other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, as amended, be vacated, to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, Mr. Speaker, but simply to say that we continue to believe on this side of the aisle that we could resolve this issue, as we have had this debate, over a longer term and give confidence to the markets, give confidence to the States and localities by simply bringing the Senate bill to the floor and passing that bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the ordering of the yeas and nays on the motion that the House suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4239 is vacated, and the Chair will put the question de novo.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4239, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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 597 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. Con. Res. 112.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1330

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112–423 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112–423.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2013 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2012 and for fiscal years 2014 through 2022.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2012: $1,836,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,064,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,336,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,604,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,800,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,962,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,092,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,234,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,411,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,586,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,766,705,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: –$62,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: –$228,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: –$214,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: –$211,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: –$215,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: –$232,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: –$259,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: –$284,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: –$296,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: –$320,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: –$348,776,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2012: $3,239,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,966,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,984,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,098,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,308,049,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,470,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,637,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,824,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,037,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,220,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,431,285,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $3,138,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,064,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,048,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,130,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,308,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,435,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,580,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,799,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,993,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,187,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,401,684,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: –$1,301,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: –$1,000,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: –$711,644,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015: –$525,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: –$508,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: –$473,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: –$488,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: –$564,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: –$582,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: –$601,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: –$634,979,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $16,140,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $17,309,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,199,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,911,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,632,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $20,366,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $21,129,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,961,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,812,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $23,682,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $24,575,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2012: $11,424,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $12,498,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $13,290,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,894,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,477,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $15,023,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,578,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $16,210,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,871,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $17,565,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $18,311,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2012 through 2022 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $560,847,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $620,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $553,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $582,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $564,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $568,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $574,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $565,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $585,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $598,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $612,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $592,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $625,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $639,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $625,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $653,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $638,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $671,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $659,506,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $47,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $49,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $47,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,118,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $50,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $52,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $53,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $54,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $56,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $57,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,154,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $30,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,996,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $7,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $13,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $5,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $4,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,174,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $35,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $36,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,453,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $37,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $38,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $41,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $42,539,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,958,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $43,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,598,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $23,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,355,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $45,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $9,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$1,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $9,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$2,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $10,253,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$4,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $24,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,043,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $138,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $88,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $102,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $109,043,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $116,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $122,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $129,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $94,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $96,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $98,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $100,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,984,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $46,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $12,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $12,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $12,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $13,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $14,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,758,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $160,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $84,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $77,217,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $81,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $89,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $99,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $103,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $107,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $108,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $109,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $111,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $110,714,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $355,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $356,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $370,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $373,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $470,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $460,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $543,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $538,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $592,964,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $596,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $638,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $640,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $676,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $674,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $719,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $718,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $773,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $761,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $813,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $812,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $869,217,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $867,542,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $492,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $491,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $515,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $514,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $543,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $542,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $567,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $616,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $616,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $633,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $633,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $655,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $655,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $716,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $716,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $768,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $767,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $819,327,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $818,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $898,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $898,790,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $556,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $555,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $537,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $502,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $499,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $500,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $498,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $507,526,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $509,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $505,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $502,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $507,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $500,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $522,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $520,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $534,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $547,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $545,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $564,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $568,249,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $145,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $31,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $38,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $43,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $52,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $57,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,079,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $128,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, $135,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $137,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $139,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $148,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $148,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $147,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $146,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $156,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $160,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $165,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $175,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,607,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $58,849,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $55,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $55,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $58,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $57,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $58,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $60,204,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $61,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $67,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,496,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $25,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $29,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $33,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $35,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $38,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $40,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $45,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,794,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $337,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $345,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $345,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $360,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $360,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $399,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $399,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $464,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $464,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $535,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $535,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $608,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $608,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $678,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $678,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $740,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $740,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $790,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $790,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $841,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $841,746,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, –$3,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$3,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $8,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, –$18,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$10,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, –$17,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$14,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, –$23,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$21,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, –$25,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$24,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, –$26,716,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$25,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, –$28,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$27,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, –$37,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$33,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, –$31,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$33,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, –$74,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$75,270,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, –$76,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$76,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, –$75,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$75,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, –$77,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$77,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, –$83,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$83,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, –$85,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$85,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, –$93,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$93,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, –$97,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$97,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, –$103,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$103,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, –$102,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$102,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, –$107,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$107,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, –$109,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$109,655,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $126,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $96,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $44,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $28,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $9,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $2,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $52,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $38,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $24,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

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

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for robust Federal investments in America's infrastructure, incentives for businesses, and support for communities or other measures that create jobs for Americans and boost the economy. The revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) provide for additional investments in rail, aviation, harbors (including harbor maintenance dredging), seaports, inland waterway systems, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other infrastructure;

(2) provide for additional investments in other areas that would help businesses and other employers create new jobs; and

(3) provide additional incentives, including tax incentives, to help small businesses, nonprofits, States, and communities expand investment, train, hire, and retain private-sector workers and public service employees;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

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

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

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

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

(3) provides additional resources for oversight and expanded enforcement activities to crack down on speculation in and manipulation of oil and gas markets, including derivatives markets;

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

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

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

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

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

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

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

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

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

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017, or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(5) makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare;

by the amounts provided, together with any savings from ending Overseas Contingency Operations, in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

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

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends the Transitional Medical Assistance program in title XIX of the Social Security Act through fiscal year 2014, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

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

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of children by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022. Improvements may include:

(1) Extension and expansion of child care assistance.

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

(3) Changes to child support enforcement to encourage increased parental support for children, particularly from non-custodial parents, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child or encourages States to provide access and visitation services to improve fathers' relationships with their children. Such changes could reflect efforts to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty. When 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

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

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that capitalizes the existing Affordable Housing Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

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

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable, including efforts to keep the interest rate on subsidized student loans from doubling in July 2013 at the end of the one-year extension of the current 3.4 percent interest rate assumed in the resolution, or efforts to ensure continued full Pell grant funding, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

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

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides additional tax relief to individuals and families, such as expanding tax relief provided by the refundable child credit, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods, fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2017 or fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2022.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

(1) for fiscal year 2014 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2015, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

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

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2013.

SEC. 302. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES UNDER THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration

of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates $9,487,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to $691,000,000, to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(2) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2013 that appropriates $60,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $15,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2013.

(c) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 303. COSTS OF EMERGENCY NEEDS, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND DISASTER RELIEF.

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

(b) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2012 or fiscal year 2013 for overseas contingency operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to the amounts of budget authority specified in section 102(21) for fiscal year 2012 or fiscal year 2013 and the new outlays resulting from that budget authority.

(c) DISASTER RELIEF.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated for disaster relief pursuant to this subsection, then the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and as necessary, the aggregates in this resolution, shall be adjusted by the amount of new budget authority and outlays up to the amounts provided under section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—Prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsections (b) and (c) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

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

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the House Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

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

(a) APPLICATION.—In the House, any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this resolution.

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

SEC. 306. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

In the House, and pursuant to section 301(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the remainder of the 112th Congress, the following shall apply in lieu of ''CUTGO'' rules and principles:

(1)(A) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the on-budget deficit or reducing the on-budget surplus for the period comprising either—

(i) the current year, the budget year, and the four years following that budget year; or

(ii) the current year, the budget year, and the nine years following that budget year.

(B) The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(C) For the purpose of this section, the terms ''budget year'', ''current year'', and ''direct spending'' have the meanings specified in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that the term ''direct spending'' shall also include provisions in appropriation Acts that make outyear modifications to substantive law as described in section 3(4) (C) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(2) If a bill, joint resolution, or amendment is considered pursuant to a special order of the House directing the Clerk to add as new matter at the end of such measure the provisions of a separate measure as passed by the House, the provisions of such separate measure as passed by the House shall be included in the evaluation under paragraph (1) of the bill, joint resolution, or amendment.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall exclude a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles in the case of a point of order under this clause against consideration of—

(i) a bill or joint resolution;

(ii) an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business;

(iii) a conference report; or

(iv) an amendment between the Houses.

(B) In the case of an amendment (other than one specified in subparagraph (A)) to a bill or joint resolution, the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall give no cognizance to any designation of emergency.

(C) If a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business, a conference report, or an amendment between the Houses includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

SEC. 307. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—POLICY

SEC. 401. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON JOBS: MAKE IT IN AMERICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the economy entered a deep recession in December 2007;

(2) a financial crisis in 2008 worsened the situation and by January 2009, the private sector was shedding 840,000 jobs per month;

(3) actions by the President, Congress, and the Federal Reserve helped stem the crisis, and job creation resumed in 2010;

(4) the economy has created 3.9 million private jobs over the past 24 consecutive months;

(5) as part of a ''Make it in America'' agenda, U.S. manufacturing has been leading the Nation's economic recovery as domestic manufacturers regain their economic and competitive edge and a wave of insourcing jobs from abroad begins;

(6) despite the job gains already made, job growth needs to accelerate and continue for an extended period of time in order for the economy to fully recover from the recession; and

(7) job creation is vital to nation-building at home and to deficit reduction—CBO has noted that if the country were at full employment, the deficit would be about one-third lower than it is today.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pursue a ''Make it in America'' agenda with a priority to consider and enact legislation to help create jobs, remove incentives to out-source jobs

overseas, and instead support incentives that bring jobs back to the U.S.

(2) JOBS.—This resolution—

(A) assumes enactment of—

(i) the President's $50 billion immediate transportation jobs package;

(ii) other measures proposed in the American Jobs Act and reflected in the President's budget; and

(iii) the President's proposed surface transportation legislation;

(B) assumes $1 billion for the President's proposal to establish a Veterans Job Corps;

(C) assumes $80 billion in education jobs funding for the President's initiatives to promote jobs now while also creating an infrastructure that will help students learn and create a better future workforce, including $30 billion for rebuilding at least 35,000 public schools, $25 billion to prevent hundreds of thousands of educator layoffs, and $8 billion to help community colleges train 2 million workers in high-growth industries with skills that will lead directly to jobs; and

(D) establishes a reserve fund that would allow for passage of additional job creation measures, including further infrastructure improvements or other spending or revenue proposals.

SEC. 402. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SEQUESTRATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the Budget Control Act of 2011 called upon the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction and the Congress to enact legislation to achieve $1.2 trillion in savings;

(2) the Joint Select Committee could not reach agreement and did not report savings legislation to the Congress;

(3) failure to enact the required savings triggered sequestration procedures as required under the Budget Control Act; and

(4) this resolution assumes the enactment of savings in excess of $1.2 trillion, negating the need for sequestration to achieve the savings.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that paragraphs (3) through (11) of section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, as amended by the Budget Control Act of 2011, shall be repealed.

