOND
STEVEN T. HAMPSON
DANIEL R. HAMPTON
DAVID R. HAMPTON III
PAUL E. HANEY
KEVIN HANKTON
BRIAN HANRAHAN
JERRE V. HANSBROUGH
JESSE L. HARDEN
CHRISTOPHER L. HARRINGTON
OMAR A. HARRIOTT
BRIAN J. HARRIS
WILLIE HARRIS III
YOLANDA M. HARRIS
MICHAEL L. HARRISON
BRIAN D. HARTMAN
BENJAMIN K. HASSELL
SCOTT A. HASTINGS
BRANDON J. HATHORNE
WADE A. HATZINGER
JONATHAN L. HAWKINS
MARK P. HAYES
SAMUEL L. HAYES, JR.
CHRISTOPHER A. HAYNES
JOSHUA C. HAYWARD
MICHAEL G. HAZELL
JOHN J. HEIDENREICH
TIMOTHY J. HEISLER
RONALD J. HERNANDEZ
MATTHEW P. HERTZ
DEBORAH R. HERZOG
MARCEL M. HICKMAN
RONALD N. HIJDUK, JR.
ISSAC A. HILES
JESSE A. HILL
SEAN R. HILL
JOHANN W. HINDERT
JONATHAN P. HITCHCOCK
DEVEN S. HOEVERS
CALVIN R. HOOVER, JR.
MICHAEL L. HOPKINS
TIMOTHY J. W. HORN
CHRISTOPHER P. HORNSBY
ISAAC S. HOWARD
LEVITICUS M. HUFF
JACOB A. HUGHES
JAMES E. HUGHES
JARED L. HULL
KEVIN D. HUMPHRES
ADRIEN G. HUMPHREYS
JOHN D. HUNTER
AUDREY D. HURDLE
ELISHA A. HUSBAND
DANIEL A. HUSEK
ERICA HUSTON
SUZANNA HUTIN
MICHAEL F. HUTSON
TIMOTHY A. IANNACONE
ALIKA K. ICHINOSE
TODD L. IMPERIALE
JOHN C. INTILE
JAY A. IRELAND
DESMOND R. JACK
BENJAMIN R. JACKSON
LUKE T. JACKSON
SHAUN F. JACKSON
ANGEL K. JACKSONGILLESPIE
LATOYA M. JACKSONMANZEY
MICHAEL L. JACOBS II
PAUL M. JACQUES
ANTHONY JAMES
MATTHEW M. JAMES
VERNON J. JAMES
STEFFANIE M. JEBB
DAVID M. JENNINGS
RONALD A. JILLARD
BOBBY W. JOHNSON
CAMERON M. JOHNSON
JACKELINE X. JOHNSON
JAMES M. JOHNSON II
LEE M. JOHNSON, JR.
SELWYN JOHNSON
BRENDAN P. JOLIET
ANDREW G. JONES
GARY D. JONES
RAYMOND C. JONES
RYAN P. JONES
BRAD C. JORDAN
ERIK K. JORGENSEN
JAMES M. KADEL
JEFFREY M. KAIN
DAIJIRO KANASE
OLIVER N. KARP
SEAN H. KARRELS
BENJAMIN A. KATZENBERGER
ROBERT A. KAZMAREK
AARON L. KEARNEY
APRIL D. KEARNEY
MOLLIE G. KEDNEY
MATTHEW J. KEESLING
JAMIE L. KELLEY
MICHAEL J. KELLY
ROBERT C. KELLY
RYAN V. KELLY
MICHAEL R. KELVINGTON
MICHAEL P. KENDALL
ERIN L. KENNEDY
LUCAS J. KENNEDY
KRISTOPHER W. KERKSICK
MATTHEW J. KIKTA
MATTHEW D. KILLORAN
COURTNEY L. KILUK
FREDERICK J. KIM
JAE Y. KIM
MICHAEL B. KIM
MIKOLA J. KING
KYLE L. KIRKPATRICK
WAUKEMSHA Q. KIRKPATRICK
BRIAN M. KITCHING
JASON S. KITTLESEN
DAVID M. KITZMAN
BENJAMIN W. KLANDRUD
JOSHUA M. KLATZKO
CHRISTOPHER E. KLICH
ROBERT C. KNAGGS
JOHNATHON S. KNAPTON
KURT S. KNOEDLER
ELIZABETH A. KNOX
MATTHEW J. KNOX
ROMAN KOCHEROVSKY
BRADLEY R. KOERNER
ROBERT J. KOLB
KENTON C. KOMIVES
JASON D. KOO
ERIC R. KOTTKE
KORY A. KRAMER
RYAN R. KROELLS
COLBY K. KRUG
DANIEL J. KRUPA
VINCENT M. KUCHAR
ANDREW J. KUEN
CHRISTOPHER P. KUSZNIAJ
FRANK J. KUZMINSKI
EMILY A. LACAILLE
BRITTON A. LANDRY
JOSEPH M. LANE
JAY P. LARDIZABAL
CALEB G. LAUE
JEREMY D. LAWHORN
TIMOTHY J. LAWRENCE
TIMOTHY W. LAWSON
LUCAS N. LECOUR
JE K. LEE
LOUIS H. LEE
DAVID A. LEIBOVICH
JAMES L. LEISTER
STEVEN H. LESTER
PETER J. LESZCZYNSKI
SCOTT D. LEUTHNER
CHAD P. LEWIS
MARK A. LICHAK
PAUL E. LINDBERG
JASON M. LINGK
CHARLES B. LINGLE
KYLE A. LIPPOLD
MICHAEL H. LISCANO
JEFFREY T. LITTLE
JOSEPH A. LOAR
DOUGLAS A. LOCKE
ROBERT L. LODEWICK
JOSHUA A. LONG
DUSTIN L. LONGFELLOW
VAL H. LOPEZ
DREW G. LORENTZEN
BRAD J. LOSNER
DENNIS A. LOUCK
THOMAS J. LOUX
JUENE M. LOWRY
KEVIN J. LOWTHER
JACK H. LUCKHARDT
MICHAEL B. LUNDEBY
WILLIAM E. LYLES III
GEOFFREY B. LYNCH III
CHRISTOPHER L. LYON
DEAN G. LYON
JEREMY H. LYONS
MARGARET S. MAASBERG
JULIE A. MACKNYGHT
CHAD D. MADDOX
BENJAMIN MAHER
CHRISTOPHER T. MAJORS
JOE B. MALISZEWSKI
JUSTIN D. MALONE
JOSHUA J. MANGAS
QUINCY J. L. MANZEY
AUSTIN P. MAPLES
LUIS D. MARIN
MICHAEL J. MARIN
CRAIG S. MARKIEWICZ
JOSEPH L. MARSHALL
DEREK C. MARTIN
JONATHAN D. MARTIN
TODD J. MARTIN
GUILLERMO E. MARTINEZ
JASON MARTINEZ
JUAN L. MARTINEZ
MATTHEW J. MARTINSON
LAYNE W. MATTHEWS
ANDREW J. MAXA
CHADWICK L. MAXEY
DOUGLAS MAYES II
ANTHONY MAYNE
ROBERT C. MCBRIDE
MICHAEL J. MCCAVE
ADAM F. MCCOMBS
CHRISTOPHER E. MCCONNELL
WILLIAM K. MCCOY
BRIAN M. MCCRAY
JAMES A. MCCUNE, JR.
JEREMY R. MCDONALD
ROBERT D. MCDONOUGH
SEAN D. MCENTEE
ERICK A. MCFERRAN
CASSANDRA D. MCGINNIS
MARY E. MCGOVNEY
BRENDAN J. MCINTYRE
TYLER S. MCKEE
DANIEL C. MCKEEL
CORY N. MCLAUGHLIN
JOHN M. MCLAUGHLIN
RYAN A. MCLAUGHLIN
JOHN M. MCLEAN II
SHAWN P. MCNICOL
MICHAEL R. MEADOR
CARL D. MEDEIROS
BENJAMIN D. MEIER
JASON A. MEIER
RYAN L. MENDENHALL
PAUL J. MENDOZA
CHRISTOPHER L. MERCADO
STEPHEN S. MERCER
BRAD A. MERCIER
MATTHEW J. MESKO
SCOTT M. MESSARE
ADRIAN A. MEYER
JUSTIN J. MICHEL
JUSTIN E. MIDDLETON
BRIAN R. MILETICH
AARON J. W. MILLER
BRIAN G. MILLER
THOMAS J. MILLER
RYAN E. MINCKLER
MARK J. MINGEE
EDWIN L. MINGES
BRIAN D. MITCHELL
DAPHNE C. MITCHELLWRIGHT
TIMOTHY M. MITROKA
WESLEY A. MOERBE
BARRON J. MOFFITT
BRETT L. MONETTE
ROBERT W. MONK
CHAD A. MONROE
LEE D. MONZON
KENNETH E. MORAN
CHADWICK H. MOREHEAD
JOHN A. MORGAN
RYAN L. MORGAN
SHIGENOBU T. MORINAGA
GABRIEL L. MORRIS
JOSEF N. MORRIS
JOHN R. MORROW
STEPHEN M. MORSE
PAUL B. MORTON
MICHAEL H. MOSTAGHNI
PATRICK J. MOTTO
RANDY R. MOUNTS
JILL K. MUDGE
SONIE L. MUNSON
CHRISTOPHER A. MYER
DAVID M. MYERS
JOSEPH E. MYERS
DANIEL S. NAAB
JAMIE O. NASI
SCOTT A. NATTER
MICHAEL J. NAU
PAUL B. NEAL
IRVIN NELMS III
SCOTT P. NELSON
JAMES M. NEMEC
DAVID W. NEWHOUSE
ALEX L. NEWSOM
NDIASHEA NGANTE
JOHN D. NGUYEN
KEN NGUYEN
DOUGLAS R. NICK
JOSEPH E. NICKEL
JOY F. NICKEL
MICAH A. NIEBAUER
ROBERT C. NOBLE
CHRISTOPHER R. NOGLE
CHRISTOPHER J. NOHLE
JONATHAN D. NORDIN
MICHAEL J. NORIEGA
RYAN R. NUGENT
DEREK J. OBERG
NEIL C. OBERLIN
RYAN J. OCCHIUZZO
EDWARD M. OCONNELL
PATRICK R. OCONNOR
CAROLINE T. OMALLEY
NORMAN P. ONEIL
MICHAEL C. ORLOFF
JOHN C. ORTEGON
MATTHEW J. OSTERGAARD
TERRENCE J. OWENS
STEVEN C. PACE
JAMES B. PACHECO
BRENT J. PAFFORD

