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

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

The Committee will rise informally.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS).

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY).

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

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

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

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012.

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

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

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

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

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

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION SUBMISSIONS

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

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

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

TITLE IV—EARMARK MORATORIUM

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

TITLE V—POLICY

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

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION SUBMISSIONS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

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

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 202. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS ON MANDATORY SAVINGS.

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

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

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

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

SEC. 302. EMERGENCY SPENDING.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

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

(2) CRITERIA.—

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

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

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

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

(iv) not permanent, temporary in nature.

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

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

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

(d) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.—As disposition of a point of order under subsection (b) or subsection (c), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the point of order. A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent of the point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

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

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

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

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

(B) total domestic employment;

(C) gross private domestic investment;

(D) general price index;

(E) interest rates; and

(F) other economic variables; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 306. BUDGET PROTECTION MANDATORY ACCOUNT.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(d) As used in this rule, the term—

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

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

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

SEC. 307. BUDGET DISCRETIONARY ACCOUNTS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE IV—EARMARK MORATORIUM

SEC. 401. EARMARK MORATORIUM.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE V—POLICY

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

It is the policy of this resolution that—

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

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

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

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

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1030

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

□ 1040

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1050

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you for this opportunity.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By cutting reimbursement rates, Medicaid will lose health providers.

Nursing home quality and staffing levels will inevitably decline.

Medicaid cuts will mean job losses in the health professions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

The RSC Budget Proposal:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1100

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

that money to the rich and to corporate special interests.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1110

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

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

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 77, noes 347, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

AYES—77

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

NOES—347

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

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

NOT VOTING—8

Garamendi
Giffords
Keating
Lowey
Meeks
Olver
Reichert
Sewell

□ 1135

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

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

ON THE RETIREMENT OF THE CHAPLAIN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1140

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

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

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

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

Thank you, Father Coughlin.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—119

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

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

NOES—136

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—172

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

NOT VOTING—5

Giffords
Keating
Meeks
Olver
Reichert

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1158

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

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

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012.

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

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

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

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

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

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

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

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

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

TITLE IV—POLICY

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

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Extension and expansion of child care assistance.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 302. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that appropriates $315,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration and provides an additional appropriation of up to $623,000,000, and that amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that appropriates $7,233,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to $1,257,000,000, to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(3) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that appropriates up to $581,000,000, and the amount is designated to the health care fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2012 that appropriates $10,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $60,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2012.

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

SEC. 303. COSTS OF OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND EMERGENCY NEEDS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 306. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

TITLE IV—POLICY

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 404. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICAID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

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

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

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

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

badly in need of reform and proposed to streamline the code, capturing some of the savings in the process, to achieve deficit reduction in a more balanced way.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This resolution's revenue policies achieve the same net savings as the revenue policies in the President's budget. It does not endorse any of the President's specific proposals unless expressly stated in this resolution.

(2) POLICY ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.—

(A) The President and this resolution extend the middle class tax cuts, provide long-term relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax for tens of millions of middle class American families, and provide estate tax relief at the 2009 levels.

(B) The President and this resolution apply President Clinton's top two tax rates to persons with adjusted gross incomes above $200,000 ($250,000 for married couples). The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform plan also assumes revenue from returning to those top two tax rates for top earners.

(C) The President and this resolution extend policies that support saving and capital formation.

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

(3) POLICY ON CORPORATE INCOME TAXES.—

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

(B) This resolution adopts those and other pro-growth corporate tax incentives in the President's budget, such as extending the research and development credit and clean energy incentives.

(C) This resolution therefore urges the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the full range of different corporate tax reform proposals to determine which one can most effectively optimize economic growth and provide for necessary revenues.

SEC. 409. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AGRICULTURE SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the current looming Federal deficit threatens our Nation's economic security and continued growth;

(2) the Committee on Agriculture reduced spending in programs under its jurisdiction when writing the 2008 farm bill;

(3) as directed by the 2008 Farm Bill, the Department of Agriculture realized an additional $6 billion in crop insurance savings by renegotiating the Standard Reinsurance Agreement;

(4) soaring crop prices and a booming farm sector make agriculture subsidies—particularly those originally designed to be temporary—difficult to defend in a time of fiscal constraint; and

(5) farm policy is vital to rural communities and protects food and energy security around the country.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that the Committee on Agriculture should reduce spending in farm programs that provide direct payments to producers even in robust markets and in times of bumper yields. The Committee should also find ways to focus assistance away from wealthy agribusinesses and toward struggling family farmers in a manner that protects jobs and economic growth while preserving the farm and nutrition safety net.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, our top priority in this Congress should be to support a robust economic recovery and put America back to work. That is what the Democratic plan does. It reduces the deficit in a steady, predictable way without slashing important investments in our kids' education and strategic national investments, without ending the Medicare guarantee, and without putting seniors, disabled individuals and kids at risk who rely on Medicare, and it reduces the deficit in a balanced way by $1.2 trillion more than the President's budget and achieves primary balance in the year 2018.

The Republican plan we've been discussing is a narrow vision of America—a place with no shared sacrifice, a place where those who have benefited the most from what our country has to offer give little in return.

The Democrats have a different vision for our country. We believe our strength springs not only from the undisputed benefits of a free people pursuing their ambitions and their dreams but also from sometimes harnessing those talents for important national purposes.

We believe America's greatness is rooted not only in a collection of individuals acting alone but from our capacity to work together for the common good. We believe that is a patriotic vision of America. We do not see the government as an enemy but as the imperfect instrument by which we can accomplish together as a people what no individual or single corporation can do alone.

Small business owners recognize that they must make certain investments to build a successful enterprise. Similarly, our Nation must make the strategic national investments necessary to keep our country strong in an increasingly global economic marketplace. Our plan does that.

We also believe we can do that while making cuts, and we make sensible, targeted cuts. But we do it in a smart way, not with a meat ax that threatens the fragile recovery.

We also agree with the fiscal commission that security spending should be part of this debate. Admiral Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has stated, and I quote, that the most significant threat to our national security is our national debt. There is growing bipartisan consensus that those security agencies must themselves be part of our effort to reduce our debt and strengthen our country.

Our approach is a balanced one. We take cuts in the discretionary and bring down that part of the budget to the lowest point as a percentage of the economy since the Eisenhower administration. We take cuts in other areas. We take cuts in mandatory programs, including agriculture subsidies.

But we make different choices than the Republican budget. We end the subsidies to Big Oil rather than keeping those as we cut education for our kids. We ask the folks at the very top to pay the same tax rate they paid during the Clinton administration rather than end the Medicare guarantee and slash funding for seniors in nursing homes and others who rely on that support.

We make very different choices in this budget, but we accomplish the goal in a fiscally responsible way.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First of all, I want to start off by commending Mr. VAN HOLLEN. It's not always that the minority offers an alternative budget. In fact, I know there are a lot of pressures not to do that. So I think Mr. VAN HOLLEN is to be commended, and his very capable staff, for actually proposing an alternative. That's important. It's important that we bring ideas to the table so we can have a real debate about ideas. I want to start with saying that.