SEC. 403. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAKING A BALANCED APPROACH TO DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the President's budget request and every bipartisan analysis of the Nation's future fiscal path have recommended deficit reduction through a balanced approach that includes both spending and revenue; and

(2) The President's choices represent the right general balance of changes to spending and revenue.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution to reduce the deficit through a similar balance of spending and revenue changes. The resolution does not endorse any specific spending cuts or revenue proposals unless they are expressly stated in this resolution.

SEC. 404. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND RETIREES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

(2) in 2011, 55 million people relied on Social Security;

(3) Social Security benefits are modest, with an average annual benefit for retirees of less than $15,000, while the average total retirement income is less than $26,000 per year;

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

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

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

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

SEC. 405. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

(2) in 2011, nearly 50 million people relied on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services;

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

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

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

(6) shifting excess health care cost growth onto Medicare beneficiaries would not reduce overall health care costs, instead it would mean beneficiaries would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both; and

(7) versions of voucher or premium-support policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely cause traditional Medicare to weaken and wither away.

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

SEC. 406. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 407. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICAID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Medicaid is a central component of the Nation's health care safety net, providing health coverage to 28 million low-income children, 5 million senior citizens, 10 million people with disabilities, and 14 million other low-income people who would otherwise be unable to obtain health insurance;

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

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

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

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

SEC. 408. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that it is the stated position of the Administration that Afghan troops will take the full lead for security operations in Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that consistent with the Administration's stated position, no funding shall be provided for operations in Afghanistan through the Overseas Contingency Operations budget beyond 2014.

SEC. 409. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) we must continue to support a strong military that is second to none and the size and the structure of our military and defense budgets have to be driven by a strategy;

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

(3) because it puts our economy at risk, the Nation's debt is an immense security threat

to our country, just as former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen has stated, and we must have a deficit reduction plan that is serious and realistic;

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

(5) from 2001 to 2010, the ''base'' Pentagon budget nearly doubled and, in 2010, the U.S. spent more on defense than the next 17 countries combined (and more than half of the amount spent by those 17 countries was from seven NATO countries and four other close allies);

(6) last year, Admiral Mullen argued that the permissive budget environment had allowed the Pentagon to avoid prioritizing;

(7) more can be done to rein in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies, including the Department of Defense—the last department still unable to pass an audit—such as the elimination of duplicative programs that were identified in a report issued last year by the Government Accountability Office;

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

(9) the Department of Defense should continue to review defense plans to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant and are applicable to 21st century threats, which should include, with the participation of the National Nuclear Security Administration, examination of requirements for the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization;

(10) more than 94 percent of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce since 2001 is due to increases at security-related agencies—Department of Defense (31 percent), Department of Homeland Security (32 percent), Department of Veterans Affairs (26 percent), and Department of Justice (6 percent)—and the increase, in part, represents a transition to ensure civil servants, as opposed to private contractors, are performing inherently governmental work and an increase to a long-depleted acquisition and auditing workforce at the Pentagon to ensure effective management of weapons systems programs, to eliminate the use of contractors to oversee other contractors, and to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse;

(11) proposals to implement an indiscriminate 10 percent across-the-board cut to the Federal civilian workforce would adversely affect security agencies, leaving them unable to manage their total workforce, which includes contractors, and their operations in a cost-effective manner;

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

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

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

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

(1) the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 should be rescinded and replaced by a deficit reduction plan that is balanced, that makes smart spending cuts, that requires everyone to pay their fair share, and that takes into account a comprehensive national security strategy that includes careful consideration of international, defense, homeland security, and law enforcement programs; and

(2) the Administration shall provide an additional bonus to members of the Armed Forces who serve in harm's way. This bonus shall be provided from savings that are achieved by increasing efficiencies, eliminating duplicative programs, and reining in waste, fraud, and abuse at the Nation's security agencies.

SEC. 410. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM AND DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

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

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

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

(5) the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform observed that the corporate income tax is riddled with special interest tax breaks and subsidies, is badly in need of reform, and it proposed to streamline the code, capturing some of the savings in the process, to achieve deficit reduction in a more balanced way.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) POLICY ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.—

(A) The President and this resolution extend the middle class tax cuts, provide long-term relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax for tens of millions of middle class American families, and discontinue the additional estate tax relief resulting from the increased estate tax exemption and reduced maximum tax rate enacted in 2010.

(B) The President and this resolution assume the revenue from returning to the top two tax rates that were in effect when President Clinton left office. The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform plan also assumes the revenue from returning to those top two tax rates for top earners.

(C) The President and this resolution extend policies that re-invest in domestic manufacturing; build up the renewable energy production capacity of the United States in order to limit our reliance on foreign oil; expand access to higher education; and support saving and capital formation.

(D) This resolution encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the various proposals made by the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform to limit tax expenditures and raise revenue for deficit reduction; and expressly rejects the approach in the Republican resolution that provides millionaires with even larger tax cuts at the expense of middle-income taxpayers. This resolution protects middle-income taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes below $200,000 ($250,000 for married couples) and encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to raise the revenue necessary in this resolution through tax expenditure reform proposals that would apply to households with over $1 million in adjusted gross income, consistent with the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform's proposals to limit tax expenditures.

(E) In particular, this resolution encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider various proposals for implementing a ''Buffett Rule''—reflecting billionaire investor Warren Buffett's realization that he faces a lower effective tax rate than his secretary—to ensure that middle class families do not face higher effective tax rates than the wealthiest members of society.

(2) POLICY ON CORPORATE INCOME TAXES.—

(A) The President and this resolution propose elimination of subsidies for the major integrated oil and gas companies, and pernicious tax breaks that reward U.S. corporations that ship American jobs—rather than products—overseas for tax purposes.

(B) This resolution adopts those and other pro-growth corporate tax incentives in the President's proposals, such as: enhancing incentives for domestic manufacturing to support a ''Make it in America'' agenda, including providing a tax credit for companies that return operations and jobs to the U.S. while eliminating tax breaks for companies that move operations and jobs overseas; closing loopholes that allow businesses to avoid taxes, by subjecting more of their foreign earnings sheltered in tax havens to U.S. taxation; extending the research and development credit; and extending and enhancing clean energy incentives.

(C) This resolution therefore urges the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the President's framework for business tax reform in determining how to best overhaul our corporate tax code so that it promotes economic growth and domestic job creation without increasing the deficit and the debt.

SEC. 411. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AGRICULTURE SPENDING.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House Committee on Agriculture should reduce spending in farm programs that provide direct payments to producers even in robust markets and in times of bumper yields. The committee should also find ways to focus assistance away from wealthy agribusinesses and toward struggling family farmers in a manner that protects jobs and economic growth while preserving the farm and nutrition safety net. Finally, it is the policy of this resolution that no Member of Congress should personally receive agriculture commodity payments, in any calendar year, the total of which exceeds 15 percent of the annual rate of basic pay for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, as of January 1 of such calendar year.

SEC. 412. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE USE OF TAXPAYER FUNDS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House of Representatives should lead by example and identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration shall review the policies pertaining to the services provided to

Members of Congress and House Committees, and shall identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, Barber shop, Salon, and the House dining room. Further, it is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

Amend the title so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2012 and fiscal years 2014 through 2022.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 423, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

We're here at a very important time for our country. As a result of extraordinary actions that have been taken over the last 4 years, and thanks to the tenacity of the American people and small businesses, we have begun to climb out of a big economic hole.

If you look at this chart right here, you'll see where we were back in January 2009, the first month President Obama was sworn in and took office. At that time, the economy was in total free fall. As a result of actions that were taken, we've begun to climb out of that hole and now we've had 24 months—consecutive months—of positive private sector job growth, creating about 4 million jobs in the economy.

We need to keep that job growth going, and that's what the Democratic alternative does. It builds on the President's proposals.

In here, we have the President's jobs plan—a plan which has been sitting in front of this body since he introduced it back in September. We took some action on the payroll tax cut. That was good. But the President has also called for a major infrastructure investment to modernize our roads and our bridges. We fund that plan, as opposed to the Republican budget which, as we've heard, slashes transportation—in fact, next year by 46 percent in spending—and which independent analysts have said will cost the economy 1.3 million jobs in 2013 and 2.8 million jobs in 2014. That is not the direction we should be going.

We need to nurture the fragile economy. We need to deal with our budget deficits in a credible way, which this does. It takes us from deficits over 8½ percent of GDP down to under 3 percent of GDP by 2015, and sustains them. And we do it in a balanced way by asking for shared responsibility.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman and my friend from Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic substitute because the House Republican budget harms middle class families throughout our country.

Mr. Chairman, under the House Republican budget, Medicare is turned from a guaranteed benefit program into a bait-and-switch scheme where millionaires get more and seniors have to pay more.

Under the House Republican budget, if you're a millionaire, you get an additional $394,000 tax cut. If you're an oil company, you get a bigger tax break. If you're a company that outsources jobs, you get a deeper tax break. But if you're a senior, you get as much as a $6,000 increase in your medical costs. You get a bill from the Federal Government for your additional Medicare costs. If you're the child of a middle class family trying to go to college, you get an additional $2,800 tuition increase.

The middle class has always been the backbone of the American economy, Mr. Chairman, and the House Republican budget kicks the middle class in the stomach.

The Democratic budget invests in education; the House Republican budget divests from education. The Democratic budget invests in our children; the Republican budget divests from our children. The Democratic budget invests in America's future; the House Republican budget divests from America's future.

And that is why we should pass this Democratic substitute, which invests and grows and strengthens the middle class, and quit investing in and growing and strengthening tax cuts for Big Oil companies and corporations that offshore our jobs.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding and let me say thanks to Chairman RYAN and members of the Budget Committee for a job well done.

This is a tough process, making real decisions about our path for the future. The interesting thing I've found about this debate that's gone on the last 2 days is that our team actually went and made the tough choices—made the tough choices to preserve freedom in America and to deal with our fiscal nightmare.

If you look at all the proposals we've seen in this debate, it's all more of the same. There are two things that are prevalent: let's raise taxes on the American people once again; and, secondly, let's kick the can down the road as if no one knows that Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are going broke. Oh, yes, all these proposals we've seen continue to kick the can down the road.

I think that the Path to Prosperity that Chairman RYAN and his committee have put together is a blueprint for America's future. We all know that we've got some $16 trillion worth of debt already—$1.3 trillion in a budget deficit this year alone. The American people know that they have got to live within their means; they have got to do a budget. They also know that you can't continue to spend money that you don't have.

And so I applaud my colleagues for the tough decisions they've made to try to do the right thing for the country and to lay out a real vision of what we were to do if we get more control here in this town. This is still a Democrat-run town.