MATTHEW J. PAINTER
SEVERO D. PALACIOS, JR.
MATTHEW N. PALADINO
MARK P. PALMA
ROBERT B. PANTOJA
JAROD V. PARKER
JOSHUA A. PARKER
JEREMY B. PASSUT
MITCHELL A. PAYNE
JOSEPH A. PAZCOGUIN
RICHARD B. PEACOCK
MICHAEL A. PEARCE
JEFFREY R. PEARSON
MARK C. PEER
BEAU D. PENDERGRAFT
MARCUS A. PEREZ
MARIAH J. PEREZ
JAMES E. PERKINS
EVAN T. PERPERIS
BROCK B. PETERS
JOHN A. PETERSON
JONATHAN G. PETERSON
ROBERT J. PETERSON III
ANDREW A. PETRIE
CHRISTOPHER R. PEVEY
JONATHAN E. PFENDER
CHRISTOPHER W. PIERCE
STEVEN E. PIERCE
ZEBULON PIKE
COLE C. PINHEIRO
MATTHEW J. PIOSA
STEPHEN J. POMELLA
EDDIE PORTER, JR.
RYAN W. POST
DAVID T. POWELL
JARED L. POWELL
JOSEPH R. POWER
MICHAEL J. PREDNY
JOHN C. PRINCIPE
JAMES B. PRISOCK
ADAM D. PROCTOR
MICHAEL A. PROVENCHER
KURT A. PRYOR
ERVIN W. PURVIS
THOMAS J. RADABAUGH
STEPHANIE M. RADFORD
RIMAS A. RADZIUS
ANDRE M. RANDOLPH
DARIUS O. RANDOLPH
JEFFREY P. RAWLINS
JAMES M. RAY
DEREK J. RAYMOND
ASSAD A. RAZA
FRANK D. RAZZANO
BENJAMIN J. RECLA
TERRY F. REDD
GILBERT REDFORD
MARK A. REID
KIP C. REMSBURG
BRIAN A. RETHERFORD
BRIAN P. REVELL
BRIAN D. REYNOLDS
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
DANIELLE RICHARDSON
JASON L. RICHARDSON
JOHN C. RICHIE
ADAM C. RICHMOND
DONALD J. RIDDLE
DARREN A. RILEY
NICHOLAS S. RINGLER
PATRICK M. RIORDAN
MATTHEW J. RIPKA
MATTHEW P. RISTAU
HEATHER I. RITCHEY
PEDRO J. RIVERA
BENJAMIN D. ROARK
CHRISTOPHER B. ROBERTS
GEMA ROBLES
DREW G. RODGERS
CLIFTON E. ROGERS
LAURA J. ROGERS
EARL R. ROLOFF
JOHN P. ROMITO
THOMAS P. J. ROOT
KRISTOPHER E. ROSE
PAUL A. ROTHLISBERGER
DAVID B. ROUSSEAU
JUSTIN M. ROY
LAWRENCE A. RUBAL
CHRISTOPHER G. RUEL
JOSHUA A. RUSSO
ANDREW J. RUSZKIEWICZ
MICHAEL J. RYBACKI
CAMERON J. RYU
PETER S. SALFEETY
RAUL SALINAS
JOHNATHON W. SAMPSEL
DANIEL J. SANCHEZ
JASON D. SANCHEZ
RAISSA O. SANCHEZ
MICHAEL L. SANDERS
BRIAN S. SANTOS
STEVEN M. SANTUCCI
JASON M. SARTORI
JOSEPH M. SAWRUK
J B. SAWYER
MICHAEL B. SCHEER
ROBERT D. SCHEIERN
ADAM A. SCHER
LAWRENCE A. SCHMIDLE
MARK S. SCHMIDT
STEVEN L. SCHMIDT
PHILIP D. SCHNEIDER
EMILY R. SCHNETZLER
ROBERT C. SCHUETTE
ADAM T. SCHULTZ
QUENTON L. SCHULTZ
CHARLES B. SCHUMACHER
BENJAMIN A. SEIPEL
DANIEL P. SEITER
EDWARD L. SELLARS
ANDREW L. SERGENT
DOUG K. SEROTA
LOUISE M. SERPICO
STEVEN P. SEVIGNY
KATHRYN L. SHAW
LAUREN M. SHAW
TREVOR W. SHELDEN
WILLIAM W. SHELTON
LADARRIAN SHERMAN
CHAD W. SHIELDS
SHANE P. SHIPSHOCK
MATTHEW J. SHIRLEY
GEOFFREY M. SHORR
ASHTON R. SHOULTS
LISA L. SHOUSE
JOSHUA L. SHRADER
ROBERT I. SICKLER
JAMES R. SIEBERT
JASON S. SIGLER
BRIAN J. SILVA
DAVID J. SIMMONS
NICHOLAS G. SIMPSON
DOUGLAS S. SIMS
PHILIP J. SINGLETON
EMMANUEL I. SIOSON
JONATHAN D. SLACK
DAMON B. SLAUGHTER
ADAM M. SLEPIAN
LEE A. SMALL III
ANDREW L. SMITH
ANTHONY D. SMITH
BRADLEY W. SMITH
GREGORY R. SMITH
KEVIN E. SMITH
SEAN T. SMITH
JACOB C. SNYDER
PATRICK J. SNYDER
MATTHEW G. SOILEAU
ELIECER I. SOLANO
ANTON V. SOLTIS
BRANDON R. SOLTWISCH
VLADIMIR R. SOTOSANCHEZ
KYLE M. SPADE
MARTIN J. SPANGLER
MEGAN R. SPANGLER
BENJAMIN C. SPERA
THOMAS J. SPOLIZINO
RICHARD T. STANFORD
AARON P. STARYAK
MICHAEL D. STEELE
SCOTT J. STEPHENS
JENNIFER L. STEVENSON
TODD J. STEVENSON
MELISSA K. STEWART
MICHAEL T. STEWART
TIMOTHY A. STEWART
RYAN T. STIDUM
JACQUELINE K. STILWELL
ANDREW B. STIPP
EDWARD R. STOLTENBERG
ADAM F. STORMS
GARY W. STRATTON II
WALTER N. STRAUBE
JAMES J. STRAVERS
NATHAN L. STRICKLAND
WESLEY V. STRONG
DAVID M. STROUD
DAVID J. STRYSKO
DONALD J. SULPIZIO
RANDALL A. SUMMERHILL
JARED J. SUNSDAHL
BRIAN J. SUPONCIC
TYREK N. SWABY
ERIC P. SWANSON
JACOB J. SWEATLAND
MICHAEL J. SYVERTSEN
ERICA L. TAISACAN
STEPHEN S. TALIAFERRO
PAUL F. TANGHE
FORREST M. TAYLOR
JOHNATHAN H. TAYLOR
PATRICK B. TAYLOR
TRAVIS J. TAYLOR
ROBERT M. TEMPLE
JACOB M. TEPLESKY
GEOFFREY A. TERRY
MATTHEW S. TERRY
TIA M. TERRY
LEIF H. THAXTON
CHRISTOPHER R. THOMA
ANTHONY E. THOMAS
KEVIN M. THOMAS
PETER A. THOMAS
JOHN K. THOMPSON
SCOTT D. THORNBURY
DEREK A. THORNTON
JOSHUA H. THYER
ALEX C. TIGNOR
SEAN D. TINKLENBERG
MICHAEL Z. TIONGCO
ADAM R. TOBIAS
STEPHEN A. TOLBERT III
JOHN C. TOLIN
FRANK I. TOOMEY
DAMON M. TORRES
RAMON J. TORRESGUZMAN
DANIEL J. TOSHNER
JOHN R. TRAHAN
JAMES D. TRASK
VANCE K. TRENKEL
DOUGLAS M. TRIPPANY II
PO C. TSUI
JOSEPH A. TULL
JASON E. TURNER
MICAH J. TURNER
CRISTOPHER M. ULRICH
MICHAEL J. URSO
JESSIE M. VALDEZ
BRADLEY R. VANCE
JEFFREY M. VANDYKE
MATTHEW B. VANPUTTE
ALAN E. VANSAUN
PATRICK L. VARDARO
KEVIN B. VAUGHAN
MARCO A. VELA
CHRISTOPHER S. VINCENT
ANN J. VOGANSAMPSON
ROGER L. VOGEL III
BEAU S. VOMASTIC
JOHN A. VOTOVICH
ADAM J. WACHOB
LESLIE A. WADDLE
PHILIP M. WAGGONER
MATT D. WAGNER
IAN M. WAGONER
DAREN K. WAJDAK
CHARLES F. WALL
CORY W. WALLACE
ANTHONY J. WARNER
COREY B. WARREN
THOMAS R. WARREN
WILLIAM W. WASH
CHRISTOPHER J. WATKINS
JOSHUA D. WEAKLAND
PATRICK J. WEAVER
GEORGE S. WEBB
WESTON R. WEBB
MICHAEL J. WEIPERT
BENJAMIN A. WELCH
MARK H. WELCH
MICHAEL M. WELLOCK
SIMON P. WELTE
HERMAN B. WEST
GREGORY C. WHEAL
JEREMY W. WHEELER
SEAN M. WHELAN
JOSHUA J. WHIDDON
THOMAS A. WHITEHEAD
THOMAS WHITFIELD II
NATHAN H. WHITNEY
STEPHANIE K. WHITTLE
ERIC J. WICKTORA
SHAUN M. WILD
JOSHUA I. WILES
JOSHUA R. WILHELM
JAMES R. WILLIAMS
JAYSON N. WILLIAMS
KARREEM V. WILLIAMS
MICHAEL S. WILLIAMS
NICHOLAS C. WILLIAMS
THOMAS M. WILLIAMS
JAMES G. WILLIAMSON
KAMILI M. WILLIAMSON
BYRON W. WILSON, JR.
JAMES C. WILTSE
BRADLEY J. WINN
STEPHEN J. WINTER
JOSEPH S. WITMER
JODI L. WITT
SCOTT E. WOHLFORD
KEVIN A. WOLF
ELIZABETH A. WOMBLE
NOBLE B. WONSETLER
JESSE L. WOOD
WILLIAM W. WOOD
LORILYN M. WOODS
MATTHEW E. WOODS
CLINTON R. WOODY
DAVID C. WOODY
LAMARIUS D. WORKMAN
GARRICK C. WORST
RICHARD A. WUKMIR
PHILIP J. WYANT
SHAILIN YNACAY
SAONG G. YOU
NEIMAN C. YOUNG
TALON C. YOUNG
ANNETTE N. YOUNGBLOOD
JOSEPH A. YURKOVICH
DAVID J. ZALLO
JOHN M. ZDEB
NICHOLAS J. ZIEMBA
CHRISTOPHER W. ZIMMER
DANIEL T. ZIMMER
CHRISTOPHER D. ZOTTER
D010901
D011165
D011284
D010533
D011558
G010128

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JOSEPH R. PRIMEAUX, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JEROME R. PILEWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JEREMY J. AUJERO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

GARY S. PHILLIPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

GENEVIEVE BUENAFLOR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

FREDDIE R. HARMON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

CATHERINE W. BOEHME

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

TODD W. MILLS
MARVIN W. WHITING

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO MAX REED

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Iowan Max Reed of Bellevue for being selected as a Star of Life by the Iowa Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Association.

Ahead of National EMS Week in May, the American Ambulance Association has recently recognized our nation's best emergency responders, who embody the example of honorable and professional service in their communities. Stars of Life, like Max, are selected by their paramedic, emergency medical technician (EMT), and ambulance service personnel peers to represent them in Washington, D.C. as they meet with Members of Congress.

A founder of the Bellevue Ambulance Service in 1972, Max is the only ''founding father'' of the 46 volunteer member service still actively responding to the community's calls. Mr. Reed has completed every level of EMT in our great state and has truly seen it all. From consoling grieving friends and families of accident victims to comforting new parents as their babies are brought into this world, there is no doubt Max's work has led him to become one of his community's greatest advocates. A CPR instructor since 1973, Mr. Reed assists his community with CPR instruction and education, as well as several other events related to his work, including EMS Education Days and Operation Prom, just to name a couple. Max's selfless efforts have helped grow the Bellevue Ambulance Service's location from a small section in the local fire department to a new independent building that he helped design. Of course, Max would say he could have never attained this level of success if not for the love and support of his wife, Mary.

Mr. Speaker, for over 41 years Mr. Reed has unselfishly given his time and talents to ensure his community is well cared for. Max's co–workers count him as a mentor, an advisor and a great friend, and I find it no surprise they have entrusted him with the distinction of representing them and their shared passion this week in Washington, D.C. as a Star of Life. Max's leadership is a testament to the hard working people of Iowa, and I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating him on a remarkable career, thanking him for his decades of service, and wishing him continued success in the years ahead.

IN MEMORIAM OF RITA VOGLER

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of one of my constituents, Rita Vogler, who passed away last week from lung cancer. A valued member of the Hesperia, California community, Rita formerly served as mayor and a city councilwoman. She also furthered the interests of the City of Hesperia as an active member of the Hesperia Kiwanis Club and the National Federation of Republican Women.

Rita is just one of 1,660,290 people expected to be diagnosed with cancer this year, according to the American Cancer Society's statistics. Approximately 580,350 Americans will die of cancer this year, or 1,600 people per day. In my home state of California alone, 57,290 people are expected to die from cancer in 2013.

I hope Rita's death will remind my colleagues of the importance of our continued pursuit of a cure for this terrible disease. At the signing of the National Cancer Act of 1971, President Nixon declared war on cancer. In that year, 215,000 Americans died from cancer. Yet the number of deaths each year has more than doubled to reach the 2013 prediction, and even when adjusted for population inflation, incidence and death rates have not shown the evidence of the nation's efforts to eradicate the disease. More Americans continue to die, leaving family and friends behind to mourn their losses. In Rita's case, her death came barely two weeks after her diagnosis with lung cancer. However, I am encouraged by the progress made by researchers every year and hope that we continue to see strides forward.

Rita's friends describe her as kind and sincere, a mentor and inspiration to many, devoted to serving her community. She is survived by her husband Al and children Rocky and Allise.

NATIONAL EYE DONOR MONTH

HON. ALAN NUNNELEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, over 1,000,000 people have had their sight restored since the Eye Bank Association of America was created in 1961. Since 1983, each March has been designated as National Eye Donor Month. As a recipient of two corneal transplants, I am honored to participate this year.

In high school I was diagnosed with keratoconus, a degenerative disease of the cornea. From then and through much of my college life, I lived with the belief that I would one day lose my eyesight. As a junior in college, I was told I was potentially a good candidate for cornea replacement surgery. On April 25, 1980, I had my first surgery and the results were almost instantaneous. Two years later, I had another, equally successful transplant procedure on my other eye. I live every day with the knowledge that not only was my vision saved, it took tremendous strength and compassion on the part of two families to make it possible.

