

my colleagues, the Save American Workers Act, we can create an America that works simply by restoring the traditional 40-hour workweek.

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

COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Missouri). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to talk about a couple of issues that are on the floor. I really want to spend this evening talking about an enormous opportunity that America has to further jobs in this Nation. It is a piece of legislation that passed off the House floor this afternoon, H.R. 4005, a piece of legislation that deals with the Coast Guard and the maritime industry.

But just a few words about the previous hour that was spent here talking about the 40-hour workweek. There is nothing in the Affordable Care Act that does away with the 40-hour workweek, not at all. The 40-hour workweek remains, and, in fact, Democrats are trying to strengthen the overtime provisions that are needed to be put into effect, when men and women across the United States work more than 40 hours and do not receive overtime, time-and-a-half pay. So that is another thing.

We just basically heard yet one more effort by our Republican colleagues to eviscerate and otherwise put aside the Affordable Care Act, which now has perhaps 12 to 15 million Americans with some sort of insurance. Perhaps it is a new health insurance policy that they previously did not have available to them or they are on Medicaid or they are on their parents' health insurance. Well over 12 million Americans now have insurance because of the Affordable Care Act.

They also have guaranteed coverage. No longer can an insurance company discriminate against them because they have a preexisting condition. No longer are newborn babies denied coverage because they are born with some sort of a medical problem. That is what used to occur in America before the Affordable Care Act.

Also, it is kind of ironic, if you will, that we just heard an hour of discussion on the 30-hour workweek, the 40-hour workweek. The 30 hours only talks about when an employer must provide insurance for their employees. It doesn't take away anybody's 40-hour workweek at all.

However, the ironic part is today, the Republicans announced the new Ryan budget, which seriously impacts every American's health care policy. The new Ryan budget repeals the Affordable Care Act and those guarantees of coverage that I spoke of just a moment

ago. The guarantee that a newborn child with a medical problem has insurance was wiped out by the proposal that was introduced by Mr. RYAN today. The guarantee that every woman is no longer discriminated against because she is a woman, a female, that guarantee was wiped out by the proposal that was put forward by Mr. RYAN today.

The guarantee that there are no more limits on coverage. Before the Affordable Care Act, if you came down with cancer and your insurance policy, as was common, had a total limit on the coverage, you would blow through that coverage and then bankruptcy was in your future. Oh, unless, of course, you didn't take the medical care. So these basic guarantees of health insurance availability were wiped out, or would be wiped out, by Mr. RYAN's budget that he proposed today.

Similarly, something that is really important for every senior is seriously affected by the Republican Ryan budget that was put forth today. It was 1965 that Medicare went into effect. Lyndon Johnson signed that bill. I actually have a photo of the speech that he gave here on the House floor, calling for the enactment of Medicare and Medicaid. It was 1963, '64 when that occurred.

The budget proposal that was put out by Mr. RYAN today would effectively end Medicare, as we know it. And if you are 55 years of age or younger, you would not have Medicare when you become 65. Instead, you would be given a voucher and told, go buy insurance in the health insurance market, which was so roundly criticized by our Republican colleagues today, and the improvements that have been made in that market by the Affordable Care Act.

So let's try to get this straight. First of all, a proposal put forward today by the Republican majority in this House would effectively end Medicare for every American who is 55 and younger and put those people into a health insurance market that has had all of its guarantees of coverage, all of the consumer protections, all of the consumer Bill of Rights in the Affordable Care Act repealed. So on the one hand you repeal all of those protections, and then on the other hand, you take every American 55 years and younger and force them into that dog fight with no protections in the private health insurance market. I don't think we want to go there. I don't think we want to go there.

What we want to do is to make sure that seniors have affordable Medicare insurance. But the proposal put forth today will deny those men and women that are currently in Medicare the opportunity to have the doughnut hole, the prescription drug doughnut hole, removed. Instead, the proposal put forth today would increase that doughnut hole, sending seniors back into the unaffordable prescription drug program that existed before the Affordable Care Act. So if you are a senior out there,

beware. Beware of the budget proposal that was put forth here in the House of Representatives today because there is serious harm to you in 2016, should that proposal ever become law.

We will fight that. We don't want Medicare to disappear, as we know it. We don't want a voucher program that forces seniors into the clutches of the private insurance companies without the protections that are presently in the Affordable Care program.

I didn't intend to talk about this today. But following on the previous hour from my colleagues who were talking so vehemently against the Affordable Care Act, I thought we ought to have a discussion about what is in the Affordable Care Act, all of the protections that are there for every, every American, whether they are 65 or older. And oh, by the way, if you are 65 now and you are on Medicare, you have an annual free medical checkup—high blood pressure, diabetes, all of those things that can affect you—an annual free checkup which has already shown that it keeps seniors healthy longer and has dramatically reduced the cost of Medicare this year and will continue to do so in the years ahead.