The saddest thing I've seen, though, when it comes to a budget, is that while we did a budget last year—we're doing another budget this year, we're making tough decisions to help preserve Social Security and preserve Medicare—it has been 1,065 since the United States Senate has passed a budget. That's 1,065 days. Almost 3 years since they've had the courage to show the American people what their solutions are.

I think it's high time that we're serious about solving America's fiscal problems. The first step is actually doing a budget.

So, on behalf of my Republican colleagues, I would suggest that we support the Ryan budget. It's a real pathway to prosperity. It makes the tough decisions and puts us on a course that's sustainable, not just for our generation, but for our kids and grandkids.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I have great respect for the Speaker. I would just suggest that he may call it a tough choice to provide and lock in another round of tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans while cutting Medicaid by $800 billion, a full one-third, by the year 2022. Two-thirds of that money goes to seniors in nursing homes and disabled individuals. I don't know if it's a tough choice. It's certainly the wrong choice. And that's what this debate is all about. It's not about whether we reduce our deficits, but how.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Democratic Caucus, Mr. LARSON.

□ 1340

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, let me rise and commend the efforts of CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and the Budget Committee and rise in full support of their balanced and fair document that emphasizes shared sacrifice. Let me say to my Republican colleagues that this appears to us much like that great philosopher Lawrence Berra said, ''deja vu all over again.''

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in another difficult period of our history, said that we need to prevail upon this country to come together and find the warm courage of national unity that comes from shared sacrifice that would again demonstrate to the American people, especially the most frail amongst us and those in the middle class who are impacted the most, that we have national unity because we have guaranteed that no longer will they be in a position where they have to suffer while others would use government in a way to prosper and grow at the expense of the middle class.

There isn't a Member of this Chamber who doesn't have friends or family who aren't affected by the altering of Medicare, Social Security, or Medicaid. These are the tough decisions that are made every single day across the dinner table.

This fragile recovery impacts the most fragile amongst us and also is tearing asunder the very middle class that we seek to provide with the guarantee—the guarantee of a social safety net that provides them with Social Security, Medicare and, yes, health care, as well. That is why the Democrats have offered an alternative plan that underscores our convictions and our belief in Social Security, Medicare, and affordable health care.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee. He's done a fantastic job.

And to the gentleman from Maryland, I know it's been difficult this week, you've stood in a difficult position, and now you're presenting your budget, and you've been in opposition to many of the budgets put forward, including the President's last night, and I know it's tough.

What we're addressing here right now, Mr. Chairman, I think, is a lot of numbers, a lot of charts and a lot of rhetoric. We hear that. But what we know is that Washington has not been forthright with the American people. For far too long, the top has been getting the bailout, the bottom has been getting a handout, and now who's going to get stuck with the bill? It's our kids. That's who's going to get stuck with the bill.

So why can't we, for once, instead of looking at the charts and numbers and throwing it all out there, just look through the lens of how will this budget impact our children and their future, their opportunity and their prosperity? Is this a budget that presents equal outcomes? Or is it going to be one that presents equal opportunities? Can we not look through that lens, for once, Mr. Chairman?

I would say that the budget that the gentleman has put forward is one more about equal outcomes. It's more taxes, it's more government, and it's more government solutions. Do you know what? Why don't we provide more opportunities and more prosperity for the children of the next generation? That's the lens that I believe we should be looking through.

And this is why: because whether we believe it or not, whether we're willing to recognize it, we are scribes of time right now. History is being written based on the discussions, the outcome and the debate that we have. We are the ones who are determining what history will reflect back on and say we did at this time and what the future exists like later. What will we choose? What will we write? Will this be the chapter that concludes with the words ''the end,'' or will we write a chapter that we can turn the page and hand the pens off to the next generation?

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that we take our pen and that we pass it to the next generation, that we can turn the page, that we can move forward, and that we can provide a new chapter and a new beginning, one that is a beginning that leads to another future of opportunity and prosperity. I believe that only happens if we pass the Republican budget that we have before us today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I do think the focus should be on our children and on the future, and that's why our budget does not do some of the things the Republican budget does do, which is, for example, say that kids who have preexisting conditions, whether it's diabetes or asthma, get insurance. We make sure that those kids can't be excluded because of preexisting conditions. They don't. We make sure that the interest rates on student loans don't double this July, as their budget would allow, because we think it's important that those students have an opportunity to get the education to get ahead and succeed.

So I hope we will continue to focus on that question as we debate the choices that are being made in this budget.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. YARMUTH.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend from Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, a recent analysis of American tax returns showed that in 2010, the top 1 percent of earners in the United States earned $288 billion more than they had in 2009—$288 billion more, the top 1 percent. In fact, that was 93 percent of all the additional income earned in the entire United States from year to year, 2009 to 2010.

Now, apparently, my friends on the Republican side were outraged that 7 percent of the additional income could slip away to the other 99 percent of American families because they came up with a budget that tried to rectify that immediately. I call it the ''Republican 1 percent budget.'' It's a gift basket for billionaires and millionaires. It contains a permanent extension of the Bush tax cuts, which have created an income gap in this country on par with Cameroon and Rwanda.

But the ''Republican 1 percent budget'' doesn't stop there. It gives an additional tax break of $150,000 a year for everyone making more than $1 million a year. And it does that by dismantling Medicare, slashing education funding, transportation, and things like the SNAP program which help so many needy families in this country.

Mr. Chairman, income inequality has become the central tenet of Republican ideology. The budget we will probably vote on later makes their commitment to widening the income gap abundantly clear. That's why I call the Republican budget, in addition to the ''1 percent budget,'' this is the ''all for 1 budget.'' It's a budget that's all for the 1 percent.

By contrast, the Democratic budget, the resolution we are offering now, is really the ''one for all budget,'' one budget that provides benefits for all Americans. It makes the critical investments that we need to make sure all Americans have equal opportunity and equal tools to realize the American Dream, and it makes sure that all contribute to the deficit reduction that we all are committed to. Everybody plays a part; everybody does their share.

I support the Democratic budget and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. GUINTA.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find what's going on in this country with the level of spending in America outrageous. People in this country have sent us here to do a job, to be leaders, and to solve problems. We have a current deficit of roughly $1.3 trillion, something that is so high that so many people can't even comprehend that number. We have a long-term debt approaching $16 trillion.

This substitute today continues that path of spending money that we simply don't have. I do thank the gentleman for at least offering a proposal—something that has not been done in the Senate—so we can debate in, I think, a reasonable way what the path is that his budget would propose versus the Path to Prosperity.

This proposal, the substitute proposal, does three things. Number one, it spends $3.7 trillion of roughly $1 trillion-ongoing deficits. Secondly, over the 10-year window, it spends $44.7 trillion, continuing the long-term debt that we have found ourselves in currently. Finally, it doesn't solve the significant drivers of our debt, and it doesn't allow for an opportunity to preserve and protect Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

The country wants us to be honest, the country wants leadership, and we continue to provide that in the House Budget Committee with the Path to Prosperity. I remind people that budget proposes stability and predictability by cutting $5.3 trillion in spending, by reducing the tax on both individual and corporate to give us a fair, level playing field and predictability for the long term. And it reduces our short-term deficit about $700 billion next year and continues to ensure we get on a path to balance. A balanced budget is the dream of every American, and we offer that opportunity in the Path to Prosperity.

With that, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

□ 1350

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. At this point I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I will yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, in light of this week's Supreme Court arguments on the health care law, I'd like to take a moment to talk about the contrast between our Path to Prosperity budget and the broken promises of that law.

As we've heard from so many of my colleagues in the last couple of days, we are on the verge of a debt crisis. I don't think any of us can argue that. And this health care law, with a total price tag of $1.76 trillion, would surely drive us over that cliff faster. Now, that is why, in the Path to Prosperity budget, we repeal the entire health care law, including the very dangerous IPAB, which would slash physician payment rates, forcing doctors to stop seeing Medicare patients. This 15-member, unelected board makes senior care even harder to access and puts bureaucrats between patients and their doctors.

Our plan for Medicare offers a choice for seniors, and they deserve a choice. We increase the competition between a guaranteed coverage option—and I want to repeat that, that this is a guaranteed coverage option—and traditional Medicare, and it allows seniors to choose. All of this would lower costs of the program while increasing the quality of care. This is the choice of two futures, both for our health care system and also the prosperity of our Nation.

Now, we can continue to go down the path of ObamaCare, where we see $1.76 trillion in spending over 10 years. We also see $525 billion in new taxes, fees, and penalties on families and small businesses. Or, we can repeal this law and put in place policies that increase competition, decrease costs, and ensure that our health care system is patient-focused.

We can continue to explode the size and scope of the Federal Government, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like. If Democrats had their way, their budget would tax more, borrow more, spend more, and waste more of the hardworking taxpayer dollars.

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

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

Mrs. BLACK. I find it interesting that last night this Chamber unanimously rejected the President's 2013 budget that would be an absolute fiscal disaster. And yet this budget before us today again doubles down on those failed policies of the past. The American people are sick and tired of Washington's culture of spend, spend, spend because they know there are consequences of living without a budget and spending more than what we take in.

What we're doing here today is being honest with the American people. We are here to cut spending, reform programs in order to save them, and we make government smaller and less intrusive.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes remaining.

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

I'm glad the gentlelady brought up the issue of health care and how these budgets impact health care.

She described their proposal as giving seniors a choice. It's interesting that they would give seniors on Medicare a choice that they don't want themselves to have, that they give Members of Congress a much better deal in health care than they would give to seniors on Medicare.

Here's what their budget would do in ending the Medicare guarantee. This blue line shows the current level of support Medicare beneficiaries get from the Medicare program, up around 90 percent. That green line right there, that's the level of support Members of Congress get from the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan. You can see it's steady; as costs go up, the support goes up proportionally. The Republican plan, that red line, is the one for seniors. That takes support steadily down relative to rising health care costs so that seniors would have to eat those rising health care costs. They bear the risk. That is a bad plan for American seniors. It's a bad plan for America.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has focused a lot on these issues as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. NEAL.

Mr. NEAL. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

What's striking about the debate that we're having today and this discussion is that essentially our Republican friends and colleagues are asking us to go back to the policies that got us here in the first place, the folly of those 6 years when they controlled the Presidency, when they controlled the Senate, and when they controlled the House of Representatives. So let me reacquaint all with their number forecast.