With corneas, the doctors are not concerned with matching by blood type, but they need to match by age. The reason is simple: the cornea does not need to wear out before the recipient does. So two families who lost a son, daughter, husband, or wife in their teens–to–mid–twenties made a decision under the worst of circumstances, and donated their loved ones corneas so that a stranger might see.

I encourage all Americans to register to become eye donors and inform your families of your wishes.

I urge my colleagues to work with their local eye banks and the EBAA to promote eye donation and its life enhancing effects on corneal recipients.

During this month, let us remember the donors and their families who have forever changed so many lives, including my own, for the better.

ANASTASIA LAWRENCE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Anastasia Lawrence for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Anastasia Lawrence is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Anastasia Lawrence is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Anastasia Lawrence for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

9TH GRADER SOPHIE BOUCHER OF NAUGATUCK, CONNECTICUT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you and all of my colleagues a letter I recently received from Sophie Boucher, a ninth grade student at Naugatuck High School in the Borough of Naugatuck, Connecticut. She writes:

''I think everyone in this state, country, continent, and world can agree that the events that unfolded in Newtown were tragic. Our hearts go out to the kids and teachers who lost their lives in Sandy Hook and also

to their parents. We can do something to prevent this from happening again, though. I feel that one of the first issues we should address to restrain this from occurring again is gun control.''

''We have all heard the saying, ''Guns don't kill people. People kill people.'' That may be true, but guns make it a whole heck of a lot easier. On the same day that Sandy Hook faced tragedy, 22 children in China were stabbed. Not one child was killed. If that man who stabbed these children had a gun, chances are the children would have been killed. We cannot just let anyone get their hands on guns, especially assault weapons. There should be stricter laws on who can obtain guns and who cannot.''

''I feel that one of the ways to go about the stricter laws is by looking at a person's medical history before they obtain a gun. Furthermore, not only the medical history of the person wanting to own the gun should be looked at, but also the medical history of the people living in the house with them. If a mother has a gun in the house, a child, whether the child has mental health issues or not, could easily get their hands on it. We saw this example hold true with Adam Lanza. Though Adam Lanza's mental history was not known, it would have been a smart idea to keep all weapons of any kind away from him. By not having any kind of weapon around a person with a mental health issue, we will be able to decrease shootings of any kind. Therefore, the medical history of the person obtaining the gun and the people living with them should be looked at.''

''Sincerely, Sophie Boucher, 9th Grader''

Like my colleagues, I always appreciate hearing from my constituents. I share this particular correspondence because it should serve us all as a reminder that there are many ways in which the Congress can act to address the issues surrounding gun violence—the point is we need to act.

HONORING TIMOTHY BOWMAN

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a young constituent, Timothy Curtis Bowman of Osgood, Indiana.

Curtis attended South Ripley High School and actively participated in the county FFA. He won numerous forestry awards at the state level, enjoyed deer hunting, and worked with his father in their tree trimming business.

We mourn a life that ended too soon and pray for understanding and comfort for family members and those in our community who knew and loved Curtis. While in times of turmoil we struggle to understand the unexplainable, may we find peace and joy in our religious faith and the memories of time shared with those we love.

Curtis will be forever remembered as a friend of his community. I ask the citizens of the 6th Congressional District to join me in keeping his parents, Tim and Pat Pennington Bowman, siblings, Keith, Michael, Tiffany, and Krista, and the entire extended Bowman family in our thoughts and prayers.

ANGELICA MOLINA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Angelica Molina for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Angelica Molina is an 8th grader at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Angelica Molina is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Angelica Molina for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

SUPPORT OF THE FLIGHT SCHOOL SECURITY ACT OF 2013

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the ''Flight School Security Act of 2013.''

This bipartisan legislation closes a known aviation security gap by requiring individuals seeking flight training on aircraft with a maximum certified takeoff weight of more than 12,500 pounds to be checked against the terrorist watchlist prior to receiving flight training.

I am proud to have the Ranking Member of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Cedric Richmond, and the Chairman of the Committee's Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, Patrick Meehan, as original cosponsors of this important legislation.

Under current law, a flight instructor, pilot school, or aviation training center are only required to check aliens—non-United States citizens—against the terrorist watchlist and receive a determination from the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) as to whether that individual presents a risk to aviation or national security prior to providing flight training.

U.S. citizens who seek the same training do not undergo these simple checks.

As a matter of practice, daily checks against the terrorist watchlist are only undertaken for aliens and individuals who hold valid airman's certifications issued by the Federal Aviation Administration; TSA does not check the names of those seeking or undertaking flight training against the watchlist until after they have already been trained on how to fly a plane and are applying for a certificate to take their first solo flight.

The ''Flight School Security Act of 2013'' closes this security gap by requiring that any individual seeking training in the operation of any aircraft having a maximum certified takeoff weight of more than 12,500 pounds, including a United States citizen, be checked against the terrorist watchlist to ascertain if the individual may pose a threat to aviation or national security and receive a determination from the Assistant Secretary that the individual does not pose a threat that warrants denial of access to such training.

The ''Flight School Security Act of 2013'' would subject individuals seeking flight school training to the same terrorist watchlist check that anyone taking a flight domestically undergoes.

It does not compel United States citizens to provide the exhaustive list of personally identifiable information, including fingerprints, which are required to be provided by an alien seeking flight training.

Mr. Speaker, the ''Flight School Security Act of 2013'' is a common sense, bipartisan bill, crafted in consultation with both TSA and stakeholders.

The bill is the product of the oversight work of the Committee on Homeland Security and represents a common sense solution to a glaring security gap.

Just last week, in an appearance before the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Transportation Security, the TSA Administrator, John S. Pistole, stated that this security gap is an issue that has to be addressed, that Congressional action would be welcome, and that checking those seeking flight training against the terrorist watchlist prior to them commencing flight training would be the best security.

I urge my colleagues to support the ''Flight School Security Act of 2013'' so that we can be secure in the knowledge that no person who poses a security threat that is significant enough to be blocked from boarding an aircraft is allowed to learn to fly one.

HONORING BRONZE STAR MEDAL RECIPIENT SPECIALIST BERNARD L. RUSTAD

HON. STEVE DAINES

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Specialist Bernard L. Rustad, who will be awarded with the Bronze Star Medal on April 5, 2013, for his bravery and selflessness while serving in Vietnam.

Specialist Rustad served with the 1st Infantry Brigade, 5th Infantry Division during Combat Operation Lam Son 719. On April 6, 1971, Specialist Rustad's unit was providing security for the last withdrawing units from the Khe Sahn airstrip area, in the midst of heavy enemy fire. During this time, Specialist Rustad noticed that soldiers from the neighboring unit had been wounded and left unattended. With complete disregard for his own safety, Specialist Rustad ran to their assistance and saved the lives of these young men.

Specialist Rustad's actions demonstrated true bravery—and also stand as an example to all of us as what true selflessness looks like.

It is an honor to present Specialist Bernard L. Rustad with the Bronze Star Medal, and I thank him for his service and sacrifice.

ARACELI MEDEL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Araceli Medel for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Araceli Medel is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Araceli Medel is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Araceli Medel for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING MN STATE COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, ROBERT J. ERICKSON

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Robert J. Erickson, upon the completion of his term as the State Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Minnesota (DAV MN). Commander Erickson has been committed to fulfilling the primary mission of DAV MN and honoring the promises our nation made to the brave men and women who have served America in uniform. I am honored to call him a personal friend.

From the broadest vision to the smallest detail serving disabled veterans, Commander Erickson has been intimately involved in the various ways the DAV MN accomplishes its mission. He has visited all 31 state chapters, from Rochester, to Fergus Falls, to Hibbing, Minnesota, and witnessed firsthand how veterans are served—and how many veterans still serve through volunteering. Under his direction, DAV MN has several unique programs to serve specific needs of Minnesota's disabled veterans. Minnesotans love the outdoors, and DAV MN organizes hunting and fishing trips to allow all veterans to continue to access these wonderful opportunities. Commander Erickson speaks proudly about the joy he sees in the hundreds of volunteers and veterans who participate in these outings.

Under Commander Erickson's leadership, DAV Magazine recently highlighted the DAV MN Donor Connection program, which has provided approximately $400,000 in donated equipment for disabled veterans. Another source of pride is the partnership with the Minnesota Twins: the MN Twins/DAVMN Winter Warm Up Coat Drive that collects new and gently used coats for disabled veterans and their families. None of these commendable efforts would be possible without Commander Erickson and his tireless team.

Commander Erickson has left a lasting mark through his leadership role on the board of the DAV MN Foundation, the charitable arm of the organization which supports projects by chapters, units, and partner organizations throughout the state. The DAV MN Foundation provides clothing and emergency assistance to homeless veterans, assists in funding the five state veterans homes, provides funds for various camps and lakeside retreats that allow veterans safe and accessible places to enjoy the outdoors, and assists with other equipment and needs for veterans living in our MN Veterans Homes. The DAV Transportation Network also serves a critical link, providing veterans with free transportation to and from VA medical facilities. Commander Erickson has helped to lead these critical programs and more as part of repaying the debt owed to our disabled veterans.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of Robert Erickson's service as Commander of DAV MN, I am pleased to submit this statement recognizing the achievements of this dedicated servant to our disabled veterans and this nation.

CONGRATULATING WAYNE SAWTELLE

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Wayne Sawtelle on his retirement from the Marshalltown Fire Department. Wayne has served his community honorably for almost two decades as a Lieutenant with the Fire Department.

Lieutenant Sawtelle has dedicated his life to the protection and safety of his fellow community members. His first day on the job in 1994 found him putting out a fire at the Sutherland Coal Plant. After 19 years, he has become a friend and mentor to his colleagues at the Fire Department. His experience and wisdom will surely be missed by his fellow firefighters.

Wayne has also been a leader and active member of the International Association of Firefighters (IAFF) and the Iowa Federation of Labor (IFL). Wayne served as Vice President at Large for the IFL as well as President of the IAFF Local 16. He has been a strong advocate for better safety and working conditions for his fellow firefighters.

Lieutenant Wayne Sawtelle has put his life at risk to protect members of his community and I'm honored to represent him in Congress. I congratulate him on his retirement. I wish him and his wife Ann all the best in their future plans and endeavors.

ASHLYN CARMOSINO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ashlyn Carmosino for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Ashlyn Carmosino is a 7th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ashlyn Carmosino is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ashlyn Carmosino for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. CLAIR COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the 50th Anniversary of the St. Clair County Bar Association, in St. Clair County, Illinois.

Prior to 1963, there were two bar associations in St. Clair County, the East St. Louis Bar Association and the Belleville Bar Association. East St. Louis was, at that time, the most populous city in St. Clair County and Belleville, just to the east, was the county seat. A review of the Illinois Court System that led to the current judicial structure also prompted the East St. Louis and Belleville Bar Associations to combine and form the St. Clair County Bar Association.

The stated purpose of the St. Clair County Bar Association is "cultivating the science of jurisprudence, promoting reform in the law, facilitating the administration of justice, elevating the standards of integrity, honor and courtesy in the legal profession, encouraging a thorough and liberal legal education and cultivating and cherishing a spirit of camaraderie among the members thereof." They accomplish this through a number of programs and initiatives that extend the benefits of the organization beyond its members to include their entire community.

The Bar Association fosters and promotes continuing legal education and its mentoring program takes advantage of the wealth of experience within its membership to assist newer members.

The St. Clair County Bar Association Foundation is the charitable arm of the Bar Association and channels a number of assistance and charitable initiatives back to the community, including extensive pro bono legal assistance. The Bar Association's Law Day Run, now in its 12th year raises money for the Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation, which assists low-income residents with obtaining legal services. Their participation in the Lawyers Feeding Illinois initiative has brought in tremendous support to help provide nutritional assistance for the hungry within their community.

The St. Clair County Bar Association has grown to approximately 700 members and is

currently headed by the Honorable Michael N. Cook, President, Thomas B. Cannady, First Vice President, Joe Rosenstengel, Second Vice President, Laura K. Beasley, Secretary and Garrett P. Hoerner, Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the St. Clair County Bar Association on their 50th Anniversary and to wish them the very best in the future.

PRESERVING THE WELFARE WORK REQUIREMENT AND TANF EXTENSION ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2013

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, in addition to Chairman CAMP's arguments against the Motion to Recommit, the following are additional reasons for opposing this motion.

1. Totally unnecessary and obviously political. The States already have complete flexibility to decide which needy families with children to cover. So States can and should place a priority on the groups the MTR specified—the unemployed, veterans, victims of violence, grandparents, as well as anyone caring for children with financial need. Democrats argued in the general debate on H.R. 890 that States should be trusted when it comes to the work requirements and that States should have virtually unlimited flexibility in implementing them. Why do they think in their MTR that States cannot be trusted when it comes to the even more elemental issue of whom to cover with TANF assistance? The answer is the MTR is an obviously political statement in search of a problem.