Now, what I really wanted to talk about was something really good and really positive that happened here on the floor of the House today, and that was the passage of H.R. 4005, the Coast Guard and Maritime legislation that reauthorizes the United States Coast Guard for 2 more years, expands their opportunities to protect our waterways, our lakes, and to protect America in the oceans that surround this great Nation. It also provides an opportunity for the mariners who want to enter that profession from the armed services, who may have been in the Navy, who have gained certain skills, so that they can get a license to be a mariner, to be a sailor, to be a ship's captain or an officer on one of our merchant marine ships. There is more that we can do with this piece of legislation, and I want to put it up here so that we can take a look at some of the opportunities that exist in this law. Here we go.

About 20 years ago, there were several hundred American-flagged ships and several tens of thousands of American sailors that were bringing American commerce, exports, and imports into our ports. So if we support the growth of jobs and the growth of trade, then we need to support the merchant marine and Coast Guard renewal act that passed the House today because it provides these opportunities.

This is not an LNG tanker. But the United States may very well be exporting liquefied natural gas. Rather than importing, we are likely to be exporting. Seven permits have been granted to the gas companies to export LNG, liquefied natural gas.

□ 2030

That is good, to a point. Export too much of this, and a strategic American

asset will be wasted, and we will lose the opportunity to have low-cost energy in the United States.

That low-cost energy, a result of an abundance of natural gas that we now have in the United States, will be lost if we export too much of that gas through the liquification and the export of it.

Right now, we are somewhere around 10 percent of the total supply would be exported; and economists tell us, at that level, we are not going to see a rise in the cost of energy in the United States. That is good, and it is good for the gas companies.

They have been drilling, and if they are able to export this, they are going to make a substantial profit on that gas that they are allowed to export, a very handsome profit, because we have seen the Ukrainian situation with Russia threatening to shut down the supply of gas to Ukraine and quite possibly to Western Europe.

Well, the cost of gas in those countries is two, three, and, in some cases, four times what it costs here in the United States; so the gas companies naturally want to export to that market, to take advantage of the higher prices there.

All well and good, if it is limited. Even at that limited rate, we could see over 100 new, American-made ships handling that export.

We need to be very aware here in Congress that American policy—the laws—have everything to do with American manufacturing; so if we are going to Make It In America once again, we need to use every opportunity to enhance our manufacturing base.

The export of billions—and indeed trillions—of cubic feet of natural gas from those seven export terminals could lead to 100 or more new tankers, LNG tankers, in the export of that gas, sending that gas all around the world, liquified natural gas.

We can build those ships here if we use our public policy wisely and simply require that American natural gas be exported on American-made ships built in American shipyards made by American workers and then flagged and sailed by American sailors, building, once again, the American merchant marine.

We have this opportunity. We should not lose this opportunity. Now, we may run up against certain trade barriers put there by the World Trade Organization. We need to find a way to maneuver around those trade barriers and use every opportunity that this strategic natural asset gives to this country, to use that not just for the benefit of the gas companies and their profits, but also to the benefit of American workers, American steel companies producing the steel, American engine companies building the engines for these tankers, and American shipyards putting together these ships that will be exporting this natural gas.

The liquefied natural gas industry opportunity must not be missed. We

must, once again, rebuild the American shipping fleet by 100 tankers. It is a very real possibility. We must not lose that possibility.

In the legislation that passed today, we see the opportunity for the Coast Guard to build new offshore patrol cutters. We see an opportunity for the maritime industry to enter into the manufacturing of ships from American shipyards, and we see the opportunity for the Coast Guard to protect America's ports. These are things that must be done, and this is public policy at its best.

However, there is a threat to all of this. The threat is found in the reality that passing an authorization bill is the starting point. It authorizes the expenditures.

The question then goes to: Will there actually be an appropriation that will fund those new ships for the Coast Guard, that will fund the merchant marine, the Ready Reserve fleet, and the maritime shipping programs?

That is on the appropriations side, and that will bring me back full circle to where I started this discussion.

The budget that was proposed today by Mr. RYAN and the Republicans decimates the programs that would fund the education of the mariners in the maritime academies, that would fund the new ships for the Coast Guard, would decimate the opportunity to build the marine security program that puts ships available for the military, shipping men and equipment to wherever they are needed in the world if there is some trouble out there that the military must respond to, that decimates the funding for the programs that are in the Coast Guard Maritime Authorization Act.