Number two, we just have a different definition of ''fiscal responsibility,'' I suppose. This budget, relative to the mark, to the base budget we're talking about, increases spending by $4.5 trillion, raises taxes by $2 trillion, and it adds $2.4 trillion to the deficit compared to the base bill we're talking about here.

It does exceed the President's budget in debt reduction, in deficit reduction, and so the gentleman is to be commended for that, but I personally think the President's budget is a pretty low water mark. It exceeds it by raising taxes another $210 billion and also cutting defense by $614 billion above the cuts that are in the base, our budget, and in the President's budget.

Secretary Gates has warned us that such cuts would leave the military unable to meet its current missions. And using his words: ''Setting indiscriminate targets to scrimp on defense is math, not strategy.''

I think it's very important that we recognize our priorities. Number one, national defense is the primary responsibility of the Federal Government. When our war fighters tell us this doesn't allow them to have the tools to keep them safe, the equipment they

need to prosecute their jobs, I think that's not responsible.

When our economy is struggling to get out of a very deep recession, over $2 trillion in tax increases I just don't think is responsible.

□ 1210

On the alternative, I think what we are offering is responsible. Our budget does four basic things. It gets the economy growing. It keeps taxes where they are and prevents massive tax increases. It saves our Medicare and Medicaid programs. It fulfills the mission of health and retirement security for all Americans by guaranteeing that people who have retired and are about to retire keep what they have, what they have organized their lives around, and then reforms these programs so that they're solvent and sustainable for the next generation. Number three, it repairs our social safety net so that it works. And it, number four, pays off our debt. That's what we do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal commission said of the Republican plan it was an unbalanced approach. Our approach is a balanced approach. Secretary Gates' comments were directed to the fiscal commission's recommendations. Our proposals are in line with what the President outlined just the other day. I would point out that Governor Haley Barbour said, ''If we Republicans don't propose some savings of money on defense, we will have no credibility on anything else.'' Of course the Pentagon has never passed a GAO budget, and I think everybody who does budgets recognizes there is some savings to be found there.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished assistant leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank my friend from Maryland for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard from our Republican friends that they're transforming Medicare. They call it a move to premium support. They also say they're just fixing the flaws in Medicaid. They say they're being brave, and finally tackling entitlement reform. But earlier today, on one of the morning shows, I heard my friend from Texas, JEB HENSARLING, being finally candid about the Republicans' view of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. He called them cruel Ponzi schemes. So there we have it.

This isn't about being brave, or transformative, or making a few changes to save the economy. Republicans are pushing the same agenda they have always had, ending the safety net programs that they view as fraudulent. And the Republican budget does exactly that. It ends Medicare, results in a huge cost shift, and forces seniors to pay $6,000 per year out of pocket.

It block grants Medicaid, slashes nursing home aid, and would lead to 50 different benefit programs across the country. That takes us back to my childhood, when benefits in our country were determined by what State you may have been fortunate or unfortunate to have been born in.

But the greatest fraud being committed is that these drastic and unfair changes don't even bring the Republican budget to balance. In fact, the Republican budget adds $8 trillion to the deficit over the next decade. Then where is all that money going, one might ask. While Republicans are gutting Medicare and Medicaid with one hand, they're giving tax breaks to big oil companies and making tax cuts for the wealthy with the other hand. That's what I call a Ponzi scheme.

Now, if you're wealthy or a special interest group, this is surely a pathway to prosperity. But if you're in your golden years, it's the Road to Ruin. Democrats have a plan to reduce the deficit in a steady, responsible way as we build a foundation for shared prosperity and long-term economic growth. In fact, the Democratic budget achieves primary balance by fiscal year 2018, and cuts the deficit by $1.2 trillion more than the President's budget. I proudly support the Democratic alternative budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER).

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

We have heard from the minority party that their budget seeks to harness the American people. Why? They have already saddled the American people with record spending deficits and debt. Just say ''neigh.''

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words about Medicare if I can. First and foremost, I want to make it very clear that if you are 55 and over, there are no changes to you whatsoever. We hear a lot about Medicare as we know it. Unfortunately, Medicare as we know it is going bankrupt. If you are for the status quo with regard to Medicare, you're on the side of the elimination of Medicare as we know it.

Another point I want to make is, we hear a lot about cuts. These are Washington cuts. This is Washington cutspeak. Where I'm from, if you get $5 on a Monday and the next day you get $10, that's an increase, not a cut. Most Americans would be appalled to know, Mr. Chairman, that the increases we are seeing are being called cuts. And I'm going to explain it to my folks when I get back to Arkansas. Medicare has not one penny of cuts in this budget. It continues to grow.

With regard to the language about vouchers, there is no voucher here. We're trying to give the folks that are 55 and under health care like Members of Congress have. Have you ever, Mr. Chairman, heard anyone in Congress describe their own health care plan as a voucher? No. Of course you haven't. Because it's not. That word has been rolled out with the other tested words, ''privatization,'' all this other nonsense, for the purposes of politics. You don't want the American people, Mr. Chairman, to have the same health care that you have.

I support this budget because it will keep our promise to seniors, it will save Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and it will preserve this country for my kids.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge Republican Members to read their own budget. It does not give seniors the same deal as Members of Congress. Members of Congress have a fair share formula. Seniors do not under their bill. Seniors get an immediate cut to the prescription drug benefit to the extent that we closed the doughnut hole, and they don't. Let's get our facts straight.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I want to thank Chairman VAN HOLLEN and I want to thank Mr. RYAN for the conduct of this debate that's taking place. They are two exemplary examples of how debate and discussion should move forward and emanate here in the House of Representatives.

Harry Truman said, ''Every segment of our population, and every individual, has a right to expect from his government a fair deal.'' I rise in strong support of the fair deal that's being proposed by the Democratic side in this debate. I rise because it helps us out with jobs and the economy, and recognizes that we must deal with the deficit, but deal with it in a manner that makes sense.

In my hometown we go to a place called Augie & Ray's. In Augie & Ray's, they want to know, whose side are you on in this? When you take Medicare and end the program as we know it, and shift the burden of the deficit at a time when we need shared sacrifice to the elderly, it is just flatly unfair. The social contract that the governed, that the people have with their government is about shared sacrifice, but it's also about the guarantee.

□ 1220

This is not about charts and statistics and flow charts; it's about people at the end of the day who are impacted by the decisions that we make; not by some economist's theory, but about a guarantee from their government, a guarantee that if they pay in, at the end of the day they are going to receive the benefits they have worked so hard for all of their lives.

That guarantee shouldn't be two-tiered. That guarantee shouldn't cut off benefits immediately to some and postpone it for others. That's a guarantee we should be working to fix, not to end. That is the fundamental difference in what's going on here today.