2. Potentially harmful. Current law includes a broad provision allowing States to screen for and identify victims of domestic violence and then create special programs and services designed to address their needs, such as waiving time limits, child support cooperation and related requirements as appropriate. Many States have done so. The MTR, coming afterward, suggests that "Nothing in this Act shall prohibit or limit" States from "providing assistance, job opportunities, or educational training" for "women who are victims of domestic violence." Why is this necessary? Are the current law protections applied by States, which would be extended for nine months under H.R. 890, not sufficient? Are States implementing them poorly or not at all? The MTR does not say. But given that the current protections afforded by States may be broader than the short list of protections in the MTR, is the MTR supposed to be limiting on States in terms of how and what they provide in terms of special help for such individuals? Again, the MTR does not say, creating confusion and potentially narrowing protections for a sensitive group.

3. Restoring the individual entitlement to welfare benefits—regardless of income? The MTR suggests a fundamental change in the nature of the TANF program. States must now spend TANF funds on "needy" families with children, with States defining financial need. However, the MTR suggests that "Nothing in this Act" (which if added to the underlying bill would mean effectively the TANF program) "shall prohibit or limit" States from providing "assistance" to "unemployed parents" or "grandparents" caring for the children of individuals in, or who died while serving in, the Armed Forces. It does not State that such adults and families must be "needy." While many of these families will no doubt be "needy" by States" definition, not all will be. Yet the MTR says that all must receive "assistance" (which generally means a welfare check) from the TANF program. Is it really the intention of the authors of the MTR to require the payment of welfare checks to families that are not "needy"? This smacks of a return to the pre-TANF era when there was an individual entitlement to welfare benefits in Federal law, which was a key impediment to States' engaging low-income families in work and productive activities needed to help them support themselves. Even worse, especially given the capped nature of TANF funds, requiring States to provide welfare checks to households in which one parent may be unemployed, for example, while the other works full-time in a high-paying job, would certainly diminish funds available to assist truly needy families with children.

4. Points to other key flaws in the Administration's waiver proposal. When Ways and Means staff reviewed HHS internal documents about their waiver plan on February 8, 2013, one of the key findings was that HHS staff has long believed the Secretary has the authority not only to waive work requirements for welfare recipients, but also other key program features like time limits and even the requirement that States must limit TANF benefits to families that include children. Yet the MTR, whose supporters argued in support of the Administration's waiver authority, lists supposed protections for parents and grandparents caring for children. Which begs the question—do supporters of the Administration's waiver authority and MTR want to allow States to pay welfare checks to single adults without children, as the Administration believes it has the authority to do? Or do they think that TANF assistance should continue to be payable only to families with children, as current law provides and the MTR seems to suggest?

BETINA PIETERSE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Betina Pieterse for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Betina Pieterse is a 12th grader at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Betina Pieterse is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Betina Pieterse for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

REMEMBERING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE IRAQ WAR

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House to observe a moment of somber remembrance for the 10th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War. On March 19, 2003, the U.S. Armed Forces invaded Iraq in what would become one of the most drawn-out missions in our military's history—a mission that would end in more than 4,000 fatalities and 31,000 wounded.

All too often, these brave men and women risk their lives to serve our country, only to return home to face a different type of battle—a battle to receive the care and benefits that they deserve.

Earlier this month, in a commitment to provide high-quality healthcare to our veterans, the Department of Veterans Affairs opened a new Veterans Outpatient Clinic in Joliet, Illinois. As part of the Edward Hines Jr. VA Hospital, the 60,000 square foot facility will offer state-of-the-art healthcare, providing a variety of services including: primary care, physical, occupational, and speech therapies, health education, mental health treatment, women's healthcare, nutrition, and retinal imaging.

With more than 5,000 veterans already signed up to receive treatment at the Joliet Clinic, the facility will go a long way toward providing the healthcare that our men and women in uniform deserve. I am proud to have the Edward Hines Jr. Veterans Hospital Outpatient Clinic serving our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to not only join me in remembering those who lost their lives serving our great nation, but to also recognize and thank those veterans who have returned home after defending our country bravely and honorably.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAID REIMBURSEMENT ACT OF 2013

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the third anniversary of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, March 23, 2013, which, among other things, expands eligibility for Medicaid to reduce the number of Americans without health insurance, I introduce the District of Columbia Medicaid Reimbursement Act of 2013 today to increase the federal government's reimbursement for the District of Columbia's Medicaid costs from 70 to 75 percent. Medicaid is financed mostly by the federal government and the states. However, the District, a city that has no state to support it, must alone absorb the state portion of Medicaid. For example, the District pays for 30 percent of Medicaid. New York City pays less than 25 percent, since a

2005 state law reduced its contribution from 25 percent. The District certainly should pay no more than New York City's pre-2005 contribution and therefore my bill would raise the federal contribution to the District's Medicaid program to 75 percent. Considering the expansion of Medicaid eligibility under the new health care reform law, effective 2014, now is the time to make the District's Medicaid burden more equitable.

Under the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Revitalization Act), Congress recognized that state costs are too high for any city to shoulder. To address this unfairness to the District, the Revitalization Act transferred certain state responsibilities from the District to the federal government, including prisons and courts, and increased the federal Medicaid reimbursement to the District from 50 to 70 percent, partially relieving this burden. The city continues to carry many state costs, however.

In 1997, a formula error in the Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital allotment reduced the 70 percent Federal Medical Assistance Percentage share, and, as a result, the District received only $23 million instead of the $49 million it was due. I was able to secure a technical correction in the Balanced Budget Act of 1999, partially increasing the annual allotment to $32 million from fiscal year 2000 forward. I appreciate that in 2005, Congress responded to my effort to get an additional annual increase of $20 million in the budget reconciliation bill, bringing DC's Medicaid reimbursements to $57 million as intended by the Revitalization Act. However, this amount did not reimburse the District for the years the federal error denied the city part of its federal contribution, and, in any case, of course, was not intended to eliminate the District's structural deficit, which this bill partially addresses.

The bill is part of my series of bills for equal treatment of DC. The series of bills addresses inappropriate and often unequal restrictions placed only on the District, and no other U.S. jurisdiction.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support the bill.

ANDREW RABBITT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Andrew Rabbitt for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Andrew Rabbitt is an 8th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Andrew Rabbitt is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their live.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Andrew Rabbitt for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING CONNECTICUT'S PERMANENT COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN AS THEY CELEBRATE THEIR 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to join the many who have gathered in Connecticut's capitol to mark the 40th Anniversary of the Permanent Commission on the Status of Women. Formed under Connecticut statute and charged with a mission to study and improve Connecticut women's economic security, health and safety; promote consideration of qualified women to leadership positions; and to work toward the elimination of gender discrimination, the PCSW is our state's leading force for women's equality.

Women, in the workplace and in our society, have come a long way since the women's suffrage movement in the 19th century and the women's rights movement of the 20th century, during which time the PCSW was first established. Today, ninety-seven women serve in the two Houses of the United States Congress and thousands serve at the state and municipal levels as well. In fact, in Connecticut, women hold fifty-five seats in the General Assembly and half of the Constitutional offices. Women own their own businesses and are leading some of the largest corporations in the world. And yet women still face a myriad of obstacles in our society. Women still make seventy-seven cents to every dollar earned by a man in comparable positions and there is still a stigma attached to women in the workforce—employers still concerned about women who may have children or are thinking about starting a family and how those choices may impact their job performance or attendance. Women statistically live longer than men yet they have less retirement security, until very recently health research did not take into consideration the basic biological differences between men and women, and sexual harassment and discrimination continue to persist in a variety of forms.

The PCSW, through policy research as well as education and awareness programs, has helped to shape the debate around these and many other issues impacting the lives of Connecticut women and create public policy that makes a difference. The PCSW has had a leadership role in advancing legislation in Connecticut to prohibit sex discrimination in credit transactions, create the first family and medical leave protections in the country, and require health insurance plans to cover a minimum of forty-eight hours hospital stay for normal childbirth and ninety-six for caesarian sections. Each of these efforts now stand as law in Connecticut and have acted as a model for legislation in other states as well as at the federal level.

Under the outstanding leadership of Executive Director Teresa Younger, the PCSW is continuing in its strong tradition of ensuring that issues that impact women and their families are at the forefront of Connecticut's public policy discussions. I have spent much of my time in Congress focused on these issues and have often turned to the PCSW for guidance and support. It is with great pride and my deepest thanks that I rise today to congratulate them on their 40th Anniversary and wish them all the best for continued success.

RECOGNIZING SANDY FEINBERG

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding resident of New York's 1st Congressional District, Sandy Feinberg.

In 1971, Sandy began her career at the Middle Country Public Library as a children's librarian. This position would lead to a forty-two year career as one of the most innovative and influential librarians on Long Island. She was named the Library Director in 1991 in recognition of her hard work and vision, a position she would hold for the next 22 years.

As Library Director, Sandy oversaw the expansion and renovation of two library locations. In 1999, she oversaw the transformation of the library's Centereach location into the largest public library on Long Island. Today, through innovative programs and extraordinary effort, it is not only the largest, but the busiest public library on Long Island.

As a pioneer in library-community interaction, she founded the Family Place Libraries initiative. This comprehensive library-based early childhood and family support program has been replicated in more than 350 libraries in 24 states.

Sandy continued the library's advancement by overseeing the opening of the Miller Business Resource Center, a regional resource to promote economic development through small businesses, entrepreneurs, and not-for-profit organizations. She also founded the Museum Corner, an interactive exhibit space with rotating hands-on educational exhibits for children. Finally, she created the Nature Explorium, a first-in-the-nation library-based outdoor learning space where children can learn about nature.

Sandy has also focused her attention on those in need outside of the library. She established the Community Resource Database, a collection of not-for-profit and government agencies available to assist residents in need. Eventually, the database would become Long Island 211, a telephone service center to connect those in need with available resources.

She served as President of the Middle Country Chamber of Commerce and was a founding member of the Middle Country Coalition for Smart Growth. She served on the boards of the Child Care Council of Suffolk County and the Long Island Museum of Art, and is currently the Chairwoman of the Board of the Early Years Institute.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of New York's 1st Congressional District, I thank Sandy Feinberg for her years of dedicated service to our community. Her passion and enthusiasm for nurturing young minds has had a positive impact on countless families. Her willingness to initiate new tasks and challenges is an inspiration to us all. While her phenomenal leadership and ingenuity will surely be missed, her imprint on the community will endure for years to come.

APRIL CENDEJAS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud April Cendejas for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. April Cendejas is a 10th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by April Cendejas is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to April Cendejas for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING RECIPIENTS OF THE FULBRIGHT AWARD

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the individuals from the 23rd District of New York who were recently awarded the Fulbright Award. Thirteen constituents from my district were selected to receive this prestigious honor: Dr. Christopher Barrett, Ms. Emily Brown, Ms. Abena Bruce, Ms. Dina Bryan, Dr. Abigail Cohn, Dr. Matthew Evangelista, Mr. Andrew Hart, Dr. Teresa Jordan, Ms. Catherine Kearns, Mr. Joshua Kim, Mr. John Maher, Dr. Judith McKinney, and Ms. Sarah Steece.

The recipients include both undergraduate students and scholars from a wide range of higher education institutions including Cornell University, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Ithaca College, New York University, Stanford University, and Williams College.

The Fulbright Program is America's largest international exchange program, having linked over a quarter of a million students with more than 155 countries worldwide. These opportunities not only offer our students a chance to educate themselves in foreign nations but these programs also help to strengthen our relationships with their host countries. Since 1977 when the Fulbright Association was established, many notable individuals have been recipients of this award. Ten Fulbright recipients have been elected to the United States Congress, 43 have received a Nobel Prize, and 78 have received the Pulitzer Prize.

Fulbright Award recipients are selected on the basis of academic or professional achievement as well as the leadership potential they show in their fields. It is a privilege to represent a district that so many of these award recipients call home. The bar has now been set very high, and I am proud to have them representing our nation as ambassadors abroad.

ON THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, as a proud Irish American, I was pleased this past Sunday to celebrate St. Patrick's Day. Celebrating our heritage today has become an American tradition that extends beyond those Americans of Irish heritage. But that wasn't always the case. For many years, Irish Americans faced discrimination and struggled to gain acceptance and economic stability in the great melting pot that is America.

The story of Irish Americans and all Americans needs to be told. We are a nation of immigrants. But there is no place today where one can go to learn the full story of who we are as a nation and the stories of the many, vibrant ethnicities that make up the fabric of the American experience. The story about the making of the American People—of all of the people—is missing and it needs to be told in the heart of our nation's capital.