We need to be consistent here. It is not enough to vote by unanimous consent off this floor a bill that authorizes a robust Coast Guard, that authorizes the rebuilding of the maritime industry, that authorizes the pay level for our coastguardsmen and women, and simultaneously put forth a budget that would defund or largely eliminate those programs.

So the question is: Are we prepared to create jobs in our Nation or not?

A final point goes to something that is really important in my district, and it is this: the levees that protect the tens of thousands of citizens in my district from flooding. This is a picture of a levee that broke in California some time ago, and the flooding devastated a community. This is a threat all across America.

The question for us here on the floor of the House of Representatives is: Are we willing to put together an infrastructure program like the President had called for in his budget? Or are we going to go with the Ryan budget which reduces—significantly reduces—the investment in critical infrastructure that protects our communities?

I could just as easily put a picture up here of a bridge that has collapsed and of roads with potholes. In this Nation,

our water systems are antiquated, our sanitation systems are inadequate, our levee systems don't meet the needs to protect our community; and in California, with a major drought underway, we do not have the money to build the water storage systems to protect the world's largest agricultural sector, California agriculture, and certainly the Nation's largest agricultural sector, or the cities and the communities that depend upon the water.

We have enormous infrastructure needs. The President, in his budget, put forth a major undertaking to fund new infrastructure by ending tax breaks for American corporations that are sending jobs overseas.

On the other hand, put forward today by my Republican colleagues is a minimalist program—not a robust program that would put millions of Americans back to work—but rather a minimalist program that actually would continue the decrease in the expenditures on infrastructure.

Let me just put up one more chart here, and this is a chart of where we are going with infrastructure spending at the Federal level. This is 2002. In 2002, we were spending somewhere in the range of \$325 billion a year on infrastructure.

In 2012—and we are not even at the lower level called for in the sequestration—we are down to less than \$250 billion a year on infrastructure, all Federal expenditures—highways, levees, ports, water systems, and sanitation systems, all of that. From \$325 billion, we have lost \$75 billion. Those are American jobs that are not coming into play.

If we take the budget proposal today from Mr. RYAN, this number will go even lower. We can't do that. This Nation is built on its infrastructure, it is built on its education, it is built on its support for seniors, and it is built on the humanitarian instincts that we have.

And what are we getting from our majority? Less—less infrastructure; less for seniors; less for Medicaid, the poor, and the elderly; and less Pell grants for those kids that want to go to school.

That is not how you build this economy. You build this economy on a great education system that has to be funded, kids that can go to college, not less Pell grants, but more, so that kids can find an affordable college education; more infrastructure investment, not less.

But go with the President. He would have us back up to this number, 325 billion, not the 75 billion less that is in the current budgets, the current austerity budgets or the budgets that have been proposed by Mr. RYAN today.

Are we going to build America or not? We put forward a major bill, the Coast Guard bill, and then we don't fund it; so it becomes hypocritical and devastating to the American economy.

For those seniors that depend on Medicare, the Ryan budget, instead of

closing the doughnut hole for prescription drugs that cost seniors that have serious health care an enormous amount of money, it opens it so, once again, seniors are going to have to pay for drugs that they cannot afford. The Affordable Care Act closed that.

Choices, we are going to make choices here. We are in the process of deciding what the budget will be for the Government of the United States.

Will it be a budget that provides the fundamental needs to grow this economy, education, and manufacturing so our shipyards and so our bridges can be built with American workers? Are we going to do that or not? Are we going to take care of the seniors? Are we going to educate our kids?

These are the questions that we confront here, and I would ask our colleagues to stop the—I don't know—3-year effort now to repeal the Affordable Care Act and, rather, work on making that new system effective, efficient, and viable.

It is the path we are on. It is not a government-run health care system. In fact, it is a private insurance system that has now been added with protections for the consumers, the consumers' health care bill of rights.

Don't repeal it. Make it work better. Work with us to address those problems that we know exist in the system. No program has ever been perfect, and we can do better here. That is our goal.

So today was a good day for me. As ranking member of the Coast Guard Maritime Subcommittee, we put forth a good policy—not complete—we need to add to it, and hopefully, that will happen when the bill is taken up in the Senate; but at the same time, we hear a continuing call to do away—to eliminate the patient's bill of rights. We don't want to do that.

I am going to yield back my remaining time here and just put this question before all of us. This is a country that needs to grow. This is a country that needs to prosper, and we need to work across the aisle here, just as we did last week with my colleague, Mr. LAMALFA, a Republican, a conservative.

