of this employee population and their families. Multinational employers value expatriate health plans for many reasons, including the role they play in recruiting and retaining a productive globally mobile workforce by ensuring coverage of their employees' and families' health care needs while abroad.

The ACA was intended to reform the U.S. health care system. Its application to expatriate health plans and to the employer sponsors and people covered by such plans, has created compliance uncertainty with respect to the law's individual and employer mandates and certain other health plan requirements. Although some of these matters have been addressed in transition guidance issued by the agencies, the guidance is temporary and does not fully address the outstanding concerns.

H.R. 4414 provides needed statutory clarification with respect to the application of the ACA to expatriate health plans and the employers, employees and family members that rely on such plans to meet the health benefits needs of a globally mobile workforce.

We appreciate your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. KLEIN,
President.

Mr. NUNES. I will also submit a letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, also in support of this clarification.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, April 9, 2014.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, strongly supports H.R. 4414, ''The Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014,'' to preserve the ability of our country's businesses to provide, and our citizens to obtain appropriate health care coverage as they conduct business and live overseas. This important bill protects the ability of American companies to provide and workers to obtain coverage abroad that have historically been offered and valued.

The PPACA was designed to improve access to coverage and health care services for people in the United States and to strengthen this nation's health care system. Whether it will accomplish these goals remains to be seen. However, it was certainly not intended and must not be misconstrued to disadvantage American companies either operating or employing individuals in other countries or selling products abroad. It is important to ensure that this unintended consequence does not occur. This bill would protect the coverage and opportunities of American workers, American employers, and American products abroad. Congress must pass this bill to explicitly exempt expatriate plans from the myriad of PPACA requirements.

Applying these new mandates to international plans would not only be extremely difficult and complex from an operations standpoint due to the global nature of this type of coverage but would also be bad policy. They would place American businesses and expatriate American employees at a disadvantage in the global marketplace. Requiring American companies that operate around the globe and their foreign-based employees to buy more costly coverage would unfairly benefit foreign competitors and foreign employees. Such PPACA-compliant expatriate plans are not likely to be cost-competitive. In many instances, they may not provide global coverage and would in fact not comply with applicable local laws. Because of conflicting requirements between these new mandates and the laws of other countries, an employer may also have to purchase multiple policies with overlapping coverage or risk noncompliance with one or more nations' laws. Congress must protect the ability of American companies and their expatriates to purchase and offer appropriate and valued plans that have long been part of how our country operates in the global marketplace.

U.S. jobs are at stake. If this legislation does not get enacted, American jobs associated with writing, servicing and administering these plans will be shipped overseas.

The Chamber continues to champion health care reform that builds on and reinforces the employer-sponsored system while improving access to affordable, quality coverage. The Chamber urges you and your colleagues to support H.R. 2575, and may consider including votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

Mr. NUNES. I will also submit a rebuttal argument for the RECORD so that people can really get to the bottom of this legislation.

I want to address some of the misperceptions and concerns that have been raised about this bill.

First, this bill has nothing to do with what type of plan insurers can write and sell to expatriates. The question is where they are going to write these same plans. Here in the United States, or overseas. The same companies are going to purchase the same plans regardless of whether this bill passes. The only question is whether or not the U.S. jobs associated with these plans will be saved.

Next, the bill does not allow U.S. employers to escape the ACA and offer substandard plans. These plans are incredibly generous by their very nature. They offer coverage in multiple countries and administration of plans that include multiple currencies, languages, and coverage mandates.

But let me quote from the legislation itself. Page 6, lines 1–6, ''the plan sponsor [must] reasonably believe that the benefits provided by the expatriate health plan are actuarially similar to, or better than, the benefits provided under a domestic group health plan offered by that plan sponsor.''

Mr. Speaker, the legislation requires that the expatriate health plan be as good as the domestic health plan that is covered by the ACA. Any suggestion otherwise does not reflect what the legislation clearly states.