They offered $1.3 trillion worth of tax cuts in 2001, and then came back in 2003 and said that wasn't enough; let's cut taxes by another trillion dollars. The underlying argument that they offered at the time was that this would jump-start growth, despite the fact that as we came off the Clinton years with the greatest spurt of economic growth in the history of the world—a budget that was balanced for 4 successive years and 22 million jobs—their argument was: We can outdo that growth if we simply cut taxes by $2.3 trillion—and, incidentally, not for the middle class. These tax cuts overwhelmingly went to people in the 1 percentile. Remember the theory that tax cuts pay for themselves?

So, let's contrast January 19, 2001 with the end of the Bush years—$15 trillion worth of debt, deficits as far as the eye could see, all under the guise of economic growth. So, let me give you a number—not an opinion, but a fact. Those 8 years offered the most anemic economic growth at any time since Herbert Hoover was President of the United States. And what they ask for today in this budget is to have bigger tax cuts for wealthy people and eviscerate the guarantee of Medicare.

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

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

Mr. NEAL. This is the party, on the Republican side, that tried to privatize Social Security during those years, and all they want to do is shoehorn these legislative proposals into tax cuts for wealthy people. Their argument today, despite these record deficits, is, with revenue at 14.7 percent of GDP—headed toward the Eisenhower years—when the town has argued for years about revenue being between 19 and 21 percent, they're going to cut Medicare to give tax cuts for wealthy people.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, before we had a chance to vote on the President's budget, I received a copy of a press release from the White House. It encouraged the House Democratic leadership to vote for this amendment. It encouraged the Democrats in the House to vote for the Van Hollen amendment, which I just thought was worthy of getting up and talking about, very briefly.

It makes me wonder why the President didn't send a press release asking his Democrat colleagues to vote for his budget. It makes me wonder what the President is thinking. Does he like the Van Hollen budget better than his own budget? I mean, I guess there are some things to like. The President's budget raised taxes by $1.9 trillion; the Van Hollen budget only raises taxes by $1.7 trillion. The President's budget raised spending by $1.5 trillion; the Van Hollen amendment only raises it by $900 billion.

But it makes me wonder where the President is. Does the President think that his budget that he offered just a month ago raises taxes too much, raises spending too much? Is it too big of a tax-and-spend document, now he wants a little bit less of a tax-and-spend document? I guess the reason he likes the Van Hollen budget is that it raises taxes, it raises spending, and it never balances. I guess those are the consistencies between the Van Hollen budget and the President's budget that we unanimously defeated last night 414–0. So I guess the President likes budgets that raises taxes, raise spending, and never balance.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, as I have through this entire debate, that any balanced approach that does not end up in a balanced budget is no balance and is no budget. For that reason, I encourage us to defeat this amendment.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thought we were back to reality today instead of in the land of make-believe. Mr. MULVANEY offered an amendment yesterday that was not the President's budget. We debated that last night. I don't know why we're continuing that charade.

□ 1400

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There's been a lot of talk about kick the can down the road and kick the can down the road. I want to know what road that is?

The road I know, the road that gave me the American Dream, was the road to an education that's being undercut by this budget. It's a road to medical security that my grandparents worked hard and struggled for to give me. So that's the road we're talking about.

The other question I have is, What can are we talking about? The budget offered by the Republicans kicks the can down the road all right, but that can is the middle class American.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I thank the chairman for yielding.

We have a lot of folks in the gallery today that have worked hard and saved money that they've earned to make their trip and to come here and listen to this debate. They understand that Santa Claus and a fairy tale is not going to pay for their transportation back. They get that. And they know that when they get back home, they're going to have to earn and work and find earned success if they want to bring their family back again. They get it. They get it. The American people get it.

At no point in time have the American people had to do more with less and the Federal Government has done less with more.

We hear a lot about fairness. True fairness does not come from wealth distribution. True fairness means rewarding merit, creating opportunity, and letting people rise. That has been a bedrock of the American system, the free enterprise system; and it is that free enterprise system that has given opportunity and rewarded people. And America has been benevolent with the gifts of being rewarded by hard work and honest dealings.

The Democratic budget does not support that; yet the Ryan budget or the Path to Prosperity, the Republican budget, does.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair reminds all Members not to refer to occupants of the gallery.

The gentleman from Maryland has 1¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR).

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the other side speak about their budget, it takes me back to growing up in Puerto Rico as a young man. And I'm very privileged to represent the people of Idaho right now, but I grew up in a very poor neighborhood. I grew up in a very poor environment in Puerto Rico.

I remember my mother taking me to the wealthier neighborhoods. And I remember her taking me to different places to the nicer stores, the nicer places in Puerto Rico and telling me that I had a choice, that I could work hard, I could play by the rules, I could do all the things I needed to do, and one day I could live in one of those homes, one day I could actually have those opportunities.

But if my mother would have had the same mentality that the other side has, I would have never been able to amount to anything in my life because what they believe is that the only way you can actually amount to something is if you take from the ones who have, if you're a ''have-not.''

My mother never believed in that. She never said some day she will own a beautiful home, you will own a beautiful car, you will own a beautiful house if you take away from the rich. She always said that was up to you to become somebody in your life. And that's the mentality that the other side has.

I have this chart here to show what really happened under the Democrats and the Republicans. If you see this, when the Democrats took control of Congress, we were at just under 5 percent unemployment. As soon as they took over Congress, and Barack Obama was elected, the unemployment rate went higher. And as soon as the Republicans were elected, the unemployment rate started going down. That's the path that we can have between the two parties.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to the budget offered by my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Then-Senator Obama, when campaigning for President, called President Bush unpatriotic for raising our national debt by $4 trillion in 8 years, a figure he has surpassed in less than 4 years.

When then-Senator Obama voted against a debt limit increase he said, Leadership means the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today on to the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

I agree with Senator Obama. If he believes this type of leadership was a failure and unpatriotic, then certainly so too should he think that about his budget and this budget here, for this budget would leave the U.S. with nearly $25 trillion of debt by the end of 2022, despite a massive tax increase of $1.7 trillion.

And despite the increase, this budget does not balance within the next 10 years, the next 20 years, and not even in 75 years. We can't wait. We can't wait, Mr. Chairman. We can't wait to balance the budget for 75 years.

Now more than ever, America needs leadership. As Senator Obama said, we cannot put the failures of today on the backs of the next generation. I agree, Senator Obama. So I reject this budget for the sake of our children and grandchildren.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just remind my colleagues that at the end of the 8 years of the Bush administration, after the tax cuts, which helped create the deficits, we ended up losing over 600,000 private sector jobs. That's the result of trickle-down economics.

The last thing we want to do is go back to those policies. The Republican budget takes us back to our policies. We invest in jobs.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, who's been focused on jobs, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I want to rise to sing the praises of our Democratic members on the House Budget Committee, led by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). Thank you for bringing us a balanced budget to the floor, a balanced option on how we go forward to the floor.

Yes, we know we have to make cuts, and we have to increase revenue, but most of all, we have to increase jobs. Growth is what is important.

And the difference between these two budgets, the budget that Mr. VAN HOLLEN is proposing and the Ryan Republican budget, is that the Ryan Republican budget loses jobs. The Van Hollen budget, the Democratic budget, is a job-creator. It's a job-creator.

It also invests in education. Think of it, if you're a student and you have a student loan, on July 1 your interest rate will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. The Ryan Republican budget says that's just fine. The House Democratic budget prevents that from happening.

And if you're a senior, the Ryan budget takes you down a path where the Medicare guarantee is cut. You may have to spend $6,000 or more for less in terms of benefits.

All the while, while not protecting our students, while not creating jobs, while not protecting our seniors and their Medicare, the Ryan budget gives an over-$300,000 tax break to people making over $1 million a year.

How can that be? How can that be?

The more people know about that budget, the more they know that it hurts them and their lives. The budget that is put forth by the House Democrats is a positive one for economic growth, for investing in our small businesses, for honoring the entrepreneurial spirit of America, for strengthening the middle class, for building ladders of opportunity for people who want to work hard, play by the rules, take responsibility for themselves to succeed as we re-ignite the American Dream.

So I thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for your leadership in putting a budget forth that is responsible, that honors our commitment to future generations, that reduces the deficit in a positive way, as opposed to Mr. RYAN's Republican budget. It doesn't even get to deficit reduction, ending that until close to 2040. I mean, the contrast could not be greater. The impact on America's families could not be greater.

Just think, seniors pay $6,000 more for fewer benefits in Medicare, while they give a $300,000 tax cut to the wealthiest people in our country.

□ 1410

You be the judge. Is that a budget that is a statement of your values?

Vote ''yes'' on the Van Hollen budget. Vote ''no'' on the Ryan Republican budget.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 15 seconds remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Maryland wish to use his remaining 15 seconds?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Yes, I would. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, our Democratic alternative invests in the President's jobs proposal, a proposal that has been sitting here in the House of Representatives since September.

We reduced the deficit in a balanced and fair way. We make choices not to provide another tax break to the wealthiest but to say we need the combination of cuts and revenue, just like bipartisan commissions have done.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Let me just try to give, in a nutshell, the economic vision the minority leader just gave us. It kind of works like this:

Take more money from communities, from families, from small businesses and send it to Washington; swish it around the bureaucracy; make the decisions here; then, through trickle-down government, try to create jobs from government; borrow more money if that's not enough; then print more money if that's not enough over at the Federal Reserve; and we can make jobs in government.

It doesn't work. We've been trying this. Look at where we are today. Our debt is bigger than our economy. Look at the common theme we've seen before us. This budget, the House Democratic budget, has a $1.7 trillion tax increase; the President's budget, a $2 trillion tax increase; the CBC budget, a $6 trillion tax increase; and least, but not last, the Progressive budget has a $6.7 trillion tax increase. Is that for deficit reduction? No. It's for more spending.

The House Democratic budget has a $4.6 trillion spending increase; the CBC budget, a $5.2 trillion spending increase; the President's budget, a $5.2 trillion spending increase; and the Progressive Caucus Budget, a $6.6 trillion spending increase.

It is clear, they want you taxed more so they can spend more, and they never, ever balance the budget and they send us off a debt cliff.

This debt crisis is the most predictable crisis we've ever had in the history of this country, and we've got to stop this notion that we can just keep taking more and more and more from families and businesses to spend us deeper into debt. It doesn't work.