That's why I am introducing a bipartisan resolution that calls for a Presidential Commission to study the establishment of the National Museum of the American People. I am joined in effort by my colleagues JOHN DUNCAN, CAROLYN MALONEY, CHARLIE RANGEL, FRANK WOLF, GERALD CONNOLLY, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, BOBBY SCOTT, DAVID CICILLINE, TIM WALZ, TIM BISHOP, TOM COLE and JIM GERLACH.

A commission is the first critical step in the path toward the creation of a national museum that will highlight the diversity and richness of the cultures from which our ancestors came and will foster a sense of belonging to the nation by the waves of people who made us the leading economic, military, scientific, and cultural force in the world. The Museum's central theme takes its inspiration from our original national motto: ''E Pluribus Unum''—From Many We Are One.

The Museum will be America's only national institution devoted exclusively to telling the full story of how the world's pioneers interwove their diverse races, religions, and ethnicities into the strongest societal fabric ever known to modern mankind. Both Canada and Mexico have major national museums in their capitals telling the story of their peoples and they are the most visited museums in those nations. People from every ethnic and minority group will come to see their own story and learn how they joined together with ''the others'' in pursuit of a more noble national purpose. Foreign visitors will come to learn how natives of their countries helped create our nation.

I fully understand the current fiscal realities of the day. This proposal will involve no authorization of federal funds and will not require the need for any taxpayer money. It does, however, already enjoy broad support having been endorsed by more than 150 organizations representing virtually every major ethnic and nationality group in the nation.

For the different groups who became Americans, the Museum will tell who, where, when, why and how transformed our nation. Today's technology makes all of this possible.

The Museum of the American People will be like walking though a dramatic documentary delving into these grand movements of peoples. It will follow in the tradition of some of today's most successful story-telling museums such as the Holocaust Memorial Museum. The goal will be to tell our peoples' compelling story with force and clarity.

In telling everyone's story, the National Museum of the American People would recognize the important differences that set us apart while celebrating the common purpose that has brought us together—E Pluribus Unum.

I encouraged my colleagues to support this measure.

ARIANNA MARTINEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Arianna Martinez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Arianna Martinez is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Arianna Martinez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Arianna Martinez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted: On rollcall No. 73—''yea''; No. 74—''yea''; No. 75—''nay.''

HONORING SANDRA SECREST FOR 30 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Sandra Secrest for her 30 years of public service to the Metrocrest area which encompasses the North Texas cities of Carrollton, Farmers Branch, and Addison.

Sandra Secrest was born and raised in Farmers Branch and graduated from W.T. White High School in 1979. She then attended Texas A&M University from 1979 to 1983 where she graduated with a Bachelor of Science in Education.

Following graduation in 1983, Sandra Secrest returned home to Farmers Branch

where she became a social studies teacher at Newman Smith High School of Carrollton-Farmers Branch Independent School District. From 1988 to 1992, Sandra Secrest worked as a Park Ranger for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers during her summer breaks from teaching.

After ten years of teaching, in 1993, Sandra Secrest changed her career to become a police officer for the City of Carrollton where she committed 20 years of service to the community. Ms. Secrest spent her first 5 years as a patrol officer, the following 8 years as a school resource officer, and the final 7 years back on patrol duty. As a school resource officer, she spent the majority of her time at Creekview High School and R.L. Turner High School. During her tenure as school resource officer, Ms. Secrest was a member of the Carrollton Police Department Gang Unit and Texas Gang Violence Task Force.

Sandra Secrest has spent her entire career serving and protecting her community. Ms. Secrest's commitment to her community speaks volumes to the integrity of her character. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking Sandra Secrest for her 30 years of public service.

AVA KOPPERSCHLAGER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ava Kopperschlager for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Ava Kopperschlager is an 8th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ava Kopperschlager is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ava Kopperschlager for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF RUSSELL SIMPSON

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to honor the life of Russell Simpson, who passed from this life on Tuesday, March 15, 2013. Russell Simpson had a true servant's heart and his life helped countless others.

Mr. Simpson was born October 14, 1934. A lifelong Toledoan, he graduated from Libbey High School and served in the United States Army. He married his wife, Patricia, in 1958 and they began their family. He was a Greyhound bus driver, a career which served him well later in life when he served older adults as a driver for senior center activities and excursions.

In 1969, the unthinkable happened and the Simpsons' four-year-old daughter was murdered. Their grief was compounded twelve years later when their nineteen-year-old son was killed during a robbery. Incredibly, out of these two horrific and senseless tragedies, the Simpsons bore fruit. In 1983, the Simpsons formed Parents of Murdered Children, a nationally recognized support group. Soon, parents with similar tragic tales had a place where they belonged and could share their grief with people who understood. As his daughter noted, ''He got through it by helping other people get through it.''

Russell Simpson was successful in persuading the county prosecutor to create a victims assistance fund. He trained to facilitate face-to-face meetings with victims or family members and their offender. He worked to educate the community and law enforcement to strengthen communication. Most importantly, he was a calm shoulder, a kind heart, compassionate eyes and a strong leader to families facing the ultimate tragedy.

Russell Simpson leaves a legacy of service. His selfless work will endure into the future. Even as he helped other families, he never lost sight of his own. Our condolences to his wife Patricia, his children Linda Lou and David, and his grandchildren. May the light which shone for others guide you as well, and in your memories may you find peace.

HONORING SAMANTHA HANSEN

SPEECH OF

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a young constituent, Samantha Rae Hansen of Holton, Indiana.

Samantha attended South Ripley High School and actively participated in a number of school clubs, including science, Spanish, and band. She was a school leader on the student council and served as president of the FFA and Country Critters 4–H club. Along with her family, she also was a member of the First Southern Baptist Church in Versailles, participating in the church choir.

We mourn a life that ended too soon and pray for understanding and comfort for family members and those in our community who knew and loved Samantha. While in times of turmoil we struggle to understand the unexplainable, may we find peace and joy in our religious faith and the memories of time shared with those we love.

Samantha will be forever remembered as a friend of her community. I ask the citizens of the 6th Congressional District to join me in keeping her parents, Matthew and Jenny Wahl Hansen, sisters, Amanda and Nikki, and the entire extended Hansen family in our thoughts and prayers.

BAILEE YODER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud BaiLee Yoder for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. BaiLee Yoder is an 8th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by BaiLee Yoder is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to BaiLee Yoder for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT JOSEPH DENNIS HELTON, JR.

HON. PAUL C. BROUN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a special purpose, calling us all to remember and honor the life of First Lieutenant Joseph Dennis Helton, Jr. On September 8, 2009, Lieutenant Helton was tragically killed in action while serving our country in Iraq.

Like many of our nation's heroes, Lieutenant Helton was an exceptional young man with a calling to be a part of something greater than himself. His desire to serve led him to the United States Air Force Academy where he graduated fifth in his class and was the recipient of numerous awards and distinctions.

Upon graduation, Lieutenant Helton was assigned to the 732nd Expeditionary Security Forces Squadron at McDill Air Force Base in Tampa, Florida. As exceptional young soldiers often do, he immediately volunteered for overseas duty, leading him to Iraq. Lieutenant Helton was awarded the Bronze Star Medal with Valor for his fortitude, bravery, and courage and the Purple Heart for his ultimate sacrifice.

As we remember and honor Lieutenant Helton and his sacrifice for our freedom, let us not forget his parents, Joseph and Jennifer, his sisters, Jeanne, Jessica, and Jordanne, and many other loving family members and friends.

Mr. Speaker, may we as grateful citizens, and Members of this body, never forget the passing of this courageous young man and encourage all Americans to honor his sacrifice which was made in defense of liberty and of this great nation. I proudly pay tribute to his memory and hold his service in the highest esteem.

HONORING T.C. FREEMAN

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish a very happy birthday to someone who has a long and distinguished record of service to our country and to the Commonwealth of Kentucky. This lady has spent a majority of her life connected to United States Army. At 80 years young, she currently serves as a civilian aide for the United States Army in Kentucky. Of course, I am referring to Mrs. T.C. Freeman who recently celebrated her 80th Birthday on March 10th.

T.C. Freeman's life has revolved around our Army since 1941 when Killeen, Texas was designated the home of Camp Hood. She met and married her husband, Colonel Bob Freeman (Ret) when he was assigned to the 3d Artillery, 2nd Armored Division at Fort Hood. She and Bob have three children, a daughter Gil, and two sons William and Robert.

For her efforts on behalf of Soldiers during Desert Shield/Desert Storm, T.C. Freeman was awarded Association of the United States Army's Citation for Exceptional Service. In 2002, she received their Anthony Drexel Biddle Medal, which is their second-highest award. She served as Tennessee/Kentucky Chapter President of the Association of the United States Army for two years, and as the Kentucky State President for two years. She also served four years as the 2nd Region President and now once again serves as a Kentucky State President

T.C. Freeman is a life member of the Association of the United States Army. She is an honorary member of the 502nd, the 187th Infantry, the 327th and 506th Infantry Regiments. She is also an honorary member of the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment and of the 5th Special Forces Group. She holds the Anne Morrow Lindberg Award and the Honorable Order of Our Lady of Loretta for her support of Army Aviation and the Aviation Community. She is a Life Member of Army Aviation Association of America.

Mrs. Freeman is also the recipient of Artillery's Molly Pitcher Award and Department of the Army Awards for Public Service and the Outstanding Civilian Service Medal. In 2010, she received the Daughters of the American Revolution's Medal of Honor.

T.C. began the ''Welcome Home Flights'' after Desert Shield/Desert Storm and she has attended almost every flight following—from Kosovo and from other 101st Deployments, to include the recent Vietnam Veterans Welcome Home on August 16, 2009.

Presently, she is welcoming home Division Units from Afghanistan and attends National Guard farewells and welcome homes. She is a supporter of Fisher House and the Wounded Warrior Programs. T.C. Freeman has visited our Warrior Heroes at both Walter Reed and Brooke in San Antonio.

Since May 2005, T.C. has served as a member of the Executive Committee of the Governor's Kentucky Military Affairs Commission. The Commission keeps the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky advised of conditions and needs of the installation. She was pleased to be involved last December in the event that named Governor Steve Beshear as an Honorary Screaming Eagle. She serves on the Board of Directors of the Fort Campbell Historical Foundation, the Hopkinsville-Christian County Military Affairs Committee, The Christian County School Superintendents Advisory and the Military Affairs Advisory Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, and she is a member of the Citizens for Fort Campbell and an Eagle Ambassador.

T.C. Freeman is a regular attendee of area Veteran's organizations, VFW, DAV and the American Legion.

Since being named a Kentucky Court Appointed Special Advocate, her efforts are not limited to Fort Campbell. She now actively supports activities of the Units at Fort Knox to include United States Army Recruiting Command and the 3rd Brigade of the 1st Infantry Division.

Mrs. Freeman has also been faithful in her support of the National Guard, the Army Reserve, University and Junior ROTC Units.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this House T.C. Freeman's remarkable life of faithful service to our Nation's heroes. She is a personal friend, but more importantly a friend to every man and woman who wears our Nation's uniform. It is my honor to recognize her before this House and to wish her a very Happy 80th Birthday.

IN RECOGNITION OF NAM VETS ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Nam Vets Association upon its thirtieth anniversary.

Nam Vets has been providing vital assistance to veterans since the association was founded in 1983. Originally serving veterans of the Vietnam War exclusively, Nam Vets has since expanded and now serves veterans from all eras. Over the years, it has become known as a local gateway to veterans' services for Cape Cod and the Islands, assisting veterans with important tasks such as finding employment and housing, receiving medical care, and obtaining employment.

Coinciding with the thirtieth anniversary of Nam Vets is the opening of its new Veterans' Outreach Grace Center (VOCG) in New Seabury. The VOCG will be a general wellness center through which veterans will receive a variety of services. Such support will include physical, psychological, educational, financial, or vocational assistance aimed at helping veterans reintegrate into civilian life. This Center will play a vital role on Cape Cod once it opens its doors to our local veterans, and I commend Nam Vets for working to achieve this important goal. I am certain that the organization's next thirty years will be bright.

Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pleasure to recognize Nam Vets upon its thirtieth anniversary. The many years of service that the organization has provided have been invaluable to the veterans and families that have been affected by its work. I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking Nam Vets for all that the association has given to its community.

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO SERGEANT RAFAEL PERALTA

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a resolution recommending the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor to one of America's bravest soldiers who made the ultimate sacrifice, Sergeant Rafael Peralta.

Sgt. Peralta's story is the epitome of what makes America great generation after generation. After immigrating as a teenager with his family from Mexico to San Diego, Sgt. Peralta joined the Marines the first chance he was able to—the morning he received his green card. According to his mother, Rosa Peralta, Sgt. Peralta ''really loved this country'' and loved being a Marine. In fact, he passed along his love for the Marines to his brother, Ricardo, who kept a promise he made at his brother's funeral by enlisting in the Marines Corps in 2010.