There is an employer mandate in the ACA. Employers are required to offer a domestic plan. If they don't, they are fined $2,000 per employee. Employers aren't going to drop their current plan for their U.S. employees, pay the $2,000 penalty for every employee on their payroll, just so they can offer their subset of green card employees a substandard plan. That is a completely unrealistic scenario.

This bill does not allow, as has been suggested, nonimmigrant farm workers to be offered substandard plans. Under the scenario envisioned by opponents of this bill, a farmer would have to drop his or her own plan and that of its U.S. workers to be allowed to offer an expat plan that somehow is less than the ACA standard. Who is going to do that? That's cutting off your nose to spite your face. But even if they were crazy enough to do that—the expat plan would still have to provide coverage in countries outside of the United States—they couldn't save money by doing this—it would likely cost the farmer more money to provide this type of plan.

Mr. Speaker, the ACA is a complicated piece of legislation, but this bill is not. This bill will allow the jobs to stay in the United States—and nothing else. This bill does not legally or practically make changes beyond this narrow scope which is why there is such strong bipartisan support.

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

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I commend Representative CARNEY for proposing fixes to the Affordable Care Act. Since the law was passed, I have said that parts of the Affordable Care Act need to be improved or changed. As Representative CARNEY has identified, there is no question that Congress needs to clarify how the law is applied to expatriate plans. The Administration has correctly exempted these plans from some ACA requirements that do not make sense for plans used primarily overseas, but the Administration is only able to provide temporary exemptions without congressional action. I am confident that the Senate will be able to make the needed targeted changes to H.R. 4414 so that it can pass both houses of Congress and gain the support of the Administration. I look forward to working with Representative CARNEY to make sure that legislation providing proper clarity to expatriate plans is signed in to law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4414.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 544 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 96.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1304

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, with Mr. HASTINGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, April 8, 2014, 60 minutes of debate remained on the concurrent resolution.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each have 30 minutes remaining.

Who yields time?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Well, here we are, Mr. Chairman, resuming the debate we left off yesterday. Let me try and give a summary of what this is all about.

This is all about getting our fiscal house in order. This is all about prioritizing hardworking taxpayer dollars. This is all about doing in our generation what we need to do to make sure that the next generation has a secure future and a debt-free future. So that is why we are bringing a budget to the floor, that is why we are making those difficult decisions, and that is why we are advocating for these important reforms.

In much of the 20th century, a lot of programs were created, and a lot of laudable goals were established. But now in the 21st century, I think we have learned a thing or two about how we can better accomplish and achieve some of these goals such as health and retirement security, because the way these programs were designed nearly a generation ago, they are now going into bankruptcy in this generation.

If we allow that to happen, then we will pull out from underneath those who depend on these programs for their health and retirement security, we will renege on that social contract. More to the point, we are going to do damage to our economy if we keep this deficit and debt going on its current course.

We asked the Congressional Budget Office to take a look at the kind of deficit and debt reduction that we are proposing and tell us over the long period, over the course of this budget, what does that do for America and for our economy? And they tell us that getting your economic and fiscal house in order, reducing the deficit and balancing the budget so that you can begin paying off the debt is good for economic growth. In fact, it will increase economic output by 1.8 percentage points. That is actually a lot.

What does that mean to every person in America? About $1,100 in more take-home pay and in higher income because we did our jobs here. But, more importantly, what it means for the next generation is, instead of sending our bills to them to work hard, to pay their taxes to pay off our bills and then they have to start working for themselves, we are going to give them a better future. Because we know right now—the CBO tells us as much—they are going to inherit a diminished future. That is point number one.

Point number two is that we have got to stop spending money we don't have. We will hear all of these arguments about the draconian cuts and the slashing and all of this. These are the same arguments we have heard time and again. And when those arguments have prevailed, they have brought us to where we are today: extraordinarily high deficits, deficits going back to $1 trillion by the end of this budget period, and a debt that is about to take off. If we don't get this under control, then we will not have the kind of economy that the people of this country deserve.