My distinguished colleague, the leader, Mr. CLYBURN, said let's recognize what's going on here, the extreme differences that have existed in this party since Roosevelt became President. An end of Social Security, an end of Medicare, an end to Medicaid, that has been the goal of the other side.

I stand in strong support of the Democratic alternative.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished chief deputy whip, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My colleague from Connecticut talked about a guarantee. Well, there is one guarantee that is for sure, Mr. Chairman, and that is the guarantee that Medicare as we know it is a pipe dream into perpetuity. It's going broke. The guarantee that the Democratic House has brought us in the past is a guarantee that says 47 percent of our debt obligations are to foreigners.

We are guaranteed right now to borrow 40 cents on every dollar unless we do something about it. So what do we do about it? There are famous themes in literature that fast-forward into the future. You get a glimpse of the reality of the future, and then we always love it when the hero comes back and says, Oh, here's what's going on. There's a choice. Let's make a good choice and let's move forward.

Well, we don't need fiction today. What we need is the clear-eyed reality of what these numbers present to us, and they present to us a choice:

We can either choose to do nothing, and I would say that is choosing, or we can choose to do something. We can choose to do a historic plan that brings a brightness to the economy, that creates jobs and opportunity, that doesn't mortgage our children's future to China and ultimately puts the U.S. on a global competitive basis, the likes of which the world will have never seen.

This is a time of choosing. Let's move forward and choose the House Republican plan, which makes guarantees and makes promises that we can keep with.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a time of choosing. Our budget chooses to make investments in our kids rather than choosing to provide even bigger tax breaks to the very wealthy, and we choose to get rid of subsidies for oil companies instead of cutting nursing homes funding through Medicare for seniors and disabled individuals.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget cuts the President's 2012 request for international affairs by $20 billion. That's 39 percent of the amount in diplomacy and development outside of Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. While diplomacy and development account for only about 1 percent of the overall budget, under the Republican plan this tiny portion of the budget would absorb a wildly disproportionate share of the cuts.

Here's what it means on the ground: Taking AIDS patients off lifesaving medication, withholding bed nets from children in malaria zones, and standing idly by during humanitarian emergencies.

I know the chairman of the committee, I know he doesn't want to see those things happen, but the effect of his plan would make them happen.

The Democratic alternative takes a wise and responsible approach to reducing the deficit. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let's talk about Medicare for a moment. It's not as if we don't have a problem. We know Medicare is going broke in 9 years. We want to make sure that the people who have retired and who are 10 years away from retiring can bank on the promises that have been made for them.

But to keep that promise, we have to reform it and save it for the next generation. So that's why we have a plan that says for people 54 and below, you too will have a plan of guaranteed Medicare coverage from guaranteed Medicare plans that you get to choose from. Choice and competition works.

A prescription drug benefit, a bunch of plans that compete against each other for the seniors' business, came in 41 percent below cost projections. Why? Because it's not a government-run program. It's not a bunch of bureaucrats.

What is the President proposing? What are the Democrats proposing? Here's what they have proposed for current seniors. The President just gave us a glimpse of it 2 days ago. He wants to take this board of 15 people he appoints on this rationing board, and they make the decisions. They price-control Medicare. They ration Medicare, $480 billion, almost $10,000 per senior on current seniors.

We are saying, don't do this to seniors, get rid of the rationing board and don't delegate Medicare decision-making to 15 people appointed by the President with no congressional oversight. Let the 40 million seniors in Medicare be in charge of their Medicare program. More importantly, we save Medicare, prevent its bankruptcy.

What does the other side do? They sit by and watch the program go bankrupt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues that the reason Medicare was created in the first place was because the private insurance industry wouldn't cover seniors' affordable care. That's what they want to go back to.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic resolution.

Last week on the floor of the House, the Republican leader, ERIC CANTOR, asked a very important question. He asked, How did we get here? So I took the challenge. I went back and have carefully chronicled a series of vote steps and quotes from Newt Gingrich, Dick Armey, John Kasich and others who argued against the Clinton plan for balancing the budget.

Remember when Clinton left office, the clock in Times Square had been turned off. Alan Greenspan said, you're paying down the debt too quickly.

We've had five balanced budgets since 1969; four of them came with Bill Clinton. The prescription that was offered on January 20 of the Bush inauguration was massive tax cuts and the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan.

And our Republican friends ask, How did we get here?

I am very optimistic about engaging in this conversation now and as we get to the debt ceiling. When Clinton walked out on January 19, 2001, 22 million jobs had been created. Economic growth averaged 4 percent per quarter. It was the greatest period of economic prosperity in the history of America. And our friends on the other side of the aisle want to turn the clock back on that reality.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. I do appreciate the conversation about the balanced budgets in the past.

Yes, Bill Clinton was the President there. He did sign that budget. But as this House knows, above any other place, this House is very aware that budgets originate in the House of Representatives. So Republicans were leading the House of Representatives pulling that budget together.

We are proposing a similar thing again, that a Republican House can propose a budget, send it to a Democrat President, and we work together to start balancing the budget again.

So that formula that we just discussed, I believe, is a very good formula. We should initiate that again and say, once again, a Republican House, do a great budget, send it over to a Democrat President, and be able to work their way through it.

I would disagree with the cuts in defense. I think it is a very common statement that we can look and say there are issues with defense systems. There are issues with our acquisition process in defense.

□ 1230

Where I would disagree is we should then take our defense and where we find savings, then move it over to deficit reductions. I represent an area around Tinker Air Force Base in Midwest City. It is a great base that is strategic to us. Those planes that fly out of there are 50-plus years old. There are some airmen that are flying with the same tail number that their grandfather flew 50 years ago. This is a

moment when we should not be robbing from defense and saying we are going to use that for deficit reduction that we need to be reinvesting.

Robert Gates, our Secretary of Defense, has said there's $178 billion that he can find, and $78 billion of that savings is applied to deficit reduction in the Republican plan, and $100 billion of it is reinvested back into the Defense Department. There are good ways to do this that leave America safe and that make strategic sense. We think we should do those things.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 1¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. MULVANEY.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start by thanking my own chairman, Mr. RYAN, and also the ranking member, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for the entire process. It has been my first year. I have enjoyed it. We've had some spirited debates. I know that we have disagreed more than we agree, but I have appreciated the opportunity to do this.

I'll close with this. This will be the last opportunity I'll have to speak on this year's budget. We've heard a lot about the benefits that accrued to this Nation during the Clinton administration. I for one am willing to give partial credit to the President at that time. It was a Democrat President. Yes, it was. It was a House of Representatives controlled by my party. And I think it was a formula that worked for the Nation.

We've heard a lot of things, though, about the importance of raising the tax rates back to the Clinton era in order to solve our problems. I would suggest to you it was not the tax rates during the Clinton era that drove our prosperity at the time.