In 2004, Sgt. Peralta was killed during a house-clearing mission in Fallujah, Iraq. According to news reports, during a firefight with insurgents, a fragment from a friendly-fire bullet ricocheted and struck Sgt. Peralta in the back of his head. According to eyewitness accounts from fellow Marines who were at the scene, Sgt. Peralta, despite his mortal wound, pulled an enemy grenade under his body and absorbed the ensuing blast. By doing so, he saved the lives of an estimated six of his fellow Marines.

Each of the armed services has provisions for judging whether an individual is eligible for the Medal of Honor—which permit no margin of doubt or error. Historically, the individual's action must be supported by incontestable evidence of at least two eyewitnesses. In Sgt. Peralta's case, seven eyewitnesses confirmed that he smothered the grenade blast with his body. Even though a pathologist report questioned whether Sgt. Peralta could have deliberately brought the grenade to his body due to his wound, separate analyses by three neurologists opined otherwise. His Navy Cross citation, the second highest American military decoration that can be awarded to a Marine, says it all: ''Without hesitation and with complete disregard for his own personal safety, Sergeant Peralta reached out and pulled the grenade to his body, absorbing the brunt of the blast and shielding fellow Marines only feet away.

Sgt. Peralta exemplified and lived the values Americans hold dear: honor, duty, and dedication to his country. In a letter written right before his death, Sgt. Peralta told his brother, ''I'm proud to be a Marine, a U.S. Marine, and to defend and protect the freedom and Constitution of America. You should be proud of being an American citizen.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution and recommend the posthumous award of the Medal of Honor to a true American hero, Sgt. Rafael Peralta.

IN HONOR OF MARSHA B. JETTÉ

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my heartiest congratulations and sincere thanks to Marsha Jetté of Norwich. For more than four decades she has assisted the farmers of Connecticut. This past January, Marsha retired after more than 41 years of working for the U.S. Department of Agriculture Farm Service Agency in Connecticut.

After graduating from Norwich Free Academy, Marsha attended Johnson and Wales Junior College in Providence, RI where she took courses in bookkeeping. Between 1969 and 1971 Marsha worked at various companies as a bookkeeper. In 1971, Marsha began her career at USDA with the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS), now the Farm Service Agency (FSA) as a Program Assistant in the New London County office in Norwich. In 1973 Marsha was made Acting County Executive Director in her office which led her to enter the County Office Training program the following year in order to become a County Executive Director.

Marsha became County Executive Director of the New London County ASCS Office on May 11, 1975. During her tenure in the county office, Marsha also served on the 2007 National CED Classification Review Committee and served as the State Communications Coordinator. In her role as State Communications Coordinator, Marsha coordinated various events including a visit from the FSA Administrator and Washington, DC staff, as well as educational tours from the Connecticut State and County Committee members. Mrs. Jetté also compiled an education text for state and county committee members in order to provide them with a better understanding of FSA and its mission.

In August, 2009, Marsha Jetté was appointed as State Executive Director of FSA in Connecticut by President Barack Obama. In her capacity as Executive Director, Marsha worked tirelessly to promote agriculture in the state and support her staff in Connecticut. The final three and a half years of her tenure at USDA crowned an impressive career. My staff and I called on Marsha countless times—whether to assess damage after a hurricane hit the state or to determine the status of FSA payments, Marsha always had the answer. Mrs. Jetté's absence at the Farm Service Agency will be felt both within and outside the agency for some time to come. I thank her for her many years of service to the agricultural community, congratulate her on her retirement, and wish her well in all of her future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF DANIEL SILVERMAN

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of Fire Chief Daniel R. Silverman on the occasion of his retirement.

Chief Silverman dedicated his professional life to the Town of Wellfleet and its fire department. He will retire after thirty years and three months of honorable service, including nearly seven years as a full-time Fire Chief. Chief Silverman's outstanding achievements as a first responder are evident in his rise through the ranks. After beginning his career as a Call Firefighter and EMT, he was subsequently awarded the role of Call Lieutenant, Call Deputy Chief, and Fire Chief. Firefighters are a pillar of strength in our society, and they routinely risk their lives to protect our neighborhoods, safeguard our families, and provide urgent aid to those who need it most. Over the course of his impressive career, Chief Silverman has demonstrated an unwavering devotion to those ideals.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Fire Chief Daniel R. Silverman for over three decades of distinguished public service. I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring all that Chief Silverman has given to his community.

COMMENDING MR. DAVID PICKLER FOR HIS ELECTION TO PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks today to recognize Mr. David Pickler, who has recently been elected as President of the National School Boards Association for 2013–2014.

David has served on the Shelby County Board of Education since 1998 and has served as Chairman of the Board for 12 years. In 2008, David was elected to the National School Boards Association's Board of Directors and served as the Southern Region Representative. In 2009, David served as President of the Tennessee School Boards Association and has held several positions of leadership with It.

David is an excellent example of the spirit of volunteerism, which we Tennesseans hold close to our hearts. His community service and philanthropic endeavors are both numerous and extraordinary, casting a legacy of selflessness and determination to better education across Tennessee. Perhaps the highlight of this legacy is the creation of the Shelby County Schools Education Foundation, which has provided more than $1 million in financial support for public education. David's awards and accolades at the local, state and national level are extensive and serve as a testament to the positive impact he has had on the children of Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Pickier for his unwavering commitment to improving education for the students of Shelby County, Tennessee, and the United States of America.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,736,188,026,047.86. We've added $6,109,310,977,134.78 to our debt in 3 years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for votes on March 18, 2013 due to a declared state of emergency in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall votes Nos. 76, 77, and 78.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OVERDRAFT PROTECTION ACT OF 2013

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Overdraft Protection Act of 2013.

With the rise of debit cards and the constant presence of swipe terminals to use those cards to pay for everything from dry cleaning to gas to candy bars, it's easier than ever for consumers to overdraw their checking accounts and incur overdraft fees.

That's how a cappuccino can become a $35 cappuccino faster than you can say ''overdrawn''. Some institutions have responded to consumer outrage over these fees by implementing a policy of denying debit card transactions that would overdraw an account and I applaud them.

But too many financial institutions don't make consumers adequately aware of the perils of overdrafts, and others reorder the posting of transactions in a way that maximizes their fees.

Although the Federal Reserve issued a rule requiring institutions to obtain affirmative consent from consumers to opt into overdraft coverage two years ago, it is quite clear more needs to be done to help consumers avoid multiple overdrafts.

A survey released last year by Pew Charitable Trusts highlights the need for the bill I am introducing today.

More than one-third of those surveyed—people who had overdrawn their accounts in the past year—didn't know they had overdraft coverage until they incurred a penalty fee, and more than half of people did not believe they had opted in. The Pew study also found that most of the people who overdraft their accounts do so more than once.

According to Moebs Services, overdraft fees brought in over $31.5 billion dollars in revenue to financial institutions in 2012.

As a result of the Federal Reserve's opt-in requirement the number of overdrafts has fallen, but some institutions have responded to the drop by increasing the price of overdraft fees and continuing to intentionally manipulate the transactions' posting order in a way that maximizes the fees they can earn from this service.

My bill increases disclosure to consumers, limits the fees' price and frequency, and bans the manipulation of transactions.

Specifically, the Overdraft Protection Act will: require consumer consent before banks can permit overdraft fees to paper checks, automated charges and debit card swipe-terminal transactions; require that fees be ''reasonable and proportional'' to the amount of the overdraft; cap the number of fees that can be charged at one per month and six per year; prohibit banks from manipulating the sequence in which checks and other debits are posted if it causes more overdrafts and maximizes fees paid to banks; require that consumers be warned at ATMs if their withdrawals will trigger an overdraft; require the CFPB to study the practices of pre-paid cards and if necessary extend these provisions to those products.

The Overdraft Protection Act will ensure consumers are protected from misleading practices and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

IN RECOGNITION OF DONALD HUSSEY

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Donald Hussey upon his retirement from the Rockland Fire Department.

Lieutenant Hussey has given four decades of dedicated service to the people of Rockland, and I know I speak for many when I say that his many accomplishments have been invaluable to the town. The Department recognized his skill early on when they appointed Lieutenant Hussey to the position of Permanent Firefighter just one year after he first entered the Rockland Fire Call Department. Lieutenant Hussey was again promoted to Permanent Lieutenant in October 1995, the same month in which he was bestowed with a Medal of Valor for saving an elderly person from a burning home. He officially retired from the Rockland Fire Department this past January, and I know that his service will be sorely missed in his community.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Lieutenant Donald Hussey upon his retirement from the Rockland Fire Department after forty years of invaluable service. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating him on this important occasion and in thanking him for all that he has done for the Town of Rockland.

HONORING JACOB VOGEL

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a young constituent, Jacob Russell Vogel of Versailles, Indiana.

Jacob attended South Ripley High School and actively participated in the FFA and as a member of the St. Charles Catholic Church in Milan. He also attended the Southeastern Career Center for emergency services and served as a cadet with the Friendship Fire Department.

We mourn a life that ended too soon and pray for understanding and comfort for family members and those in our community who knew and loved Jacob. While in times of turmoil we struggle to understand the unexplainable, may we find peace and joy in our religious faith and the memories of time shared with those we love.

Jacob will be forever remembered as a friend of his community. I ask the citizens of the 6th Congressional District to join me in keeping his parents, Brian and Ann Sieverding Vogel, siblings, Matthew, Luke, and Jessica, and the entire extended Vogel family in our thoughts and prayers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on Monday, March 18, 2013 so I missed rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: On rollcall vote No. 76 regarding the Journal vote, ''yes,'' on rollcall vote No. 77 regarding the ''Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service'' (H. Con. Res. 18), and on rollcall vote No. 78 regarding the ''Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby'' (H. Con. Res. 19), ''yes.''

RECOGNIZING MARCH AS NATIONAL FROZEN FOOD MONTH

HON. REID J. RIBBLE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March as National Frozen Food Month and to honor one of my home state's own frozen food companies, Seneca Foods Corporation.

Founded in 1949, Seneca Foods is one of our nation's largest processors of fruits and vegetables. In fact, Seneca Foods produces more than 2 billion cans and bags of frozen fruit and vegetable products every year, which equates to over 5 billion servings.

I had the pleasure of visiting Seneca's Gillett, Wisconsin plant last August. There has been an active canning factory on this site since 1909 and Seneca took over the site in 2003.

Seneca Foods believes in providing the community with jobs and continually improving its facilities. At Gillett, this included a 2007 warehouse expansion that tripled the storage space.

There are 37 full-time employees at this facility. But in season, it grows to employ over 210 seasonal employees and has an annual payroll of $4.3 million.

Much of what I know about Seneca Foods I learned from Executive Vice President and COO Paul Palmby, who serves on the Board of the American Frozen Food Institute and is the chairman of the Produce for Better Health Foundation, PBH, which promote increased consumption of fruits and vegetables for better health.

Both Seneca Foods and the American Frozen Food Institute were recognized recently as PBH Fruits & Veggies—More Matters® Role Models.

Working together, these entities regularly promote the nutritional benefits of fruit and vegetable consumption as part of an important effort to encourage healthy eating.

Mr. Speaker, in celebration of National Frozen Food Month, I wish to applaud Seneca Foods and the entire frozen food industry for their hard work and contributions to the health of our nation and its citizens.

HONORING FIVE PLANO EAST HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, THE AT&T HACKATHON COMPETITION WINNERS

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate five remarkable students from Plano East High School on winning first place in the AT&T Hackathon Competition.

The AT&T Hackathon, held at the AT&T Foundry development center in Plano, is a competition to promote innovative technology, the entrepreneurial spirit, and growth in computer science education. The competition is open to all technical and non-technical computer developers and designers across the Dallas-Fort Worth area. Each team is given a little more than 24 hours to create a smartphone app, which helps solve a problem plaguing the community—in this case, the decreasing high school graduation rate.

Out of all the technology experts in the room, it was the Plano East high school team, comprised of Trent Davies, 17; Bilal Ayub, 16; Ahmed Khan, 16; Matthew Laux, 17; and Jimmy Khong, 17 that put their computer science skills to work and took home the prize. Competing against 150 plus people, the students won the contest with oculr, an app that takes camera phone-snapped pictures of math equations and searches the Internet for instructions on how to solve the problem. What a great idea. At the kickoff of the competition, the students developed the idea in less than five minutes, gave a 60 second lightning pitch to a crowd of 150 professional developers, and then created the product the very next day. To conclude the competition, the team of sixteen and seventeen year old students presented a three-minute demonstration of the app prototype to a panel of judges,

experts in the technological field. I am incredibly impressed with their ability to create and put a new idea into action in only a 24-hour period. You are truly some of the best and brightest.