We don't want Washington to stand in the way of people's success. We want Washington to play its rightful supporting role so that people can become successful. We believe in a system of natural rights and equality of opportunity so people can make the most of their lives. We don't believe in a system where government thinks that they must take this commanding role within the middle of people's lives that ends up bankrupting this country, diminishing the future, and lowering economic growth and prosperity. There is a big difference in approaches. We want to tackle these challenges.

What I also want to say is that we have an important obligation to secure this country and protect our national defense. America, like it or not, is the superpower nation in the world and a duty that falls upon us to take that responsibility seriously. With that responsibility also comes the ability to chart our own course in the world, to help preserve the peace, and to help pave the way for prosperity so that we can have economic opportunity and so that we can advance our views and our values and the protection of individual and human rights and democracy.

These things are good for America. A strong America and a strong military helps make for a peaceful America and a prosperous America.

So we need to take the needed reforms to make sure that these critical retirement programs are there, not only intact for people in and near retirement, but there for those of us who are younger when we hope to retire. We need to get our spending under control so we can balance our budget and pay off our debt. We need to enact pro-growth economic reform like tax reform and economic development to create jobs today.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

At the end of the day, instead of growing government spending at 5.2 percent, which is the trend, we are proposing to grow it at 3.5 percent over the next 10 years. Hardly draconian.

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

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

Some things do not improve with age. We are here one day later, and this Republican budget is just as bad for the country today as it was yesterday.

Our Republican colleagues are going to have to choose: either you claim your budget balances or you fess up to the American people that you are keeping big parts of the Affordable Care Act, because you can't do both. As we talked yesterday, the House Republican budget only reaches their claim of balance in 10 years if they take the revenues from the Affordable Care Act and all the savings from the Affordable Care Act. And if they are going to claim that they are repealing that—as they voted 54-plus times to do on this floor—then their budget is automatically out of balance.

Now, all of these budgets significantly reduce the deficit as a share of our economy in the outyears. The fundamental question is what choices these budgets make in getting there. And the Democratic budget that has been proposed and the President's budget, all those budgets say we need to have shared responsibility and we need to work together to accomplish that goal.

The Republican budget rigs the rules in the favor of the most powerful and the most wealthy—right? So if you are a millionaire, under the Republican budget, you get your top tax rate cut by a full one-third, and everybody else in this budget gets walloped. So if you are a senior on Medicare, you will immediately see your prescription drug costs rise if you have high prescription drug costs—right?—because they reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole. That is a choice they make in the Republican budget for seniors today, even as they choose to protect special interest tax breaks for the very powerful.

They choose in this budget to say that students, while they are still in college, will be charged interest rates on their student loans—that saves them $40 billion—while they protect tax breaks for hedge fund owners. We don't think that is the right choice.

I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. MCDERMOTT), a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee who has always focused on making the right choice for the American people.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, this budget is not a real plan to address the urgent needs of the American people. This budget is an announcement of a campaign for the Presidency of the United States. This bill is intended not to stir great debate in Congress that ultimately delivers fiercely needed solutions for Americans; instead, this bill is written for the 2016 Republican National Convention.

When you listen to the chairman talk about this budget, what you are really hearing is the inaugural address of the 45th President of the United States, a rousing address that asks not what you can do for your country, but proudly proclaims your country refuses to do a thing for you: millions of seniors will be tossed off Medicare; the social safety net will be gutted to pay for millionaire tax cuts; infrastructure projects left to rot; denying millions of Americans health security; and Medicaid slashed to the bone. And that is just going to be the first 100 days.

Remember as you vote: a budget is a statement of your moral principles of what you think ought to go on in a society. Today's vote is the first vote. If that kind of people get elected either in the Senate or in the Presidency in 2016, this is what you are going to see. They are putting it right out there for everybody in America to see. And that is why you must vote "no."

□ 1315

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Wow, that is a doozy, I have got to tell you. That is a doozy if that kind of people get elected.

Look, we just think we should balance the budget, have government live within its means, and pay off our debt. If those kinds of people get elected, great.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our distinguished majority whip.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Path to Prosperity budget.