With that, I urge a ''no'' vote on the House Democratic substitute.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 262, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

AYES—163

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

NOES—262

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul

Paulsen	Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman
Pearce	Roskam	Sullivan
Pence	Ross (AR)	Terry
Peterson	Ross (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Petri	Royce	Thornberry
Pitts	Runyan	Tiberi
Platts	Ryan (WI)	Tipton
Poe (TX)	Scalise	Turner (NY)
Pompeo	Schilling	Turner (OH)
Posey	Schmidt	Upton
Price (GA)	Schock	Visclosky
Quayle	Schrader	Walberg
Reed	Schweikert	Walden
Rehberg	Scott (SC)	Walsh (IL)
Reichert	Scott, Austin	Webster
Renacci	Sensenbrenner	West
Ribble	Sessions	Westmoreland
Rigell	Shimkus	Whitfield
Rivera	Shuler	Wilson (SC)
Roby	Shuster	Wittman
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Wolf
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Womack
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Woodall
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Yoder
Rohrabacher	Southerland	Young (AK)
Rokita	Stearns	Young (FL)
Rooney	Stivers	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Filner	Mack	Rangel
Jackson (IL)	Meeks	Towns

□ 1437

Mr. FARR and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 150, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me just start off by thanking all of the staff and the minority and their staff for the hard work.

I want to congratulate Mr. VAN HOLLEN for bringing his substitute to the floor. The minority does not need to do that, and I think that it is good for the process and the system that they do that.

In particular, I want to thank our Budget Committee staff: Alex Stoddard, Andy Morton, Austin Smythe, Charlotte Ivancic, Conor Sweeney, Courtney Reinhard, David Logan, Dennis Teti, Dick Magee, Eric Davis, Gerrit Lansing, Jane Lee, Jenna Spealman, Jim Herz, Jon Burks, Jon Romito, Jose Guillen, Justin Bogie, Marsha Douglas, Matt Hoffmann, Nicole Foltz, Paul Restuccia, Stephanie Parks, Steve Spruiell, Ted McCann, Tim Flynn, and Vanessa Day.

I also want to thank our personal office staff and the people who are over there at the Ford Building that not everybody sees but who work for the Congressional Budget Office. I had the privilege to meet with them last December while they were busy putting the payroll tax numbers together.

This year, the President's budget came late. Easter came early. Everyone was crunched. We worked them overtime, very hard. Now, we don't always like the estimates they necessarily give us, but I want to thank them for their dedication and their professionalism in making this process work.

With that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

PAUL RYAN PERSONAL OFFICE STAFF

Allison Steil, Andy Speth, Chad Herbert, Danyell Tremmel, Joyce Meyer, Kevin Seifert, Megan Wagner, Nathan Schacht, Sarah Peer, Smythe Anderson, Susie Liston, Teresa Mora, Tricia Stoneking, Lauren Schroeder, Casey Higgins, Aubrey Yanzito, Rick Jacobson.

CBO STAFF

Adam Talaber, Adam Wilson, Adebayo Adedeji, Alan van der Hilst, Alexandra L. Minicozzi, Allison Percy, Amber G. Marcellino, Amy E. Petz, Andrea K. Noda, Andrew Stocking, Ann Futrell, Anna E. Cook, Annette W. Kalicki, Athiphat Muthitacharoen, Aurora K. Swanson, Avi Lerner, Barbara Edwards, Barry Blom, Benjamin R. Page, Bernard C. Kempinski.

Brianne B. Hutchinson, Bruce G. Arnold, Carla Tighe Murray, Caryn Rotheim, Chad M. Chirico, Chad Shirley, Charles Pineles-Mark, Charles Whalen, Chayim Rosito, Christi Hawley Anthony, Christian K. Howlett, Christina Vu, Christine M. Bogusz, Christopher Murphy, Christopher Williams, Christopher Zogby, Courtney Griffith, Cynthia R. Cleveland, Damien Moore, DaMischa Phillip.

Daniel Frisk, Daniel S. Hoople, Darren Young, Dave Hull, David A. Brauer, David Arthur, David Austin, David B. Newman, David C. Gaffney, David D. Jackson, David E. Mosher, David Rafferty, David Torregrosa, David Weiner, Dawn Sauter Regan, Deborah A. Kalcevic, Deborah Kilroe, Deborah Lucas, Denise Jordan-Williams, Doug Elmendorf, Dwayne Wright.

Ed Harris, Edward (Sandy) Davis, Edward C. Blau, Elias Leight, Elizabeth Bass, Elizabeth Cove Delisle, Ellen C. Werble, Emily Holcombe, Eric J. Labs, Ernestine McNeil, Ernestine McNeil, Esther Steinbock, Felix Reichling, Frances M. Lussier, Francesca Castelli, Frank J. Sammartino, Frank S. Russek, Gregory Acs, Gregory H. Hitz, Heidi Golding, Holly Harvey, Jamease Miles.

James A. Langley, James Baumgardner, James Johnson, Janet F. Airis, Janet Holtzblatt, Janice M. Johnson, Jared Brewster, Jason Wheelock, Jean P. Hearne, Jeanine Rees, Jeff LaFave, Jeffrey Kling, Jeffrey M. Holland, Jennifer C. Gravelle, Jennifer Smith, Jessica Deegan, Jessica S. Banthin, Jimmy Jin, J'nell L. Blanco, Joanna (Jodi) Capps.

Joe Miller, John H. Skeen III, Jonathan A. Huntley, Jonathan A. Schwabish, Jonathan P. Morancy, Joseph Evans Jr., Joseph Kile, Joshua Shakin, Joyce M. Manchester, Juan M. Contreras, Juann H. Hung, Judith Cromwell, Julia M. Christensen, Julia Mitchell, Julie H. Topoleski, Julie Somers, Justin Humphrey, Justin R. Falk.

Kalyani Parthasarathy, Kate Kelly, Kathleen FitzGerald, Kathleen Gramp, Kent R. Christensen, Kevin Perese, Kim J. Kowalewski, Kim P. Cawley, Kirstin B. Nelson, Kurt Seibert, Lara E. Robillard, Larry Ozanne, Leah C. Mazade, Leigh S. Angres, Leo K. Lex, Linda Bilheimer, Linda Schimmel, Lisa Ramirez-Branum, Loretta Lettner, Lori B. Housman, Lyle Nelson.

Majid Moghaddam, Marika Santoro, Marin A. Randall, Marion C. Curry, Mark Booth, Mark E. Sanford, Mark J. Lasky, Mark P. Hadley, Mark T. Grabowicz, Martin von Gnechten, Mary M. Froehlich, Matthew Goldberg, Matthew Pickford, Matthew Schmit, Maureen Costantino, Megan E. Carroll, Melinda B. Buntin, Melissa Merrell, Michael Bennett, Michael Levine, Michael S. Simpson, Mitchell A. Remy, Molly W. Dahl, Monte Ruffin.

Nabeel A. Alsalam, Nancy A. Fahey, Natalie J. Tawil, Nathan T. Musick, Noah P. Meyerson, Noelia J. Duchovny, Paige Piper/Bach, Pamela Greene, Patrice L. Gordon, Patrice L. Watson, Paul Burnham, Paul Jacobs, Paul Masi, Paula D. Brown, Perry C. Beider, Peter H. Fontaine, Philip C. Webre, Priscila Hammett.

R. Derek Trunkey, Rae Wiseman, Raymond J. Hall, Rebecca Rockey, Rebecca V. Yip, Robert A. Sunshine, Robert G. Shackleton Jr., Robert McClelland, Robert W. Arnold, Robert W. Stewart, Rod Goodwin, Romain Parsad, Ron Gecan, Ronald L. Moore, Ryan G. Miller.

Sam Papenfuss, Santiago Vallinas, Sarah Ammar, Sarah Anders, Sarah Jennings, Sarah Puro, Shane Beaulieu, Shannon Mok, Sharon Broderick, Sharon Corbin-Jallow, Sheila Campbell, Sheila M. Dacey, Sherry Snyder, Simone Thomas, Stephanie Burns, Stephanie Cameron, Stephanie M. Ruiz, Stephen P. Rentner, Steven A. Weinberg, Stuart A. Hagen, Sunita C. D'Monte, Susan Willie, Susanne S. Mehlman.

T.J. McGrath, Tamara Hayford, Terry M. Dinan, Theresa A. Gullo, Thomas B. Bradley, Tiara P. Mizelle, Valentina Michelangeli, Vi Nguyen, Virginia Myers, Wendy Edelberg, Wendy Kiska, William J. Carrington, William Ma, William Randolph.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by thanking all the members of the Budget Committee, Republicans and Democrats alike. We had a very good debate in the Budget Committee. We had a good debate here on the floor. And I want to thank all our colleagues. We obviously have deep differences, but I think everybody conducted this debate in a civil manner.

I also want to thank the chairman for the way he conducted the proceedings in the committee. And to all the staff, Republican and Democratic staff, I want to thank our team, headed by Tom Kahn. Many of them are here on the floor. As I think everybody knows, they've spent many, many, many late nights working on this budget. So I salute all of them as well as the folks over at the Congressional Budget Office.

□ 1440

We obviously think that this budget proposed by our Republican colleagues is the wrong choice for America.

I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Democratic whip, my friend, our colleague from the State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RYAN, who is an outstanding Member of this body and my friend, and who is one of the most able among us, as well as Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who has been my close friend for many years and one of the most able among us, have just spent time thanking our staffs for the work that they have done. I share their view that our staffs have worked mightily. And, indeed, there has been much debate.

Tragically, the product we will produce today is far less than the sum of our parts in this body. It is, I would suggest to you, a product unworthy of the intellect that has been applied to it. It is a product, indeed, that I think will hurt America, not help America. It is a product that is too much politics and too little policy. It is a product of which I think this House can not be proud.

It is a product that relies on substantially undermining the security of seniors. I say that as one who has said repeatedly that in reaching a fiscally sustainable path we must deal with entitlements. We need to do so together, and we need to do so in a balanced way.

But there is no balance in this proposal. Seniors, middle class, the vulnerable, and working Americans are asked to pay the price of this agreement. And, indeed, not only are they asked to pay the price, but the best off among us is asked to do the least.

That's not the America of which we're all proud—that has worked together and sacrificed together at times, to come together to make a joint contribution to the welfare of this country.

This product is less than the sum of its parts. This product would undermine the guarantee of Medicare.

Again, we need to deal with entitlements, but not in a way, I tell my friends in this House, that undermines the guarantee of senior security as well as family security, so their children will know their parents are secure.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, we had an agreement. I think that the gentleman from Wisconsin is an honorable man. He is my friend. I like PAUL RYAN. But I am sorely disappointed, I tell my friend.

We came to having a difference of opinion on what the number ought to be for this year's budget. You had a lower number. We had a higher number. We almost took the Nation to the brink—as a matter of fact, we took it to the brink—of default.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. We came to the brink of default in this great Nation, the most creditworthy Nation on the face of the Earth, and were downgraded as a result of failing to get to an agreement. But when we got to an agreement, it was an agreement. And if we are able to rely on one another's words, we ought to keep our agreements.