Let me show you what President Clinton did to the size of the government workforce. President Clinton was elected right about here. There was a dramatic reduction in the size of the Federal workforce, a dramatic reduction in the size of Federal spending on people who work for the Federal Government. In fact, unprecedented in the last 30 years, done again under a Democrat President and a Republican House.

What happened as a result? As spending as a percentage of our economy went down, the unemployment rate went down. As the government spent less, more people went back to work. As we sit here, we all agree that the discussion is really about jobs. There's nothing more telling than what happened during the Clinton administration as a formula for how to create jobs—the government needs to spend less.

My question to my esteemed colleagues on this side of the aisle is, where is this type of leadership out of the White House these days? Where is this generation's Bill Clinton saying let's spend less on government spending so that people go back to work? If we put President Obama's proposals, his current budget, up here, it would be almost the exact opposite of what your party proposed only 20 years ago. Where is that type of leadership out of the White House?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Democrat substitute amendment. Let me just quickly here sum up. The Democrats' prescription, if you will, for our Nation's fiscal troubles basically includes what? More spending, more debt and more taxes, more taxes on hardworking families and small businesses. And so while the Democrat budget has lower deficits than, well, the President's budget, you really need to take a closer look at how they achieve this and how they achieve the deficit reduction compared to the White House's budget.

Let's take a look at it. First, well, they raise taxes again. How much? By $208 billion more than the President's budget on all Americans. Then what do they do next? They cut the defense budget. By how much? By $614 billion again relative to the President's budget over the 10-year window. Now, at the same time, you already had Secretary Gates who has said that we need to cut the Defense budget by $78 billion. They want to cut Defense by $614 billion on top of that.

What about in addition to that? Well, in their budget, if you go into it and look, there's about $400 billion in unspecified savings. Unspecified? Here at the 12th hour they still can't decide how they want to try to rein in spending? Of course not, because they really honestly don't want to do so.

I believe that budgets must be credible, and the Democrats' budget doesn't pass that test at all. The only specific savings in the budget come from how? Raising taxes again on Americans and cutting the defense budget. The Democrat budget does not tackle even the drivers behind our deficits. What are they? It does not address the pending bankruptcy—yes, bankruptcy—of Medicare and Medicaid. The Democrat budget is nothing more than punting, which is exactly what the administration and the White House have been doing as well.

Now, look, the American people want Congress to do the right thing. The American people want us to get spending, want us to get deficits, and they want us to get our debt here in Washington under control, just as American families have to get their spending, deficit and debt under control, just as small businesses across this country have to get it under control. The Democrats' budget is frankly an embarrassment and shows that the other side is not serious about taking our fiscal challenges seriously.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself 45 seconds.

What we heard just doesn't fit the facts. In fact, our budget does make cuts to domestic programs, but we do not do it in a meat ax way. We make cuts to agriculture subsidies. We do tax reform as the commission recommended, getting rid of a lot of clutter in the Tax Code for special interests. That is what we do.

With respect to defense, our numbers track what the President was saying the other day, but we do get rid of a so-called overseas contingency fund which we think our Republican friends would like to join us on which gives the executive branch a blank check to undertake any military operations whatsoever for the next 10 years and doesn't have to ask Congress. That's what we do.

What we don't do? We don't end the Medicare guarantee. What we don't do is we don't keep giving subsidies to oil companies while we cut education for kids. That's what we don't do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the very distinguished Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend him and the members of the Budget Committee for their hard work to bring legislation to the floor to enable us to have this debate yesterday and today and I think for a long time to come.

We have said it over and over again: A Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. It should reflect what is important to us as we allocate the resources of investments for the future. Much has been said about this deficit, and I want to join the distinguished ranking member before I go any further in correcting the record.

I listened with great interest as Members on the other side are taking credit for the Clinton administration balanced, or budgets in surplus. And I remind them or tell them, because many of them may not know, that those budgets were a result of the 1993 budget vote that we took on this floor of the House without one Republican vote which was the source of that fiscal discipline and job creation, again, as other speakers have said, over 20 million jobs created.

So when I hear the Republicans say it was the Clinton Presidency and the Republican Congress, no, it was the Democratic Congress, because we know that deficit reduction is essential. We had to stop the budget deficits that President Clinton inherited, and now

we have to stop the budget deficits that President Obama inherited.

Budget deficits, I've heard our colleagues say, are immoral. I quite agree. We have a responsibility and an obligation to our children and our grandchildren not to send them any bills, personal or official. And we do not intend to do so. But they were immoral during the Bush years, too, when they were giving tax cuts to the rich, two unpaid-for wars and a prescription drug benefit that gave away the store to the private sector and sent the bill to the taxpayer.

So here we are with a choice on the floor. Some of it was spoken; a vision of it was shared with the Nation by President Obama the other day. He talked about an America of greatness that cared about its people. He talked about the essential need for us to reduce the deficit. He talked about growth, investments, and job creation.

□ 1240

He talked about being fair to our seniors and keeping our promise to them. In the budgets that we have before us today, one presented by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, one presented by the Republicans, we see a sharp contrast, one that supports the vision that the President puts forth, and one that definitely does not.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the budget deficit; but we also in doing so, if we are going to do right by the American people, have to recognize that there are other deficits. We have a deficit in education. We have a deficit in innovation because innovation begins in the classroom. We have a deficit in investments in our infrastructure. All of these investments have a payoff back to us. They create growth. They bring revenue to the Treasury, and they help reduce the deficit.

It is a false economy to think that we can write a budget that cuts serious investments in education, infrastructure, innovation and the rest and think that we are going to end the deficit. You cannot cut your way out of it. You cut, you grow, and you increase revenue. That's a subject I will hold for when we talk about the Republican budget more specifically.

What is important to note, if you had one thing to know about the difference between the Democrats and the Republicans in terms of these budgets, if you had just one thing, it would be on the subject of Medicare. The Republican budget breaks the promise that this country has made to seniors that after a lifetime of work, they will be able to depend on Medicare to protect them in retirement. But the plan here ends Medicare as we know it and dramatically reduces benefits for seniors. It forces seniors to buy their insurance from the health insurance companies where the average senior would be forced to pay twice as much for half the benefit—as much for some as $20,000 a year.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to this chart, ''Senior Citizens Health Cost Skyrockets Under Republican Budget.'' Blue is the government share, red is the beneficiary share. Health care spending for a typical 65-year-old in 2022 dollars, the Republican budget would have $8,000 from the Federal Government, $12,500 from the individual, which is more than twice what the Medicare cost should be to a senior, $6,150; twice as much for less in benefit.

Now, this chart is not our chart. This information was conveyed to the Republican chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, in a letter to him describing what the cost would be to seniors under his plan. I just don't think that is fair to our seniors. This plan has the wrong priorities. It is focused on helping corporate special interests and Wall Street, not reducing the deficit or helping the country.