Every day, millions of Americans are competing in a race with an economy that asks us to accept a new normal, an anemic growth, an Obama economy.

I was recently in a high school speaking of the challenge that America had, and a student asked me a question about it. I asked him did he play a sport. He happened to be on the swim team. I said: Let me give you an analogy of America competing worldwide by a swim meet. Picture America in a swim competition with every other country. Many times at the early years, after the 1980s, we would jump into the pool and we would swim and we would win. We would hang those championship banners out. In this new Obama economy, things changed, a stimulus spending. Well, that meant we had to add a weight belt, about 20 pounds. Then the tax increases came. We had to add more weight. An onslaught of regulation, pretty soon you are up to 100 pounds.

You know what? We jump in that pool and we don't always win. And nobody says take the weight belt off. They just say you just don't swim like you used to. Think about it. Since the recession, part-time employment has increased at the expense of full-time. Over 90 million Americans are out of the workforce all together; 46 million live in poverty.

You know, the CBO, Congressional Budget Office, now says the new natural rate for unemployment is 6 percent. That means 11 million Americans not working is somehow natural in America. That is what a weight belt will do for you. It will drown you.

Today is different. Today we are going to unshackle. We are going to take that weight belt off. We have a budget that creates a Tax Code that is simpler and fairer, one that let's you keep more money in your pocket and lets you invest differently, one that balances and takes away that debt of the weight belt, one that unshackles the energy—more jobs, cheaper fuel, more manufacturing jobs to be able to grow. We strengthen Medicare and Medicaid. So we take care of the current and the future. We plan to swim for years and compete for years in the future.

I tell you, today, there are two different directions: you can stay with this anemic growth or you can jump into a pool with a future brighter than we have seen before and one that we know that will hang a new banner of championship, that America will rise once again with the prosperity of a balanced budget, one that will take us into a future of strength.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, the gentleman referenced several times the Congressional Budget Office and the economy. I urge all our colleagues to read the Congressional Budget Office report. It indicates that this House Republican budget will actually slow down economic growth over the next couple of years and slow down job growth over the next couple years.

Yes, we need a simpler, fairer Tax Code, but this House Republican budget would provide a huge tax break to the very wealthy and increase the tax burden on the middle class. In fact, they cut the top rate from 39 percent to 25 percent. That is a full one-third tax cut. So millionaires get an average of $87,000 tax break. Middle-income taxpayers have to finance that cut for the folks at the top. That means an increased tax burden of $2,000 for a middle class family. That is not good, fair tax reform.

For somebody who knows a lot about the economy and doing it right, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, budgets are a reflection of our values, they are a statement of our priorities, and they are about the choices we make to set the course for our future.

With this budget, Republicans are choosing the well-off and well-connected over middle class families, choosing, for instance, $45 billion in tax subsidies for oil companies whose own executives say they don't need it over veterans of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq who are out of work.

They choose a new average tax cut of $200,000 per millionaire per year over 170,000 of our Nation's most vulnerable children who would lose Head Start services.

Mr. Chair, we just finished with March Madness, and I am very proud of the University of Kentucky Wildcats. They had a great season. But isn't one of the cruel ironies of this debate, Coach Calipari of the University of Kentucky, who makes $5 million a year, roughly, under the Republican budget would get an additional tax cut of $700,000 a year, while the students who support his program would see their Pell grants slashed nationwide by a total of $145 billion over 10 years. Isn't that something? A man who makes $5 million coaching basketball gets a $700,000 tax break, while the students who were suffering and working hard to pay their way through college get slashed. This is one of the choices the budgets are about. This is why the Republican budget is totally out of step with American values. This is why we should reject the Republican budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 30 seconds to say, boy, I wonder what tax bill they are talking about, because it is not the one that is within the Republican budget. The Ways and Means Committee writes tax laws. We put out the outlines of tax reform that say there is a trillion dollars a year of tax expenditures, of loopholes that can be closed to give us a fairer, simpler Tax Code, that lowers taxes for everybody, all families and businesses, not whatever it is they are saying.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an extra 30 seconds.