It simply said that 302(a), which simply means, for the public, that the dollars we were going to spend on discretionary spending this fiscal year coming would be $1.47 trillion. That's a lot of money, no doubt about it. Your side didn't like it, my side didn't like it, but we agreed on it.

That agreement is not carried out in this budget. How can we rely in the future on such an agreement? It asks seniors to pay the bill, the vulnerable to pay the bill, but not the wealthiest in America. It puts Medicare at risk and does not get us to where we want.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. In fact, it adds $10 trillion, and then some magical formula that's somewhere out there, like waste, fraud, and abuse, we're going to find the money to pay for the $10 trillion in tax cuts. That's by the extension of the Bush tax cuts and the 35 to 25. Some magical way, we're going to eliminate preference items. It doesn't say which ones. It doesn't say who's going to pay the bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, we can do better. The parts in this body are very good on both sides of the aisle—good intellect, good instincts, and a love for this country. We can do better.

Let's reject this budget. Let's do some real work. Let's come together and put this country on a fiscally sustainable path without harming our people.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished majority whip, Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for the work that he's done, both sides.

We've watched a lot of debate. This floor is supposed to be devised to have the power of the idea to win.

Mr. Chairman, we watched the President's budget come here and, unfortunately, unite us when nobody thought that was the direction to go.

We watched history be made on this floor for many years. It's always said that history repeats itself. In my short lifespan, if I'm really looking at where America stands, it stands much where we stood in 1980—a choice between two futures.

Have you ever thought for a moment the similarities of 1980 to today?

In 1980, America was afraid that Japan was going to surpass us in our economy. Today, we have fear of China and India being larger.

In 1980, Iran was holding Americans hostage. Today, they want to close the Strait of Hormuz. They want to develop missiles that hold the world hostage.

We had an energy crisis. Today, the price of gasoline is the highest it's ever been.

Every generation in America has been able to improve on the generation before it, but do you realize 1980 was the first time a majority of Americans believed the best days were behind us? 50.4 percent. Today, it's at 74. We had a challenge in our foreign policy. We literally had a President put a sweater on and tell us to turn the heater down.

Our biggest challenge is our debt that faces us.

Well, today we have a choice, a choice of two futures, just as we did in 1980. So the choice today is: Do you want that European model; or do you want something that faces our challenge, honest to the American people, and rises to the occasion?

When Ronald Reagan was sworn in at his inaugural, he said:

> Our willingness to believe in ourselves and our capacity to perform great deeds; to believe that together, with God's help, we can and will resolve the problems which now confront us. And after all, why shouldn't we believe that? We are Americans.

Winston Churchill once said of America:

> You can always count on them to do what's right after they've exhausted every other option.

We have exhausted every other option. This is an opportunity for a new path, for a new future.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House Republican budget resolution offered by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Chairman PAUL RYAN.

Mr. Chairman, people in this country are looking. They are desperate to see a strong signal from Washington that we are prepared to make the tough decisions necessary to address our Nation's fiscal crisis. Today, we will pass our budget that proposes real, honest solutions to create a stronger economy and a more certain future for our country.

□ 1450

Our budget takes bold steps that will get the fiscal house in order and will manage down the debt and deficit. It also strengthens the entitlement programs which are the biggest drivers of our debt. It reforms the Tax Code and prevents devastating defense cuts from taking place—all without raising taxes.

Mr. Chairman, we are seizing the opportunity to address what even the minority has admitted is the most predictable economic crisis in our Nation's history. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, those on the other side of the aisle seem to refuse to be able to deal with this crisis and actually propose a solution.

The Democratic-controlled Senate has failed to pass a budget in over 1,000 days, shirking its responsibility to the American people. And the President has refused to put forth any serious solution to pay down the historic debt and deficit that he helped create. In fact, the President's budget will actually aggravate the Nation's problems. President Obama's budget saddles the American people with massive tax increases, puts more burden on job creators, weakens our military and fails to provide a plan to save our entitlement programs. I believe these policies will fundamentally change our Nation for the worse.

In contrast, Mr. Chairman, our budget restores the system of free enterprise that has made America the greatest nation in the world. We propose a simpler, fairer, and more competitive Tax Code that will actually foster economic growth and job creation. Instead of picking winners and losers, our plan levels the playing field. Our budget lowers tax rates for taxpayers, broadens the base, and gets rid of loopholes and preferences so we can grow the economy and see more jobs created.

Mr. Chairman, our budget seeks to save our entitlement programs because we actually produce a plan to solve the disproportionate cause of our deficits in health care entitlements.

This commitment to lead, this commitment to find solutions and to actually put a plan in place is what has been missing from the debate in this town. And we ask our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in that commitment to actually adopt a plan so that we can begin to make progress and send a signal to the American people that we get it and that we are here to help solve the problem.

Mr. Chairman, House Republicans are offering the American people a choice in terms of the direction this country will take. And I thank Chairman RYAN and the members of his Budget Committee for their hard work to produce this pro-growth, solutions-oriented budget. This document does begin to address the serious fiscal challenges we face and grow the economy so that our children have the same hope, opportunity, and ability to achieve success that our parents gave to us and their parents to them.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If I could ask how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank our colleagues for a vigorous debate, and I would remind everybody that just a few years ago when the President was sworn in, our economy was in a total free fall. The bottom was falling out, we had negative 8 percent GDP, and over 800,000 jobs were being lost every month. And as a result of extraordinary actions that were taken, along with the tenacity of the American people, we have climbed out of that hole that we inherited. We have now had 24 months of consecutive private-sector job growth. Let's keep that growth going.

The budget that the President proposed, the budget that the Democrats proposed, did that. It expanded investments in jobs. The Republican budget will cut our investment in transportation next year by 46 percent when we have 17 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

Independent analysts have said that their budget will cost us 1 million jobs this year and cost us 2 million jobs next year. That's not what we need. The Congressional Budget Office has said that over one-third of our current deficit is because of underemployment. Why would we want to add to underemployment, as the Republican budget does?

Now, in the long term, we've got to get our deficits under control. The issue is not whether we need to do that, the issue is how. As the previous speaker said, the question is the choice. Our Republican colleagues overwhelmingly have signed this pledge saying they are not willing to close one tax loophole—not one penny—for the purpose of reducing the deficit. And when you say to folks making over $1 million a year, you don't have to share any more responsibility of reducing the deficit, when you say to big oil companies we're going to keep going with the taxpayer subsidies, do you know what? You've got to take out the budget on everybody else, at the expense of seniors, at the expense of middle-income taxpayers, and at the expense of important investments in our economy. And that's what their budget does. That's why it ends the Medicare guarantee.

They're proposing to give seniors a deal that's a lot worse than we have for Members of Congress—worse than the one for Members of Congress, seniors on Medicare. They cut Medicaid by $800 billion, more than one-third of the program, by 2022, putting seniors and disabled individuals at risk. They cut education investments and would allow interest rates on student loans to double this July. Those are not decisions that we make if we want a strong economy and a robust future for our children and grandchildren.

So this is all about choices, and we don't think that it's bold to provide tax breaks to millionaires while you're ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors. We don't think it's courageous to protect big taxpayer giveaways to companies that ship American jobs overseas while we're cutting investments in education, science, research, and infrastructure right here at home. We don't think it's fair to provide another round of tax cuts to folks at the very top. The Tax Policy Center says it's going to be close to $400,000 on average for people making over $1 million. We don't think it's fair to do that, financing those tax cuts by increasing taxes on middle-income Americans.

I would challenge our colleagues: show us how you make up for $4.6 trillion in lost revenue from dropping that tax rate without socking it to middle-income taxpayers? So far, Republican colleagues have been absolutely incapable of showing us that they're not shifting the burden to middle-income taxpayers.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is all about choices. Unfortunately, we didn't pass the alternative Democratic budget. Let's not make the mistake of passing this Republican budget plan. We can do better. We can do what bipartisan groups have done, take a balanced approach, cut spending and also cut the loopholes for special interests. Let's do it in a way that the American people would say brings us together, rather than apart.

So I would urge rejection of this budget. It makes the wrong choice for America. I thank the chairman, and I thank my colleagues.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, we are bearing witness to history this week. Across the street, we are witnessing what could be the end of bureaucratic-controlled health care. What we are on the verge of witnessing is a powerful reaffirmation of the American idea, and we are finally having the debate we need to have.

Our rights come to us naturally, they come from God and nature, and not from government. This health care law is the latest and perfect example of the notion that government is now needed to grant us new rights. And if that is the case, then government has authority to ration, to regulate and to redistribute exactly how we exercise these new rights, such as health care. And if these new government-granted rights conflict with our constitutional rights and liberties, well, then, such is the sacrifice needed in the name of progress, or so the thinking goes.

Across the street, we are witnessing what could be a rejection of this line of thinking. The new health care law, which asserts unlimited power to the Federal Government to decide for Americans how they should go about getting their health care, simply is not compatible with the Constitution.

□ 1500

But the Justices who are considering this case, they've raised a very good point: If this is, at the end, a bureaucrat control of health care, what comes next? And if you listen to them, you may hear a pretty dim view of Congress' ability to solve this problem.

With respect, I would suggest that they take a look at what we are accomplishing here in this body today. Here, in this Chamber, we are witnessing the growing momentum of a new approach, one that maintains a critical role for government, but ultimately puts the American people in charge where they belong.

For the second year in a row, we are passing a budget that outlines a new approach to Medicare. We keep the protections that made Medicare a guaranteed promise for seniors throughout the years, but this is what we say to the bureaucrats who have mismanaged this program into bankruptcy: Enough. Your approach doesn't work. Government has never come up with the magic formula to micromanage America, let alone lower costs and improve quality. It's time to put 50 million seniors, not 15 bureaucrats, in charge of their own health care decisions.

Forcing insurance companies to compete, that's the only way to guarantee quality affordable health care for seniors that lasts for generations. That's the answer to what comes next. Let's keep building on the growing bipartisan consensus on how to improve patient-centered health care reform.

But putting our trust in Americans, it goes beyond health care. It is what this entire budget is all about. We get government bureaucrats out of the business of picking winners and losers in the economy because Americans should make their own decisions about what kind of car they drive or what kind of light bulb they use. We give power over the safety net programs to the States because we believe that governments that are closest to the people are in the best position to design programs for their unique communities, to get people on to lives of self-sufficiency and upward mobility.

When we lower tax rates by closing special interest loopholes, we're saying we in Washington don't need to micromanage people's decisions through the Tax Code. Let people keep more of their own hard-earned dollars; let them decide how to spend it. Economic growth, jobs, upward mobility, opportunity, these are what we're striving for, just like our parents did the same for us.