It raises taxes for the middle class while cutting them for the wealthiest in our country. It repeals Wall Street reforms for the big banks. It abolishes Medicare as we know it, cuts funding for education, health care, alternative energy and job training programs, and uses the money not for reducing the deficit but to help the most privileged, help the most privileged and negate what we did in our health care bill, which was to start to close the doughnut hole.

If you are a senior and you see that your prescription drug costs will come down under the health care bill and the doughnut hole will close, this budget reverses that.

There are so many reasons for seniors and people with disabilities and people who care about Medicare to be concerned. Medicare is a bedrock of stability for our seniors, for their health, for their economic security, and for those with disabilities who depend on it. We must make sure that it is solvent, but we must not charge seniors more while giving bigger tax cuts to the wealthy.

Just remember these three points. First of all, it abolishes Medicare as we know it, increasing costs to seniors, while it gives tax breaks of tens of billions of dollars to Big Oil.

Changes in Medicaid will send seniors out of nursing homes while we give tax breaks to companies that send jobs overseas. This Ryan budget, the Republican budget, will hurt education, cut the education of our children, increase the cost of higher education for young adults, 10 million young adults, while we give tax cuts to the wealthiest. That's just not the American way.

The President said in his remarks that we are about shared responsibility and shared sacrifice. We are about a sense of community in our country. And so as we want to reduce the deficit, the fiscal deficit, and we must, and we have proven, Democrats have proven that we can, this proposal does not.

But what Mr. VAN HOLLEN is proposing in the positive sense is recognizing that we need to reduce the deficit, growth is a part of that and so we have investments in education and the innovation that springs from that, and other initiatives that grow our economy, that strengthen the middle class, that creates jobs as it reduces the deficit.

I urge our colleagues to vote ''yes'' on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget and ''no'' on the Ryan budget to strengthen the middle class.

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

First, let me start off by saying that the only way the word ''oil'' is mentioned in this budget—it is not in the Tax Code—it is that we want to drill for more of it in this country so we can lower gas prices and get ourselves off foreign oil.

Let me address Medicare briefly. I have here the Federal Employee Benefit Handbook that everybody in Congress, every Federal employee has. Nowhere in this book does it say voucher. Look at all of these plans we get to choose from: Kaiser, Aetna, Humana, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, Coventry, pages and pages of choices and options. This is what we're talking about for people 54 and below.

Guess what, the biggest threat to Medicare is the status quo. Medicare goes bankrupt in 9 years. And so, is this exactly like the Federal employee health plan? No, it is not. It is the same kind of plan because what we say is in the future, people who are wealthy don't need as much of a subsidy. People who are sick need more, people who are low-income need more, and they get complete out-of-pocket coverage. More for the sick, more for the poor, less for the wealthy, and a solvent Medicare system.

But more importantly, the people choose. Medicare beneficiaries choose. What's the President's plan? What's the Democrats' plan? Appoint 15 people to do the choosing. It is a different philosophy. Should we have 15 unelected bureaucrats run Medicare, ration Medicare, or should we allow 40 million to 50 million seniors make the decision?

Let's talk about taxes. Look at all of these budgets we've been looking at today. By the way, our budget doesn't even cut taxes. I wish I could say it does. Revenues still rise, about $12 trillion under this budget. We just don't want to go up and up and up.

The budget we have here is a $2 trillion tax increase; the plan we had before, the Progressive plan, a $16 trillion tax increase; the Congressional Black Caucus budget, a $6 trillion tax increase.

This budget cuts defense $619 billion; the Progressive budget, $1.2 trillion; the CBC budget cuts defense $469 billion.

The CBC budget increases spending on domestic spending $4.1 trillion. The Progressive Caucus increases domestic

spending $11.4 trillion. The Democratic budget increases, relative to the mark, $4.6 trillion.

So we've got it. We know where they are. More spending. More spending on everything, but cut and gut defense, and raise taxes a lot.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Democratic alternative budget for FY 2012. With this budget, Congressman VAN HOLLEN has offered a responsible alternative to the dangerous Republican approach.

The Democratic alternative offers a dramatically different vision of America's future. It takes on our deficits, but not in a reckless way. It does so responsibly, so that we can continue investing in our economy and our people. It took us years to get into this fiscal challenge, and economists agree that it would be disastrous to try to get out of it overnight. But that is exactly what Republicans want to do. Democrats believe in a balanced approach that keeps our economy growing while getting us back to living within our means.

The Democratic alternative also allows us to keep the promise of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid to our seniors, the disabled, and the poor. What our country needs is to get on a more responsible fiscal path. But we cannot afford to remake the social contract in a way that harms the least advantaged in our society. Democrats want to strengthen these programs—not destroy them.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget is a responsible alternative to a Republican plan that would fundamentally alter the kind of society that we live in. Democrats reject the false choice between fiscal responsibility and our values. We are offering an opportunity to get serious about our deficits without turning our backs on those who can least afford it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Democratic budget.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 259, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—166

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

NOES—259

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

NOT VOTING—7

Aderholt
Bishop (UT)
Giffords
King (IA)
Meeks
Olver
Reichert

□ 1312

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

Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BALDWIN, Messrs. POLIS, COSTELLO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 276, I was detained by two (2) elevators which were in use by non-Members during votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by first thanking the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, and the entire Budget staff. I would also like to thank the Democrat members on the Budget Committee as well.

What we are taking up today is the point of where this country goes. Because this debate has gone on for quite some time, there is probably not one person in America that has not watched the news and watched the clock of our debt of $14 trillion.

I want you all to imagine for one moment, just imagine for one moment, what the future of this country would hold in the dreams if that clock was zero. What could we invest in? What could we build? And what would our

children become? But because that clock does not say zero and that clock continues to climb in the wrong direction, that's why we are here today. But it is a good day because today is the day that we turn that clock back around.

We have a plan and a Path to Prosperity that will create jobs—even those on the outside that looked at it said there will be more than 1 million jobs, a plan that will make us energy independent, but also a plan that does something the rest of America has to do as well: tighten our belts.

So today, when we come and have to put our card in the voting slot, I want you to think of one thing: Today could be the day that we create the great America comeback, or it could be the day that America goes into the long fade into history. The floor is made up of a microcosm of America, and all of America knows that we have to control the situation we are in.

So today, a ''yes'' vote is for jobs, for energy independence, and a new Path to Prosperity.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we are turning back the clock. We're turning back the clock on progress and we're turning back the clock—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, what the Republican budget does is turn back the clock on a fair deal for the American people.

Every person in this body today loves this great Nation of ours and believes it's a special place. We have to maintain the dynamism and exceptionalism of this country. We see different paths and make different choices to accomplish that goal.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois will state his point of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my question is about the clarification of the rules. The rules also, for our visiting guests, allow the Sergeant at Arms to clear the Chamber, if necessary. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. It is within the authority of the Chair to clear the gallery.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the Chairman.