Technology touches our lives now more than ever before. Students encounter social media constantly outside the classroom so why not incorporate media into the classroom to further engage and prepare students for a technology-driven world? These five Plano students embody the future of innovation. I commend them for putting their creative minds to work for the betterment of their peers and the perpetual success of our community.

Once again, congratulations, students, on your outstanding accomplishment. I am proud to see such innovative thinking and active problem–solving from the youth in our great state of Texas. You all have very bright futures ahead of you. God Bless you.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE IRAQ WAR

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tenth anniversary since the launch of Operation Iraqi Freedom and to remember the men and women of our armed services who have defended the United States in the war on terror.

Starting on March 20, 2003, and for nearly nine years thereafter, members of our Armed Forces fought to protect both their loved ones back home and Iraqi citizens from the many threats that lingered in the region. It was a long and difficult journey for us as a nation but none more so than the journey traveled and sacrifices made by our service men and women and their families. The United States lost 4,475 members of our armed services by the time we left Iraq in December 2011, and an additional 32,220 were wounded. I know that I speak for many when I say that these men and women, who gave so much for their country, are true American heroes whose names will be forever honored.

Our involvement in Iraq may be officially over, but we still face many threats as a nation, and there is much work ahead of us in the war on terror. We still have many members of our Armed Forces who continue this fight, both at home and abroad. On this important anniversary in the war on terror, I ask that we take a moment to honor and recognize the many troops we have lost, the sacrifices made by those who stayed at home, and the men and women of our Armed Forces who remain on the front lines in the name of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the tenth anniversary of the war in Iraq. I thank my colleagues for joining me in honoring of the service men and women who have defended the United States.

CONGRATULATING THE GARDEN THEATRE ON THEIR FIVE YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the Garden Theatre of Winter Garden, Florida, on the celebration of their five year anniversary. The Garden Theatre works to provide cultural performing arts such as concerts, movies and live plays to the City of Winter Garden and the Central Florida region.

The Garden Theatre was originally constructed in 1935 in Mediterranean Revival style as a single-screen cinema where the community gathered to watch the most current newsreels and films. Through the years the theatre underwent various renovations until 1963, when it closed. In February 2008, because of the tireless effort put forth by the Winter Garden Heritage Foundation, the restored Garden Theatre reopened to the public.

While proudly representing historic downtown Winter Garden, the Garden Theatre affords economic development to the Central Florida region by presenting four to seven events each week and annually hosting over 200 events. A study from the Arts and Economic Prosperity Report estimated an annual economic impact from the theatre's operations and events to be more than $1 million annually. During the past five years, the Garden Theatre has been active in Central Florida, enriching and entertaining the community through creative experiences while encouraging economic growth and providing nostalgic charm.

On behalf of the citizens of Central Florida, I am pleased to congratulate and recognize the Garden Theatre as an outstanding local business, and I wish them many more successful years of providing quality performing arts to the Central Florida community.

IN HONOR OF THOMAS A. RIDER

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Thomas A. Rider for his continued dedication to the agricultural industries of Santa Cruz County and the Pajaro Valley. Tom is a thoughtful, soft-spoken, intelligent leader and his contributions have translated to increased viability of these crucial industries throughout the Central Coast. It is with great honor that I recognize Mr. Thomas A. Rider as the 2013 Al Smith Friend of Agriculture award winner.

Tom is part of the fifth generation of his family in the Pajaro Valley. He graduated from Watsonville High School in 1966 and went on in 1971 to obtain his degree from Oregon State University.

In the early to mid 1980s, Tom helped this family's business, H.A. Rider & Sons Bottles, make the successful transition from producing apple juice and cider to being a co-packer of flavored waters, brewed teas, energy drinks, and lemonades.

Tom has served on the Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau Legislative Committee, in addition to chairing the Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency.

Later in his career, Tom served as the 4th Supervisorial District Representative for the Genetic Engineering Subcommittee for Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency, HAS. Additionally, Tom represented the Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau on the Transportation Funding Task Force, which is comprised of over 90 members representing business, neighborhood, environmental, health, and community-based organizations. Tom has also been a champion of the Basin Management Plan Committee for the Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency, PVWMA.

Committed to improving the agricultural industry, Tom is currently a board member for the Central Coast Agricultural Task Force, CCATF and a member of the Legislative Committee for the Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that agricultural industries of Santa Cruz County and the Pajaro Valley will continue to thrive with Tom's devotion.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1913–S1965

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 602–617, S. Res. 80–81, and S. Con. Res. 9. **Page S1950**

Measures Passed:

National Ag Day 40th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 81, commemorating March 19, 2013, as the 40th anniversary of National Ag Day. **Page S1957**

Measures Considered:

Department of Defense, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1914, S1928–44**

Pending:

Reid (for Mikulski/Shelby) Modified Amendment No. 26, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1914**

Toomey Amendment No. 115 (to Amendment No. 26), to increase by $60,000,000 the amount appropriated for Operation and Maintenance for the Department of Defense for programs, projects, and activities in the continental United States, and to provide an offset. **Page S1914**

Durbin Amendment No. 123 (to Amendment No. 115), to change the enactment date. **Page S1914**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 11:15 a.m., on Wednesday, March 20, 2013, all post-cloture time on Reid (for Mikulski/Shelby) Modified Amendment No. 26 (listed above), be considered expired; that Durbin Amendment No. 123 (to Amendment No. 115) (listed above), be withdrawn with no other second-degree amendment in order; that Senate vote on or in relation to Toomey Amendment No. 115 (to Amendment No. 26) (listed above); that upon disposition of Toomey Amendment No. 115 (to Amendment No. 26), Senate vote on or in relation to Reid (for Mikulski/Shelby) Modified Amendment No. 26, as amended; that upon disposition of Reid (for Mikulski/Shelby) Modified Amendment No. 26, Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill; and that if cloture is invoked on the bill, the 30 hours post-cloture begin to run as if cloture were invoked at 1 a.m., on Wednesday, March 20, 2013. **Page S1957**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, March 20, 2013, with the time until 11:15 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees. **Page S1957**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Patricia E. Campbell-Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Elaine D. Kaplan, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Michael Kenny O'Keefe, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Robert D. Okun, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

Catherine M. Russell, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

29 Army nominations in the rank of general.

5 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

2 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army, and Navy.

Pages S1958–65

Messages from the House: **Page S1949**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1949–50**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1950**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1946–49**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1951–56**

Additional Statements: Pages S1946–49

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Pages S1956–57

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S1957

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:39 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 20, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S1957–58.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States European Command, United States Northern Command, and United States Southern Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Admiral James Stavridis, United States Navy, Commander, United States European Command, General Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., United States Army, Commander, United States Northern Command, and North American Aerospace Defense Command, and General John F. Kelly, United States Marine Corps, Commander, United States Southern Command, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities received open and closed briefings on cybersecurity threats in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Kevin Mandia, and Richard Bejtlich, both of Mandiant Corporation, Alexandria, Virginia; Stephanie O'Sullivan, Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence, Miriam Perlberg, National Intelligence Manager for Cyber, and Sean Kanuck, National Intelligence Officer for Cyber Issues, all of the Office of National Intelligence; and Lieutenant General Jon M. Davis, USMC, Deputy Commander, U.S. Cyber Command.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Richard Cordray, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and Mary Jo White, of New York, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

BIPARTISAN SOLUTIONS FOR HOUSING FINANCE REFORM

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine bipartisan solutions for housing finance reform, after receiving testimony from former Senator Mel Martinez, Co-Chair, Bipartisan Policy Center's Housing Commission; Peter Wallison, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C.; and Janneke Ratcliffe, Center for American Progress Action Fund, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

INSURANCE MARKETS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance and Investment concluded a hearing to examine streamlining regulation, improving consumer protection and increasing competition in insurance markets, including S. 534, to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, after receiving testimony from Baird Webel, Specialist in Financial Economics, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Monica J. Lindeen, Montana State Auditor and Commissioner of Securities and Insurance, Helena, on behalf of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; Jon Jensen, Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America, Spartanburg, South Carolina; and Scott Trofholz, The Harry A. Koch Company, Omaha, Nebraska, on behalf of The Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers.

UNITED STATES FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard concluded a hearing to examine developments and opportunities in United States fisheries management, after receiving testimony from Eric Schwaab, Assistant Administrator for the National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; Robert Beal, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Executive Director, Arlington, Virginia; Randy Fisher, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission Executive Director, Portland, Oregon; Dave Donaldson, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission Assistant Director, Ocean Springs, Mississippi; James J. Gilmore, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Bureau of Marine Fisheries Director, East Setauket; Emerson C. Hasbrouck, Cornell University Cooperative Extension Marine Program, Riverhead, New York; and Thomas P. Fote, Jersey Coast Anglers Association, Toms River, New Jersey, on behalf of the New Jersey State Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs.

PAYMENT PROGRAMS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the options and challenges related to possible reauthorization and reform of two payment programs for local governments, focusing on the recently expired "Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act" and the "Payment in Lieu of Taxes", after receiving testimony from Senator Baucus; Thomas Tidwell, Chief, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Pamela K. Haze, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Budget, Finance, Performance and Acquisition; Anne-Marie Fennell, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; Jay O'Laughlin, University of Idaho College of Natural Resources, Moscow; Mark Haggerty, Headwaters Economics, Bozeman, Montana; Paul J. Pearce, National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition, Stevenson, Washington; and Ryan R. Yates, National Association of Counties, Washington, D.C.

PRESIDENT'S TRADE AGENDA

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's 2013 trade agenda, after receiving testimony from Demetrios Marantis, Acting United States Trade Representative.

SYRIA'S HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs concluded a hearing to examine Syria's humanitarian crisis, after receiving testimony from Anne C. Richard, Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees, and Migration; Nancy E. Lindborg, Assistant Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development; Antonio Guterres, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, New York, New York; and Tom Malinowski, Human Rights Watch, and Michael Singh, The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, both of Washington, D.C.

RETIREMENT SAVINGS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine keeping savings in the retirement system, after receiving testimony from Matt Fellowes, HelloWallet, and Christian E. Weller, University of Massachusetts Boston, on behalf of the Center for American Progress Action Fund, both of Washington, D.C.; and Alison T. Borland, Aon Hewitt, Lincolnshire, Illinois.

AMERICAN AIRLINES/US AIRWAYS MERGER

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine the American Airlines/US Airways merger, focusing on consolidation, competition, and consumers, after receiving testimony from W. Douglas Parker, US Airways Group, Inc., Tempe, Arizona; Thomas W. Horton, AMR Corporation and American Airlines, Fort Worth, Texas; Diana L. Moss, American Antitrust Institute, Washington, D.C.; and William J. McGee, Consumers Union, New York, New York.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Gregory Alan Phillips, of Wyoming, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Enzi and Barrasso, and Karol Virginia Mason, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee ordered favorably its Biennial Report for the 112th Congress.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 31 public bills, H.R. 1244–1274; and 5 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 26–27; and H. Res. 127–129 were introduced. **Pages H1629–32**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1632–33**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 127, dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth District of Texas (H. Rept. 113–22).

Page H1629

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Collins (NY) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1571**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:42 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H1576**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Rev. Alisa Lasater Wailoo, Capitol Hill United Methodist Church, Washington, DC. **Page H1576**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 272 yeas to 133 nays with 1 answering ''present'', Roll No. 81. **Page H1590**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:43 p.m. and reconvened at 2:15 p.m. **Page H1588**

Dismissing the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth Congressional District of Texas: Agreed by unanimous consent to H. Res. 127, to dismiss the election contest relating to the office of Representative from the Twenty Eighth Congressional District of Texas. **Page H1590**

Providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress: The House agreed to H. Res. 115, to provide for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress, by a yea-and-nay vote of 272 yeas to 136 nays, Roll No. 82. **Pages H1581–90, S1591–97**

H. Res. 122, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) and the resolution (H. Res. 115), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 80, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas 189 nays, Roll No. 79. **Pages H1588–90**

Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014: The House began consideration of H. Con. Res. 25, to establish the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, March 20th. **Pages H1581–90, S1597–H1625**

H. Res. 122, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) and the resolution (H. Res. 115), was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 80, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas 189 nays, Roll No. 79. **Pages H1588–90**

Quorum Calls Votes:—Four yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1588–90, H1589–90, H1590 and H1596–97. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held a hearing on Department of Energy, Environmental Management. Testimony was heard from Dave Huizenga, Acting Assistant Secretary, Environmental Management, Department of Energy.

APPROPRIATIONS—HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OFFICERS FY 2014 BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing on Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request for House of Representatives Officers. Testimony was heard from Daniel J. Strodel, Chief Administrative Officer; Karen L. Haas, Clerk; and Paul D. Irving, Sergeant at Arms.