Mr. Chairman, it is so rare in American politics to arrive at a moment in which the debate revolves around the fundamental nature of American democracy and the social contract, but that is exactly where we are today. One approach gives more power to unelected bureaucrats, takes more from hardworking taxpayers to fuel the expansion of government, and commits our Nation to a future of debt and decline. This approach is proving unworkable in Congress, in our courts, and in our communities.

This contrast with our budget could not become clearer: We put our trust in citizens, not in the government. Our budget returns power to individuals, to families, to communities.

As these choices become clear, today's budget is a vote of confidence for the American experiment. We think that putting our trust in the American people will renew their trust in us. We think Americans should control their destinies, and we trust them to make the right choices about the future of our country.

Mr. Chairman, we think America is on the wrong track. We believe the President is bringing us toward a debt crisis and a welfare state in decline. We are offering the Nation a choice. We are offering the Nation a better way forward. And we are offering the Nation a plan to renew America and the American idea.

Mr. Chairman, let's have that vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my opposition to the House Republican budget which ends Medicare guarantees while giving huge tax cuts to millionaires and billionaires. As they have done countless times over the past three decades, the House Republicans are siding with millionaires and billionaires, while making life more difficult for seniors, students, and working people and families. To fund an average tax cut of $400,000 per year for people making more than $1 million annually, they would take away the Medicare guarantee and the Affordable Care Act's provisions to close the donut hole and for free preventive care; destroy more than 4 million jobs through 2014; and cut funding for Pell Grants, K–12 education and Head Start. Instead of continuing with 30 years of failed trickle-down economic policy, we should be investing in our infrastructure, education and research—we need to pass the President's budget for our country's long-term economic health and to renew the American Dream for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I will vote today for H. Con. Res. 112, authored by Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN, because we have a duty to address our nation's looming fiscal obligations. Simply put, we cannot continue to kick the proverbial can down the road.

When I came to the floor to vote for last year's budget, we were $14 trillion in debt. Today, we are $15.5 trillion in debt. It is projected we could be $17 trillion in debt by the end of the year and $21 trillion in debt by 2021.

This will be our fourth straight year of trillion dollar deficits. Four straight years.

We are currently spending 10 cents of every dollar on interest to finance the debt, even though we're borrowing money at historically low rates. If we realistically assume that rates will rise, we could be spending close to 1 out of every 6 dollars to finance the debt by the end of the decade. And that is under the best case scenario.

That is money that could be going to our national defense, repairing our roads and bridges or life-saving cancer research.

In 1970, 5 percent of debt held by the public was in foreign hands. In 1990, it was 19 percent. Today, more than 40 percent of our publically held debt is in foreign hands.

Who are our bankers? Nations such as China, which is spying on us, where human rights are an afterthought, and Catholic bishops, Protestant ministers and Tibetan monks are jailed for practicing their faith, and oil-exporting countries such as Saudi Arabia, which funded the radical madrasahs on the Afghan-Pakistan border resulting in the rise of the Taliban and al Qaeda.

Quite frankly this borrowing is unsustainable, dangerous and irresponsible.

That is why I have been willing to make the hard choices to ensure a better future for our children and grandchildren. Every two years I take an oath to support and defend the Constitution. I do not sign pledges to lobbyists or special interest groups.

That is why I have been working with my colleagues, through my assignment as chairman of the House appropriations subcommittee that funds the departments of Commerce and Justice, to cut $95 billion in federal spending since the start of this Congress, including $11 billion from my subcommittee alone.

That is why I have repeatedly voted against the payroll tax holiday, which steals from the Social Security Trust Fund. The most recent extension alone took $93 billion and brought us nearly a month closer to the statutory debt limit. With just one vote in February, we practically wiped out all the $95 billion savings from the cuts enacted since Republican took back control of the House.

I have speaking out about the need to get our nation's fiscal house in order since George W. Bush was in office.

In 2006 I introduced legislation to create an independent, bipartisan commission to address our debt and deficit. I called it the SAFE Commission, short for Securing America's Future Economy. It said everything should be on the table for discussion: all entitlement spending, all domestic discretionary spending, including defense spending, and tax reform, particularly changes to make the tax code more simple and fair and to end the practice of tax earmarks that costs hundreds of billions of dollars. Congress would be required to vote up or down on the commission's recommendations, just as was done in the base closing process.

I was glad to have been joined in this effort by my good friend and colleague JIM COOPER of Tennessee. Our legislation served as the blueprint for the president's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, commonly referred to as the Simpson-Bowles Commission. I am pleased Mr. COOPER and Mr. LATOURETTE produced a full substitute amendment that I believe is the right way forward. I commend them for their work.

The Simpson-Bowles Commission produced a credible plan that gained the support of a bipartisan majority of the commission's 18 members. Called "The Moment of Truth," the commission's report made clear that eliminating the debt and deficit will not be easy and that any reform must begin with entitlements. Mandatory and discretionary spending also has to be addressed as well other "sacred cows," including tax reform and defense spending.

Had just three more members of the Simpson-Bowles Commission supported the recommendations, this plan likely would have passed the Congress and be law today. I was disappointed that the president, and his administration, walked away from the commission. The president failed the country. And the Congress has also failed. This town is dysfunctional. If the plan had advanced, we would already be on our way in getting our nation's fiscal house in order.

We have to find a solution to this debt crisis. Failure is not an option.

Congress and the president must be willing to support a plan that breaks loose from the special interests holding Washington by the throat and return confidence to the country.

Congress and the president also need to be honest with the American people and explain that we cannot solve our nation's financial crisis by just cutting waste, fraud and abuse within discretionary accounts. The real runaway spending is occurring in our out-of-control entitlement costs and the hundreds of billions in annual tax earmarks. Until we reach an agreement that addresses these two drivers of our deficit and debts, we cannot right our fiscal ship of state.

I regret that the bipartisan Cooper amendment failed. But since it did, today I'm voting for the Ryan budget.

Like last year's proposal, this budget blueprint calls for significant reductions in discretionary spending, for reduced tax rates and for the repeal of the costly health care reform law.

The plan also points out that we can no longer ignore the trillions of dollars in unfunded liabilities that consume our budget. There may be disagreement on the significant changes in Medicare and Medicaid entitlement programs that he proposes, and while his plan is again silent on changes needed to reform Social Security entitlements, it does recognize that need. Mr. RYAN continues to pull back the curtain on the mandatory spending ''elephant in the room,'' which we can no longer ignore.

I want to be clear: I would prefer for this House to pass the bipartisan Cooper-LaTourette budget, which is modeled on the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles plan. Even though there were some parts that I would have liked to change, I spoke in strong support of that budget proposal and continue to believe that it is the only plan that can pass the Senate. That proposal put everything on the table, and, more importantly, sought to achieve enough deficit reductions to turn off the need for the sequester that could be so harmful to our defense capabilities. But, again, as that bipartisan proposal failed to pass, I will support the Ryan plan.

I do not agree with everything in this proposal, and will work to improve future legislation. For example, I regret that this proposal does not offer more on ways to address Social Security and tax reform efforts.

This resolution also unfairly targets the federal workforce. While there are many federal employees in the Capital region, it is worth noting that more than 85 percent of the workforce is outside of Washington.

It is also worth noting that more than 65 percent of all federal employees work in agencies that support our national defense capabilities as we continue to fight the War on Terror. The first American killed in Afghanistan, Mike Spann, was a CIA agent and a constituent from my congressional district. CIA, FBI, DEA agents, and State Department employees are serving side-by-side with our military in the fight against the Taliban.

Let's also not forget the Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents who are working to stop the flow of illegal immigrants and drugs across our borders.

Or the medical researchers at NIH working to develop cures for cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's and autism.

Or the VA doctors and nurses treating veterans from World War II to today.

Or the FDA inspectors working to stop a salmonella outbreak. These are all federal employees.

Mr. Chair, enough is enough. It is simply wrong to claim, as the Ryan budget does, that these public servants ''have been immune from the effects of the recession.''

This budget also could be improved by providing for the needs of the most vulnerable in our society. As the Congress deals with the budget, we must always do it in a way that does not neglect the needs of the poor. Scripture (Proverbs 19:17) tells us, ''He who is kind to the poor lends to the Lord.'' And in the New Testament Jesus talks a lot about the poor. Matthew 25 says that if we ignore the poor and hungry it is the same as ignoring him. But this budget resolution is an outline for future action, not an enacting piece of legislation that carries the weight of law.

The budget also seeks to shore up our defense capabilities for the next year by finding alternative savings to prevent the across-the-board cuts that are coming in January as a result of the Joint Committee on Deficit Reduction's bipartisan failure of leadership, which, regretfully, represents the larger failure of the President and both political parties.

Another example of this failure of leadership is the decision by the Senate not to even offer a budget proposal. While the Budget Control Act, BCA, does not require a new budget to establish FY 2013 spending levels, the BCA was passed with the assumption that the so-called supercommittee on deficit reduction would be successful. We need to have a robust debate in the public arena as everyone works to mitigate the harmful cuts that will result from the coming sequester. It is an abdication of responsibility for the Senate to refuse to put forth a budget.

This budget recognizes that our fiscal challenges are too great to wait until the next election. We, as elected representatives, have a duty to lead. We have a duty to put forth ideas within the public sphere and engage in debate. I'm ready to make the tough choices today. I vote for the Ryan budget so that the House can get to work.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chair, listening to the claims of the opponents of this budget, one would think it represented a full-frontal assault on the welfare state and the entitlements system. However, in fact—with all respect to Shakespeare—the sound and fury over this budget ultimately signifies nothing. Under this budget, the federal government will spend $3.5 trillion next year, while under President Obama's budget the federal government will spend $3.8 trillion. The small difference between the congressional budget and the President's hardly seem to justify the overheated rhetoric we hear emanating from both sides of the aisle.

Even under the most optimistic scenario, this supposedly radical plan does not balance the federal budget until my one-year old great-granddaughter will be in college. Under less optimistic assumption, my great granddaughter will be almost 30 before she sees a balanced federal budget. This assumes that Congress will adhere to this year's budget in future years, a dubious assumption since we cannot bind future Congresses to abide by our spending plans. The only budget this Congress cannot legally bind any future Congress to follow a budget we passed today.

The only budget this Congress controls is this year's budget. So why aren't we making substantial spending cuts this year, instead of putting off the hard choices?

Critics of this budget do have a point when they criticize this budget for misplaced priorities, since this plan calls for the federal government to continue to waste trillions of dollars in a future attempt to police the world. Mr. Speaker, through my years in public life I have explained the folly of our hyper-interventionist foreign policy; I will not rehash those arguments here. Instead, I will simply point out to my colleagues that we can no longer afford to spend trillions overseas.