I would just encourage those to continue the civil conversation that we are having about a very difficult conversation in our country.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, if I——

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order, and would affirm to all Members that the Chair has the authority to clear the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we all agree we have to act now to put in place a plan to reduce our deficit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

□ 1320

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to begin my remarks from the beginning and reset the clock.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues.

As I said, nobody doubts that every person in this Chamber loves this country and wants to do the right thing.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery, which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant-at-Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I'm tempted to reserve my time and yield it back to the other——

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery which is in contravention of the laws and rules of the House. The Sergeant-at-Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The Chair makes this announcement for purposes of possible prosecution.

The gentleman from Maryland may proceed.

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

As I said, I was tempted to reserve my time and allow my colleague to proceed. But as I understand the Chamber is now quiet, let me begin where I left off and say that all of us agree, everybody in this Chamber agrees, we need to put in place a plan to reduce our deficit in a predictable, steady manner. The question throughout this debate has been not whether, but how we do that. And as the bipartisan fiscal commission has indicated, any responsible effort requires a balanced approach.

And the Republican plan simply fails on that score. And that's what the cochairs of the bipartisan fiscal commission said. They said it, ''falls short of the balanced, comprehensive approach needed for a responsible plan.'' And when you peel off the layers, what you find is the Republican plan is not bold. It's just the same old, tired formula we've seen before of providing big tax breaks to the very wealthy and powerful special interests at the expense of the rest of America—except this time it's dressed up with a lot of sweet-sounding talk of reform. But at the end, it's the same old ideological agenda—except this time on steroids.

To govern is to choose. Each of us is sent here to make difficult choices, and the choices that are made in the Republican plan we believe are wrong for America.

We do not believe it's courageous to protect tax giveaways to big oil companies and other special interests when we're slashing investments in our kids' education, scientific research, and critical investments in the future.

We don't think it's bold to provide another tax break to millionaires while ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors and sticking seniors with the bill for ever-rising health care costs.

We do not believe it's visionary to award corporations that ship American jobs rather than American products overseas while we're terminating affordable health care for tens of millions of Americans right here at home.

And we don't think it's brave to give Governors a blank check of Federal taxpayer dollars and then a license to cut support for seniors in nursing homes, individuals with disabilities, and poor kids.

And we don't think it's fair to raise taxes on middle-income Americans to pay for additional tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

□ 1330

Yet those are the choices that are made in the Republican budget. Where is the shared sacrifice? We have American men and women putting their lives on the line in Iraq, in Afghanistan, while others hide their income in the Cayman Islands and Switzerland and refuse to pay their fair share to support our national efforts. And that is why the bipartisan commission, among other reasons, said that the Republican plan is just not balanced. It's not.

Let's say ''no'' to the Republican plan. Let's say ''yes'' to finding a balanced way to reduce our deficits in a way that protects the values and priorities of the American people and in a way that gets our economy moving and America back to work.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, earlier this week, USA Today reported that we have the fewest participants in our workforce than at any time in 30 years. And my Democratic colleagues announced their plan to increase taxes $1.5 trillion on our economy, much of it on our small businesses.

The Congressional Budget Office has announced that Medicare is going broke in 2020. And my Democratic colleagues announced their plan to double down on the rationing of health care for our seniors.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Budget Office has announced that Social Security will go broke in 2037. And my Democratic colleagues have announced this is not a problem. We're ready to implement the 22 percent benefit cut that's already in our statute.

Survey after survey shows that our fellow citizens believe that their children will be worse off than they are, and yet my Democrat colleagues announced their plan to add $9.1 trillion to the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to quit spending money we don't have. It's time to quit borrowing 42 cents on the dollar, much of it from the Chinese, and then send the bill to our children and grandchildren.

The Republican budget will help us create jobs with fundamental tax reform in preventing these tax increases. It will save our social safety net programs. Programs that have been of a great comfort to my parents and grandparents before our eyes are morphing into cruel Ponzi schemes for my third-grade daughter and my first-grade son. And, Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget will put us on the path to pay off the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, I heard from one of my constituents recently. He said, I never felt so embarrassed and ashamed of anything I have done in my life as I do about leaving this mess in the laps of Tyler and Caitlyn, my precious grandkids. I have written them both a heartfelt apology for them to read when they get old enough to understand what I allowed our country's governing authority to do to them.

Mr. Chairman, I have got a message for Mr. Calhoun. Put that letter away. House Republicans are going to stand for Tyler and Caitlyn. We're going to put America back to work. We're going to save the social safety net and preserve the American Dream for ourselves and our posterity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it's hard to see how someone would define saving the social safety net by ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors, by slashing Medicaid by over $750 billion, a program that disproportionately helps seniors in nursing homes and disabled individuals. It's really hard to understand how that is preserving the social safety net. It reminds me of that strange statement we once heard that you have to destroy the village in order to save it.

Now, let's understand what happens under this budget to Medicare. This budget ends the Medicare guarantee for seniors. It doesn't reform Medicare; it deforms and dismantles it because it forces seniors off the Medicare program, into the private insurance market.

And it does nothing, as it dumps the seniors into the private insurance market, to control the rate of increase in health care costs. Instead, it transfers to the senior all those risks and all those costs. Seniors will pay a lot more, while the insurance companies will get all their Medicare payroll taxes. They'll get a bonanza out of this thing, but seniors will be left holding the bag.

If your voucher amount, call it whatever you want, is not sufficient to pay for the increased cost, you eat it. And we saw earlier the fact that by the year 2022 seniors will have to pay more than $6,000 above what they would have had to pay under the regular Medicare program. If your doctor's not on a private plan that you can afford, tough luck. This is rationing health care by income, nothing more.

And I want to say something just to clear the record one more time. We keep hearing that they're offering seniors exactly what Members of Congress get. It simply is not true. What Members of Congress get is what's called a fair share deal. I encourage my colleagues on all sides of the aisle just to look at the Federal Employees Benefit Plan. And you look in the Office of Personnel and it says: ''This formula is known as the fair share formula because it will maintain a consistent level of government contributions as a percentage of program costs regardless of what plan the enrollees elect.'' And it says that the government contribution equals the lesser of 72 percent of the amounts OPM determines are program-wide, or 75 percent.

The point is Members of Congress get a fair share formula. The Republican budget does not give a fair share formula to seniors on Medicare. It just doesn't. In fact, the way it saves money is to give them an unfair deal. It unconnects the support we give to seniors from rising health care costs. That's why seniors will end up paying so much more and more and more, because you make the savings—health care costs are going up like this, and the support, if you want to call it support, it's really not coming from the Medicare program or the Federal Government, is going like this. That's why the seniors are having to eat those additional costs. That is what the Republican budget does. At the same time they do provide additional tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

If you want to get rid of some of the junk in the Tax Code, you can support the Democratic plan, because we got rid of subsidies for the oil companies. We got rid of those perverse tax incentives to reward corporations that are shipping American jobs instead of American products overseas.