APPROPRIATIONS—GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on General Services Administration Oversight. Testimony was heard from Dan Tangherlini, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS—TOP MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES AT THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AND EDUCATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on Top Management Challenges at the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education: Perspective from the Inspector Generals. Testimony was heard from Elliot P. Lewis, Assistant Inspector General, Office of Audit, Department of Labor; Kathleen S. Tighe, Inspector General, Department of Education; Daniel R. Levinson, Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BUDGET; AND YOUTH VIOLENCE RESEARCH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice and Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing on National Science Foundation Budget; and Youth Violence Research. Testimony

was heard from Subra Suresh, Director, National Science Foundation; and a public witness.

APPROPRIATIONS—STATE AND FOREIGN OPERATION, AND RELATED PROGRAMS PUBLIC AND OUTSIDE WITNESSES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operation and Related Programs held a hearing for public and outside witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—INDIAN HEALTH OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior held a hearing on Indian Health Oversight. Testimony was heard from Yvette Roudibeaux, M.D., Indian Health Service; and public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE MILITARY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Quality of Life in the Military. Testimony was heard from Sergeant Major Raymond F. Chandler III, Sergeant Major of the Army; Master Chief Petty Officer Michael D. Stevens, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy; Sergeant Major Michael P. Barrett, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps; and Chief Master Sergeant James A. Cody, Sergeant of the Air Force.

APPROPRIATIONS—FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice and Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Federal Bureau of Investigation Budget. Testimony was heard from Robert S. Mueller III, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

EQUIPPING, MODERNIZING, AND SUSTAINING THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE COMPONENTS AS AN OPERATIONAL FORCE IN A TIME OF BUDGET UNCERTAINTY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on Equipping, Modernizing, and Sustaining the National Guard and Reserve Components as an Operational Force in a time of Budget Uncertainty. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Stanley E. Clarke III, Director, Air National Guard, USAF; Lieutenant General William E. Ingram Jr., Director, Army National Guard, USA; Lieutenant General James ''JJ'' Jackson, Chief, U.S. Air Force Reserve, USAF; and Lieutenant General Jeffrey W. Talley, Chief, U.S. Army Reserve and Commanding General, USAR.

NUCLEAR DETERRENT: WHAT ARE THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A STRONG DETERRENT IN AN ERA OF DEFENSE SEQUESTER

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent: What Are the Requirements for A Strong Deterrent in an Era of Defense Sequester? Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY AND INNOVATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled ''American Energy Security and Innovation: The Role of Regulators and Grid Operators in Meeting Natural Gas and Electric Coordination Challenges''. Testimony was heard from Philip D. Moeller, Commissioner, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Cheryl A. LaFleur, Commissioner, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and public witnesses.

HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES: HARNESSING WIRELESS INNOVATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Health Information Technologies: Harnessing Wireless Innovation''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SUSTAINABLE HOUSING FINANCE

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing ''Sustainable Housing Finance: An Update from the Federal Housing Finance Agency on the GSE Conservatorships''. Testimony was heard from Edward J. DeMarco, Acting Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency.

THE WAY FORWARD IN AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Middle East and North Africa; and Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled ''After the Withdrawal: The Way Forward in Afghanistan and Pakistan'' (Part I). Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications held a hearing entitled ''Homeland Security Grants: Measuring Our Investments''. Testimony was heard from Tim Manning, Deputy Administrator, Protection and National Preparedness, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Anne Richards, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, Office of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security; David

Maurer, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Issues; Government Accountability Office.

DHS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency held a hearing entitled ''DHS Information Technology: How Effectively Has DHS Harnessed IT to Secure Our Borders and Uphold Immigration Laws?''. Testimony was heard from Margie Graves, Deputy Chief Information Officer, Department of Homeland Security; David Powner, Director, Information Technology Management Issues, Government Accountability Office; and Charles K. Edwards, Deputy Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security.

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PRIVACY ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigation held a hearing entitled ''The Electronic Communications Privacy Act, Part 1''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RELEASE OF CRIMINAL DETAINEES BY U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT: POLICY OR POLITICS?

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Release of Criminal Detainees by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement: Policy or Politics?''. Testimony was heard from John Morton, Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environment Regulations held a hearing on H.R. 1126, to facilitate the completion of an appropriate national memorial to Dwight D. Eisenhower. Testimony was heard from Representative Issa; Carl W. Reddel, Executive Director, Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission; and public witnesses.

AUTHORIZATION, STANDARDS, AND PROCEDURES FOR WHETHER, HOW, AND WHEN INDIAN TRIBES SHOULD BE NEWLY RECOGNIZED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Authorization, standards, and procedures for whether, how, and when Indian tribes should be newly recognized by the federal government: Perspective of the Department of the Interior''. Testimony was heard from Kevin Washburn, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY WATCHDOGS' RECOMMENDATIONS COULD SAVE TAXPAYERS BILLIONS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''DOD and DHS: Implementing Agency Watchdogs' Recommendations Could Save Taxpayers Billions''. Testimony was heard from Robert Hale, Under Secretary of Defense Comptroller and CFO, Department of Defense; Lynne Halbrooks, Principal Deputy Inspector General, Department of Defense; Rafael Borras; Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security; and Charles Edward, Deputy Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security.

UNDERSTANDING THE ADMINISTRATION'S DECISIONS ON SPENDING CUTS AND FURLOUGHS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation and Regulatory Affairs and the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and the Census joint subcommittee held a hearing entitled, ''Sequestration Oversight: Understanding the Administration's Decisions on Spending Cuts and Furloughs''. Testimony was heard from David Robbins, Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission; Michael Young, USDA Budget Director, Department of Agriculture; Hari Sastry, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Resource Management, Department of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S STRATEGY FOR EXPORTING LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements held a hearing entitled ''The Department of Energy's Strategy for Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas''. Testimony was heard from Chris Smith, Acting Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

REVIEW OF U.S. GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO TRACK AND MITIGATE ASTEROIDS AND METEORS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Threats from Space: A Review of U.S. Government Efforts to Track and Mitigate Asteroids and Meteors, Part 1''. Testimony was heard from John P. Holdren, Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President; William L. Shelton, Commander, U.S. Air Force Space Command; Charles F. Bolden, Jr.,

Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

CHALLENGES FOR SERVICE-OWNED SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Workforce; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a joint subcommittee hearing entitled ''Consistently Inconsistent: Challenges for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses''. Testimony was heard from William Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office; A. John Shoraka, Associate Administrator, Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, Small Business Administration; Tom Leney, Executive Director, Veterans and Small Business Programs, Department of Veterans Affairs.

TAX REFORM AND TAX PROVISIONS AFFECTING STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Tax Reform and Tax Provisions Affecting State and Local Governments''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

HUNGARY

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine the trajectory of democracy in Hungary, focusing on Hungary's constitutional changes with a particular view to the independence of the judiciary, present-day Hungary's relationship to its Holocaust-era past, and the implications of Hungary's sweeping legal changes for civil society, including an independent media and religious organizations, after receiving testimony from Brent Hartley, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs; Jozsef Szajer, Hungarian Member of the European Parliament, Fidesz-Hungarian Civic Union, Budapest; Kim Lane, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey; Sylvana Habdank-Kolaczkowska, Freedom House, New York, New York; and Paul A. Shapiro, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science and Space, to hold hearings to examine assessing the risks, impacts, and solutions for space threats, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine aviation safety, focusing on the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) progress on key safety initiatives, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine reforming the delivery system, focusing on the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation, 9:30 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine counterterrorism policies and priorities, focusing on addressing the evolving threat, 2:15 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Reauthorization Act of 2013'', and S. 330, to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), Time to be announced, S–216.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine Hurricane Sandy, focusing on getting the recovery right and the value of mitigation, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the future of drones in America, focusing on law enforcement and privacy considerations, 10:30 a.m., SD–226.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine building an immigration system worthy of American values, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine Veterans Affairs mental health care, focusing on ensuring timely access to high-quality care, 10 a.m., SR–418.

House

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee, business meeting to consider the following measures: H.R. 634, the ''Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2013''; H.R. 677, the ''Inter-Affiliate Swap Clarification Act''; H.R. 742, the ''Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2013''; H.R. 992, the ''Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act''; H.R. 1003, to improve consideration by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders; H.R. 1038, the ''Public Power

Risk Management Act of 2013''; and legislation regarding the ''Swap Jurisdiction Certainty Act'', 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, hearing on Children's Mental Health, Oversight, 10 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve Oversight, 10 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, hearing on Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure, 10 a.m., H–405 Capitol. This is a closed hearing.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on Major Construction Projects of the Department of Energy Oversight, 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing on Judiciary Oversight, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, hearing on Education: Perspective from the Inspector Generals, 10 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice and Science, and Related Agencies, hearing on National Aeronautics and Space Administration Budget, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee, hearing on the Posture of the U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1120, the ''Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Health Information Technologies: How Innovation Benefits Patients'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled ''State of Community Banking: Is the Current Regulatory Environment Adversely Affecting Community Financial Institutions?'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Crisis in Syria: The U.S. Response'', 9:45 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, hearing on ''Hezbollah's Strategic Shift: A Global Terrorist Threat'', 1:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, hearing entitled ''Measuring Outcomes to Understand the State of Border Security'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technology, hearing entitled ''Cyber Threats from China, Russia and Iran: Protecting American Critical Infrastructure'', 2 p.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, markup on H.R. 367, the ''Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013''; and H.R. 982, the ''Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency (FACT) Act of 2012'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet, hearing entitled ''The Register's Call for Updates to U.S. Copyright Law'', 3:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 527, the ''Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act''; H.R. 254, the ''Bonneville Unit Clean Hydropower Facilitation Act''; H.R. 291, the ''Black Hills Cemetery Act''; H.R. 507, the ''Pascua Yaqui Tribe Trust Land Act; H.R. 588, the ''Vietnam Veterans Donor Acknowledgment Act of 2013''; H.R. 678, the ''Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act''; H.R. 716, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the city of Vancouver, Washington, and for other purposes; H.R. 1033, the ''American Battlefield Protection Program Amendments Act of 2013''; and H.R. 1159, the ''Cabin Fee Act of 2013'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee, business meeting to consider the following: legislation concerning the Federal Information Technology Acquisition and Reform Act; H.R. 1211, the ''FOIA Oversight and Implementation Act of 2013''; H.R. 1163, the ''Federal Information Security Amendments Act of 2013''; H.R. 1162, the ''Government Accountability Office Improvement Act''; legislation concerning Presidential and Federal records; H.R. 328, the ''Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2013''; H.R. 1133, the ''Presidential Library Donation Reform Act''; H.R. 1104, the ''Federal Advisory Committee Reform Act''; H.R. 249, the ''Federal Employee Tax Accountability Act of 2013''; H.R. 882, the ''Contracting and Tax Accountability Act of 2013''; H.R. 313, the ''Government Spending Accountability Act of 2013''; and legislation concerning the DC CFO Act, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled ''Improving EPA's Scientific Advisory Processes'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Technology, hearing entitled ''Examining the Effectiveness of NIST Laboratories'', 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Entrepreneurial Assistance: Examining Inefficiencies and Duplication Across Federal Programs'', 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Focusing on People: A Review of VA's Plans for Employee Training, Accountability, and Workload Management to Improve Disability Claims Processing'', 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing entitled ''Challenges of Achieving Fair and Consistent Disability Decisions'', 10 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, hearing entitled ''Financial Products Tax Reform'', 1:15 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 933, Department of Defense, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, with up to three votes on or in relation to Toomey Amendment No. 115 (to Amendment No. 26), Reid (for Mikulski/Shelby) Modified Amendment No. 26, and the motion to invoke cloture on the bill at approximately 11:15 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 20

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Complete consideration of H. Con. Res. 25—Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E334
Bishop, Timothy H., N.Y., E331
Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E329
Broun, Paul C., Ga., E333
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E335
Cook, Paul, Calif., E327
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E335
Daines, Steve, Mont., E328
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E327, E331, E336
Enyart, William L., Ill., E329
Farr, Sam, Calif., E337
Foster, Bill, Ill., E330
Johnson, Sam, Tex., E336
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E333
Keating, William R., Mass., E334, E335, E336, E337
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E327
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E329
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E335
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E332
Messer, Luke, Ind., E328, E333, E336
Moran, James P., Va., E332
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E330
Nunnelee, Alan, Miss., E327
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E327, E328, E329, E329, E330, E331, E332, E332, E333, E333
Reed, Tom, N.Y., E332
Reichert, David G., Wash., E330
Ribble, Reid J., Wisc., E336
Roe, David P., Tenn., E335, E335
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E332
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E328
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E337
Whitfield, Ed, Ky., E334

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.