Also, many of those who share my goal of unwinding the federal welfare and entitlement system understand the need to do without harming Americans currently reliant on the system. That task will be much easier if we began by eliminating overseas militarism, foreign aid, and corporate welfare. Yet this so called radical budget treats the Pentagon as a sacred cow, as if closing one overseas base or canceling one contract for Lockheed-Martin will render America defenselessness.

This budget bill not only fails to reduce spending by changing our foreign policy, it also fails to make any meaningful changes in domestic spending. While the bill does repel the President's misguided national health care plan, and repeal a few other federal programs, it leaves the vast majority of the federal welfare-regulatory leviathan intact. Despite the claims of both proponents and opponents that this budget dramatically downsizes the federal government, it does not repeal one unconstitutional cabinet department, not even the Department of Education, which has no constitutional authority and if anything has diminished the quality of American education.

Mr. Chair, the problem facing the federal government is at root not a fiscal problem but a philosophical problem. Too many people in both parties have bought into the idea that the federal government should run the economy, run our lives, and run the world. Until that idea is repudiated and we once again embrace the principles of liberty and constitutional government we will not be able to address our fiscal problems. This budget does little to advance the goal of moving us toward a free society; therefore I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chair, I rise today to strongly oppose the Republicans' budget proposal. I remain committed to creating jobs, expanding health care coverage, and promoting education, but this budget signals that the Republicans do not. In fact, this budget seems designed to have devastating effects on American families and businesses, and would dramatically damage our nation's improving economy. This legislation makes significant cuts to social programs and investments in education, destroys American jobs, and represents the latest in a series of Republican attacks on Medicare.

Although our economy is recovering from years of misguided policies, many Americans are still struggling to make ends meet. Gas prices have skyrocketed in recent months. Quality health care and education are becoming more expensive for the average American. Families are fighting to save their homes from foreclosure and escape from under mountains of debt.

Instead of focusing on these important issues, Mr. RYAN and the Tea Party have developed a budget that dramatically undermines the social safety net that so many Americans depend on. I believe that budgets are reflections of our values—and it is clear from this proposal that Mr. RYAN and the Tea Party do not possess the same values as ordinary Americans.

By turning Medicare into a voucher program, this budget would effectively end Medicare as we know it, and shift thousands of dollars of health costs onto seniors. But gutting Medicare is not enough for the Republicans. The Ryan budget would also cut more than $1 trillion from Medicaid, and endanger health care coverage for over 60 million Americans, including low-income children, pregnant women, nursing home patients, and persons with disabilities.

This budget also demonstrates the Republicans' lack of commitment to investing in America's youth. By proposing to cut funding for education by 45 percent, it is clear that the Republicans do not understand the importance of investing in education, and in science, technology, engineering, and math in particular, to ensure our nation's competitiveness in the global economy. At a time when states are drastically reducing their education budgets—including my home state, which recently cut funding for education by $5 billion—the Republicans' budget attacks critical initiatives ranging from extra reading and math help for low-income students to much-needed financial aid for college. If Mr. RYAN and the Tea Party get their way, in 2014 nearly 10 million students would see their Pell Grants fall by more than $1,000 dollars, and 200,000 children and their families would no longer be able to participate in Head Start.

In my 16 years proudly representing the people of my district, this is by far the worst piece of legislation that I have seen. Mr. RYAN and the Tea Party have once again put forward a budget to benefit the wealthy and special interests groups at the expense of middle-class Americans, seniors, veterans, and children. While this budget provides huge tax cuts for the richest one percent of Americans, it does nothing to stimulate the economy nor create jobs, and would adversely impact the Hispanic community and the residents of my district.

This budget yet again shows how out of touch the Republican Party is with the lives of ordinary Americans. Instead of focusing on creating jobs and putting Americans back to work, it extends the Bush tax cuts—which I voted against and continue to oppose—for the wealthiest Americans, and provides millionaires and billionaires with an average tax cut of $150,000. To put this amount into perspective, $150,000 would pay for: one years' worth of savings for a senior in the Medicare prescription drug "donut hole" ($600); one school computer lab ($40,000); one year of medical care for a veteran returning home ($8,945); one grant for medical research on chronic diseases ($50,000); one tax credit to make a year of college more affordable ($2,500); one firefighter, police officer, or first responder kept on the job ($42,000); and one college student receiving the maximum Pell Grant ($5,550).

In today's economic climate, we don't need more subsidies for big oil and bigger tax loopholes for hedge fund managers on Wall Street. Yet, the Republicans have put forward a budget that provides huge tax cuts and subsidies for the mega-rich and corporations, while utterly failing to support vital investments in education, job training, research and development, and our nation's crumbling infrastructure.

For these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this ideological, radical budget, and stand firm in support of job creation, health care, and education for all Americans.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the shortsighted foreign assistance cuts in Chairman RYAN's FY13 Budget. The Ryan Budget slashes our foreign aid by 10%, dangerously undermining some of the most low-cost, high-return tools in our national security toolbox. And why? Because the Chairman claims it will help to reduce the deficit. But the numbers tell a very different story. These foreign aid cuts amount to 0.2% reduction in our deficit. Two-tenths of one percent! Dr. Mike Tierney of The College of William & Mary put it best when he said, "Cutting foreign aid to address the budget crisis is like getting your hair cut in an effort to lose weight."

In our present fiscal environment, every dollar we spend must yield the highest possible return on our investment. And that means doing everything possible to efficiently reduce the threat of costly conflict and build stable, peaceful American allies. And who is on the frontlines of building peace? Our State Department diplomats, our USAID development professionals, our Peace Corps Volunteers, our US Institute of Peace civilian power, our Inter-American Foundation grassroots development capacity, to name a few. And the budget that supports this smart power amounts to less than 2% of our total budget. Talk about big return on small investment!

But the Ryan Budget cuts will also have real reverberations for US workers. Foreign aid creates strong markets for US goods; 11 of our top 15 trading partners are graduates of US foreign assistance programs. And one out of every five American jobs is tied to trade. So, not only does this ill-conceived budget jeopardize our national security efforts, it takes an unnecessary swipe at American workers in the midst of a fragile economic recovery.

Mr. Chair, make no mistake about it: I firmly believe we need to get our fiscal house in order. So for this reason, we must support foreign assistance because foreign assistance supports peace. And peace is the least costly, most important tool in our national security toolbox.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 112) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2013 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2014 through 2022, and, pursuant to House Resolution 597, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

YEAS—228

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

NAYS—191

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gibson
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Israel
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern

McIntyre	Rehberg	Slaughter
McKinley	Reyes	Smith (WA)
McNerney	Richardson	Speier
Michaud	Richmond	Stark
Miller (NC)	Ross (AR)	Sutton
Miller, George	Rothman (NJ)	Thompson (CA)
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Moran	Ruppersberger	Tierney
Murphy (CT)	Rush	Tonko
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Towns
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda T.	Tsongas
Neal	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Olver	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Owens	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Pallone	Schiff	Walz (MN)
Pascrell	Schrader	Wasserman Schultz
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Waters
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Peters	Scott, David	Welch
Peterson	Serrano	Whitfield
Platts	Sewell	Wilson (FL)
Polis	Sherman	Woolsey
Price (NC)	Shuler	Yarmuth
Quigley	Sires	
Rahall		

NOT VOTING—12

Broun (GA)	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Dicks	Mack	Pingree (ME)
Filner	Meeks	Rangel
Hinchey	Paul	Watt

□ 1527

Mrs. LOWEY changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 151, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, April 3, 2012; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Friday, April 6, 2012; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 10, 2012; when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, April 13, 2012; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, April 16, 2012.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 4281. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 29, 2012.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 703(c) of the Public Interest Declassification Act of 2000 (50 U.S.C.) 435 note), I hereby re-appoint Mr. David E. Skaggs of Longmont, Colorado to the Public Interest Declassification Board.

Thank you for your consideration of this re-appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
House Democratic Leader.

CAMDEN PROPERTY TRUST

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a distinguished company from the Houston area, Camden Property Trust.

Camden was recently recognized by Fortune Magazine as one of the 100 best companies to work for.

This is not the first time they've been named to such an esteemed list, as Camden consistently ranks among the most desirable places to work in America.

Camden is the only multifamily real estate company to be named to this prestigious list. They employ nearly 1,800 people in 13 States.

Camden provides conservative financial policies and a positive, dynamic work environment.

Camden is also committed to helping employees improve their personal and professional lives through outstanding training programs, mentoring, networking, and community service.

This commitment has helped Camden become a leader in their industry and a valued asset to the Houston area.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud their high standards and wish them continued success.

□ 1530

A PROMISE TO TRAYVON

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I made a promise to Trayvon. I made a promise to his mother. I promised to stand up for Trayvon. I promised that I would rise every day and let the world know how long it has been since he was murdered. Today marks 33 days since Trayvon's death—33 days without justice.

I want to let Trayvon know that I'm going home this evening. I'm going home because votes have finished for the week, but I will be back. This vigil will not stop. It will continue every day. Every day the House is in recess, I will tweet the world and update on how many days have passed without justice; and this Sunday, I will personally host a rally back home—Trayvon's home—in Miami, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I want Trayvon to know that he is not forgotten. He is missed. He is loved. We will continue to stand up for justice for Trayvon.

STAFF SERGEANT JOSEPH D'AUGUSTINE

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. As cochairman of the House Explosive Ordnance Disposal Caucus and as a former Army EOD tech, I address you today with a heavy heart. On Tuesday of this week, Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine was killed in Afghanistan by an IED. He was 29 years old.

Staff Sergeant D'Augustine was an EOD tech in the United States Marine Corps, and he had four tours of duty in Afghanistan and Iraq to his credit. He enlisted in the Marine Corps the day after he graduated from Waldwick High School in New Jersey in 2001. As an EOD tech, Staff Sergeant D'Augustine displayed the full extent of his bravery by clearing explosive threats in defending the lives of his fellow marines, soldiers, airmen, and sailors.

EOD techs, like Staff Sergeant D'Augustine, play an invaluable role in securing our freedom and in combating terrorism, but too often their heroic deeds go unreported.

Staff Sergeant D'Augustine is survived by his parents and three sisters. I am eternally grateful for Staff Sergeant D'Augustine's service to our country and for all the brave men and women who defend our freedoms at home and abroad as members of the armed services. On behalf of the Congressional EOD Caucus and the interservice EOD family, our thoughts and prayers are with the family of Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT LET STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES GO UP

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a matter of great urgency for America's students and their families.

In just 3 months, if Congress does not act, millions of Americans will be thrown deeper into debt. That's because on July 1 the interest rates on need-based student loans will double, from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. This interest-rate hike will hit 7 million Americans who are already in financial need.