So if you want to start with tax reform, vote for the Democratic plan. Those are the choices we made, not ending the Medicare guarantee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) for his outstanding leadership and all the hard work he has shown in leading this effort to put together a budget for this House. I also want to commend the hard work of his members in the committee for bringing this forward.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government is broke. We borrow nearly 40 cents of every dollar we spend. Our debt is more than $14 trillion and is averaging yearly trillion-dollar deficits. We simply cannot afford to keep spending money we don't have, and we must bring down the debt.

Now, for years this House, including legislators on both sides of the aisle, has kicked the can down the road. Americans were led to believe that we could spend hundreds of billions of dollars that we don't have and that there would be no consequences. And when it came to fostering an environment where American business could compete in a global economy, we became complacent. This must stop.

□ 1340

It's time to be honest with the American people.

Mr. Chairman, we stand at a crossroads. Before us lie two divergent paths: one defined by crushing debt, slow growth and diminished opportunity; and one defined by achievement, innovation and American leadership.

By demonstrating courage and directly confronting our challenge at this critical moment, we can fulfill the promise of America and pass on to our children a Nation that offers everyone a fair shot at earning their success.

The House Republican budget is an honest, fact-based proposal that details our vision for managing down our debt and growing our way back to prosperity.

First, we will stop spending money that we don't have. This budget cuts non-security discretionary spending to below 2008 levels and freezes it for 5 years. Overall, we reach $6.2 trillion in savings against the President's budget.

Second, we will lead where the President has failed by finally addressing our insolvent entitlement programs. We know that these programs are the biggest drivers of our debt, and the Congressional Budget Office acknowledges that if we don't take action, these important safety net programs will go broke.

We cannot afford to ignore this oncoming fiscal train wreck any longer. While it may be seen by some as politically risky, we Republicans are willing to lead, because, to be frank, complacency is not an option.

To be clear, our plan will not touch benefits for today's seniors and those nearing retirement. For those of us 54 and below, it calls for reforms that will restructure Medicare and Medicaid to ensure that these safety nets will still be there for those who need it, not for those who don't.

Unlike the lofty outline the President gave in his speech this week, our budget is not a political document. We do not dream up imaginary savings and dodge specifics in an effort to lull people into the belief that they can actually get things for nothing. Our budget is a concrete plan for getting our fiscal house in order, and we do not resort to tax increases on the very small businesses and job creators we need to put America back to work.

Bringing down the debt sends a message to American families. It sends a message to businessmen and -women, to entrepreneurs and to investors. It gives them the confidence that they won't face a future plagued by inflation, higher taxes and higher interest rates.

We understand that cutting spending alone is not enough. That's why our budget calls for pro-growth policies to get our economy growing and get people back to work.

Families and small business people are struggling, and today, Tax Day, millions of them will send their hard-earned money to Uncle Sam. The last thing we should be asking them to do is to send yet again more. Instead, our budget calls for a more competitive tax system that will encourage the economy to grow, create jobs and spur investment in the private sector.

We call for the end of crony capitalism that allows privileged industries to gain competitive advantage in our Tax Code, and we call for a more simple system that lowers rates for all but makes sure everyone pays their fair share.

Mr. Chairman, with this budget, House Republicans are changing the culture in Washington from one of spending to one of savings.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, America will see that it can get its fiscal house in order after years of mismanagement. We are finally doing what families and small business people have been doing for years: tightening the belt and learning how to do more with less.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman RYAN and his committee for their outstanding leadership.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, the American people understand that we can't continue to spend money that we don't have. Our national debt has now surpassed $14.2 trillion, and it's on a track to eclipse the entire size of our economy.

This massive debt that we are incurring hurts private sector job creation, eroding confidence, spreading uncertainty amongst employers big and small, and discouraging private investment in our economy that is sorely needed in order for us to create jobs.

This debt is also a moral threat to our country. In my opinion, it is immoral to rob our children's and grandchildren's future and leave them beholden to countries around the world who buy our debt. We have a moral obligation to speak the truth and to do something about it.

Yesterday, we took the first step in beginning to address this massive debt by passing legislation that will reduce our deficit by $315 billion over the next 10 years. It was an imperfect bill, but it was a positive step that has cleared the decks and allowed us to focus on cutting trillions of dollars, not just billions.

Chairman RYAN and the members of the Budget Committee have done an excellent job of putting together a budget that's worthy of the American people. This budget will help job creation today, lift the crushing burden of debt that threatens our children's future, and preserve and protect programs like Medicare and Medicaid. Most importantly, the budget shows families and small businesses that we're serious about dealing with America's spending illness so we can put our country on a path to prosperity.

The Ryan budget sets the bar for the debate going forward. President Obama had an opportunity to match it. Unfortunately, he gave a partisan speech about the need for more spending, more taxing, and more borrowing. He said he wants to target our debt problem through a so-called ''debt fail-safe,'' but exempts the major entitlement programs that account for most of the long-term debt problems. And he proposed yet another commission, though he ignored the recommendations of this last one.

Instead of offering serious solutions, the President asked Congress to raise the debt limit without addressing Washington's spending problem. The President wants a clean bill, and the American people will not tolerate it.

Now, let me be clear: There will be no debt limit increase unless it's accompanied by serious spending cuts and real budget reforms.

We delivered this message on Wednesday morning to the President. We cannot continue to borrow recklessly and dig ourselves a deeper hole and mortgage the future of our children and grandchildren. The American people are looking for leadership to address this debt crisis. Unfortunately, the President has failed to put a serious proposal on the table. If the President won't lead, we will.

□ 1350

No more kicking the can down the road. No more whistling past the graveyard. Now is the time to address the serious challenges that face the American people. And we will.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that even if we adopt the Republican budget, we're going to have to lift the debt ceiling for years and years to come. So let's not play Russian roulette with the economy and the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

Now, on the question of jobs—the question of jobs—during the Clinton administration, we asked the very wealthiest for a little bit more sacrifice than they have today. And do you know what happened to jobs? Twenty million jobs were created during the Clinton administration. Under the current tax rates, after 8 years of George Bush, the private sector lost 630,000 jobs.

So you see the pattern here. During the Clinton administration, economic growth was booming, and 20 million jobs were created. During the 8 years of the Bush administration, there was a net loss of 653,000 jobs. We need to continue to invest in this country and make sure that the entrepreneurs of this country can continue to thrive. We need to do this in a balanced way.

I would point out that the folks who said that this Republican plan we are debating would increase jobs are the same people who predicted that the Bush tax cuts would create jobs. That's the blue line. That's the prediction of the Heritage Foundation about what

would happen. The red is the reality. If we want to create jobs and reduce the deficit, we need to do it in a balanced way. That's what the fiscal commission said. That's what the Democratic plan does.