We said we need to build something in California. We need to build a water storage system. So we have introduced legislation, the sites reservoir legislation, a bipartisan piece of legislation, a major infrastructure reservoir for the State of California, where we can store water for the drought that is going to come—not for the current drought, that opportunity was lost years ago—but for the next drought, nearly 2 million acre feet of water to be stored to be available for farmers, for the city, for the environment, to be used when needed when the rain is not there.

That is the kind of bipartisanship that we need. We need to come together. We need to spend our money wisely and efficiently. We can do that in a bipartisan way. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. LAMALFA, for working on a project that is desperately

needed in California. We need those levees all across this Nation.

□ 2045

We need those shipyards building American ships to carry that natural gas all around the world. We don't need to do too much of it. We don't want to drive up the price in the United States. We want to make sure that if we are going to export a strategic national asset that all of America benefits—not just the gas companies, but all of America—the shipyards, the shipbuilders, the steelworkers, the plumbers, the pipe fitters, the electricians, those middle class jobs, 100 ships. It is possible. We need to work together to make that happen.

We have got a full agenda ahead of us. An austerity budget won't make it. It is going to harm this Nation. It is going to deprive us of what we need to do: to build the infrastructure, to educate, to do the research, and to make this country move forward. Hopefully we will make a wise decision.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back my remaining time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, April 1, 2014.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress, two additional requirements for the consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget resolution were set forth in Section 3(e) of House Resolution 5 (113th Congress).

The first requires the concurrent resolution on the budget include a section related to means-tested and nonmeans-tested direct spending programs. The second requires a statement from the Chair of the Committee on the Budget defining those terms to be included in the Congressional Record prior to the consideration of such concurrent resolution on the budget. Amendments to, and conference reports on, the concurrent resolution must also fulfill these provisions.

Enclosed please find two tables prepared in order to fulfill the terms of section 3(e) referred to above. I have also included a communication and associated tables from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, with whom I have consulted in the preparation of this material. While the nonmeans-tested list is not exhaustive, all programs not considered means-tested can be considered nonmeans-tested direct spending. The description of programs considered to be means-tested direct spending and nonmeans-tested direct spending is the same as the one filed on March 7, 2013 in compliance with the section 3(e) requirement.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. RYAN of Wisconsin,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2014.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you requested, enclosed are two tables that show federal spending for each of the government's major mandatory spending programs and tax credits that are primarily means-tested (that is, spending programs and tax credits that provide cash payments or assistance in obtaining health care, food, or education to people with relatively low income or few assets). Table 1 shows CBO's baseline projections for the 2014-2024 period; Table 2 shows historical spending data from 2004 through 2013, along with CBO's estimates for 2014.

The tables include total spending for mandatory programs that are primarily not means-tested, but they do not include separate entries for individual programs in that group that have means-tested components (for example, student loans and some portions of Medicare, other than low-income subsidies for Part D). They also do not include means-tested programs that are discretionary (for example, the Section 8 housing assistance programs and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program). However, the tables show discretionary spending for the Pell Grant program as a memorandum item because that program has both discretionary and mandatory spending components and the amount of the mandatory Pell grant component is partially dependent on the annual amount of discretionary funding.

In CBO's latest baseline projections, published in *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2014 to 2024* (February 2014), mandatory outlays for both means-tested and nonmeans-tested programs are projected to grow over the next decade at an average annual rate of 5.4 percent (see Table 1).

Overall, the growth rates projected for total mandatory spending over the coming decade are slower than those experienced in the past 10 years—by about one-half percentage point per year, on average. Over the 2005-2014 period, CBO estimates that total mandatory outlays will have increased at an average annual rate of 6.0 percent—means-tested programs by an average of 6.8 percent per year and non-means-tested programs by 5.7 percent per year (see Table 2).

A number of programs shown in Tables 1 and 2 have been or are scheduled to be significantly affected by changes in law, the recent recession, and the continuing recovery. As a result, important aspects of the programs in the future may differ significantly from historical experience, and those differences may be the source of some of the variation between the growth rates in the past 10 years and those in the coming decade. For example, spending for Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), health insurance subsidies, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and the refundable portions of the earned income and child tax credits has been or will be significantly affected by program changes that unfold over time.

The difference in growth rates for Medicaid in the two periods stems in part from policy changes that, on net, reduced those rates for the past decade (when they averaged 5.4 percent) but will increase them in the coming decade (when they are projected to average 6.8 percent). For example, in 2006, Medicaid spending contracted when spending for prescription drugs for certain people was shifted to the new Medicare Part D program. By contrast, projected rates of growth in Medicaid spending over the coming decade are