We urge everyone, respectfully, to vote ''no'' on the Republican plan. It's the wrong choice for America.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for bringing a budget proposal to the floor today that is a statement of our national values and about what we care about: investing in our children, honoring our seniors, creating jobs, growing the economy and strengthening the middle class. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for your great leadership in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, today we will be taking a vote that is very, very important for the health and security of American seniors. A great deal is at stake. I'm just going to focus on one part of this Republican budget. I want to say to my Republican colleagues, Do you realize that your leadership is asking you to cast a vote today to abolish Medicare as we know it? Because that is the vote that we have. This is not about an issue; this is about a value. This is about an ethic. Medicare is a core value of our social compact with the American people. Yet this budget shreds that contract which is part of the strength of our country. The Republican proposal breaks the promise that our country has made to our seniors that after a lifetime of work, they will be able to depend on Medicare to protect them in retirement.

This plan, the Republican plan, ends Medicare as we know it and dramatically reduces benefits for seniors. It forces them to pay more to buy their insurance from health insurance companies, where the average senior will be forced to pay twice as much for half the benefit. I want to repeat that: the Republican plan forces seniors to buy their insurance from health insurance companies where the average senior will be forced to pay twice as much for half the benefits, as much as $20,000 per year more for some seniors.

This plan has the wrong priority for our seniors and for all Americans. Just remember these three things about the Republican budget: It ends Medicare as we know it as it gives big tax breaks and subsidies—tens of billions of dollars—to Big Oil. This budget reduces Medicaid for our seniors in nursing homes, sending them away from nursing homes, while it gives tax breaks to companies that send jobs overseas. This budget hurts our children's education. In fact, it increases the cost of higher education for nearly 10 million of our young adults, while it gives tax breaks to America's wealthiest families. That's just not fair. It is just not the American way.

Here we are. Yesterday, we observed the 100th day of the Republican majority in Congress. In those 100 days, not one job has been created. Not one job agenda is in the works. And what are we doing? We are here to abolish Medicare instead.

I have heard our colleagues say that the budget deficit is immoral. It's been immoral for the 8 years of the Bush administration, and I didn't hear anybody say ''boo'' while we were giving tax cuts to the rich, having two wars unpaid for, and giving prescription drug bills to the private sector.

Democrats are committed to reducing the deficit. We have demonstrated that we can during the Clinton administration, and we will. We are committed to strengthening the middle class, to growing our economy as we reduce the deficit, and to creating jobs. The Republican budget fails to do that, and the Republican budget will not have Democratic support.

We are here, and as one of the previous speakers said, now is the time. Now is the time to preserve Medicare. And Democrats will. I urge a ''no'' vote on the Republican plan.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself the remainder of my time.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our staffs, the Democratic staff and the Republican staff, for all of their hard work in getting us to this moment.

I want to ask my colleagues a question. I want to ask the American people a question. I remember one of the worst moments I had in Congress was the financial crisis of 2008. It seems like it was yesterday. We had the Treasury Secretary and we had the Federal Reserve chairman coming here talking about crisis and talking about bank collapses. And what came out of that was really ugly legislation that we passed on a bipartisan basis but no one enjoyed. That crisis caught us by surprise. It was unpredictable. We didn't see it coming.

Let me ask you this. What if your President and your Member of Congress saw it coming? What if they knew why it was happening, when it was going to happen, and more importantly, they knew what to do to stop it and they had time to stop it, but they didn't? Because of politics? What would you think of that person?

Mr. Chairman, that is where we are right now.

This is the most predictable economic crisis we've ever had in the history of this country. Yet we have a President who is unwilling to lead. We have too many politicians worried about the next election and not worried about the next generation. Every politician in this town knows we have a debt crisis. They know that we are in danger.

We cannot avoid this choice. To govern is to choose. We are making a choice even if we don't act. And that's the wrong choice. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. Will we be remembered as the Congress that did nothing as the Nation sped toward a preventable debt crisis and irreversible decline? Or will we instead be remembered as a Congress that did the hard work of preventing that crisis, the one that chose this Path to Prosperity? This Path to Prosperity charts a different course. It gets us off this wrong track.

It achieves four objectives:

Number one, grow the economy and get people back to work.

Number two, fulfill the mission of health and retirement security. We don't want to ration Medicare. We don't want to see Medicare go bankrupt. We want to save Medicare.

Number three, repair the social safety net. Get it ready for the 21st century. We don't want a welfare system that encourages people to stay on welfare. We want them to get back on their feet and into flourishing, self-sufficient lives. So let's reform welfare for people who need it, and let's end corporate welfare for people who don't need it.

□ 1400

Number four, let's do the work of lifting this crushing burden of debt from our children.

This is what we achieve. We have a choice of two futures, but we have to make the right choice. We must not leave this Nation in decline. We must not be the first generation of this country to leave the next generation worse off. Decline is antithetical to the American idea. America is a Nation conceived in liberty, dedicated to equality and defined by limitless opportunity. Equal opportunity, upward mobility, prosperity; this is what America is all about.

In all the chapters of human history, there has never been anything quite like America. This budget keeps America exceptional. It preserves its promise for the next generation. Colleagues, this is our defining moment. We must choose this Path to Prosperity.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) having assumed the chair, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013

through 2021, and, pursuant to House Resolution 223, reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 193, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—235

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

NAYS—193

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

NOT VOTING—4

Giffords
Meeks
Olver
Reichert

□ 1423

Mr. LAMBORN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION OF MEMBERS OF STAFF

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to thank all of our hardworking staff in our office and on the House Budget Committee, who put in long hours, dedicated years of expertise to making this budget possible, to making this budget passable—to making this moment happen.

I want to thank Budjon Burks, Eric Davis, Vanessa Day, Marsha Douglas, Tim Flynn, Nicole Foltz, Jose Guillen, Jim Herz, Matt Hoffmann, Charlotte Ivancic, Pat Knudsen, Jane Lee, Dick Magee, Ted McCann, Andy Morton, Courtney Reinhard, Paul Restuccia, Jon Romito, Austin Smythe—our staff director—Jenna Spealman, Stephen Spruiell, Conor Sweeney, Dennis Teti, Dana Wade. I call him ''John Z,'' but it's John Zakrajsek. That's an inside joke. Brad Butler, Jonathan Golster, Spencer Pepper, Alex Stoddard.

I also want to thank from our personal office:

Smythe Anderson, Laurie Krmpotich, Joyce Meyer, Sarah Peer, Mark Positano, Kevin Seifert, Martin Skold, Andy Speth—my chief of staff—Allison Steil; our interns: Brad Kirschbaum, Jane McEarney, David Pelsue, Greg Spevacek, and John Watts.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank all of the hardworking staff for making this possible.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 1213, H.R. 1214, H.R. 1215, AND H.R. 1216

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be permitted to file its reports to accompany H.R. 1213, H.R. 1214, H.R. 1215, and H.R. 1216 at any time through Wednesday, April 27, 2011.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42–43), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. BECERRA, California