What we are saying is, keep the award where it is, the maximum award, and fully funded for the decade. That is slashing it?

That is as opposed to the President who is saying let's grow it and then have some cliff and show no way or means of paying for it. The President and his budget is making a promise in Pell grants that he shows no way of keeping. We think we should make a promise and keep it; that is why we fully fund the current award at Pell.

And, oh, by the way, we also are cognizant of the fact that a lot of studies show us we are raising tuition. We are contributing to tuition inflation. And we need to get to the bottom of that before we keeping throwing more money at a system that is raising tuition.

Mr. Chair, with that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Chair, in this House, we take the constitutional power of the purse very seriously. We also take the future of young Americans very seriously, and we take the notion of leaving something better for the next generation very seriously.

Again, this year, the majority has proposed a budget that responsibly balances our budget within 10 years. It secures our social safety net for the most needy and for seniors. It repeals the uncertainty forced on Ohioans and all Americans by ObamaCare.

The budget begins to unburden future generations from the tyranny of the debt being left to them by today's decisionmakers. The CBO estimates it will pay $223 billion in interest payments this year—$223 billion in interest. That is enough to build 100 new Brent Spence bridges, which is an aging bridge that spans the Ohio River in Cincinnati, a critical artery for our Nation's highways reaching from Michigan to Florida.

Going back to those payments, left unchecked, they will balloon to $880 billion within 10 years. That is about how much we are spending on Social Security every year right now. American prosperity cannot afford to throw our money away to interest payments.

Vice President JOE BIDEN is fond of saying, ''Don't tell me what you value; show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value.'' It is a revealing quote, Mr. Chair, especially since Senate Democrats yet again refuse to even consider a budget. I guess according to the Vice President, Senate Democrats don't really value anything at all.

It is disrespectful to the American people and to hardworking Americans that this budget debate isn't happening in the Senate. As we have seen in recent years, the Senate Majority Leader has decided not to introduce a budget. In fact, the only time the Senate has introduced a budget recently was when the Senators knew that they wouldn't be paid unless they did so.

I know that Ohio families and Ohio businesses budget and plan for the future. They should be able to expect at least as much from their government, and the House is meeting our obligation with this budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I just want to respond to a couple of points the chairman made about tax reform. You know, Republican etiology in Washington has been that of trickle-down economics. The idea is you provide the wealthiest people in the country with a tax break and somehow it trickles down and lifts everybody up. The problem is that theory was proven bankrupt in the early 2000s. Under the Bush administration, we tried that—lower tax rates at the top. The economy did not do any better. In fact, what we got was huge deficits.

Now in this Republican budget, they are right back to the same old veiled theory. They called for reducing the top tax rate for millionaires from 39 percent down to 25 percent, and they claim that they are going to do this in a deficit-neutral way. When you do the math, what that means is you are going to have to increase the tax burden on middle class taxpayers to finance tax breaks for folks at the top.

Just to give our Republican colleagues an opportunity to say that that is not what they intended, in the Budget Committee, we offered an amendment calling it Protect the American Middle Class from Tax Increases, saying, okay, at least tell the Ways and Means Committee that one of your principles as you reduce tax breaks for millionaires is not to increase the tax burden on the middle class, and every Republican on the Budget Committee voted against that provision.

I am pleased that we have the author of that amendment with us on the floor right now. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the great State of New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, this budget is fundamentally unserious. We have heard this now for 4 years in a row. My friends on the other side of the aisle come down to the floor with their draconian budget claiming they are reluctantly forced to make tough decisions because the specter of a debt crisis is right around the corner—this, despite the fact that our deficit is falling at the fastest rate since the end of the Second World War. We said this: we would do it, and we did it.

This supposedly looming debt crisis is going to be so incredibly bad for this country that we need to reluctantly gut programs that help low and moderate Americans to prevent it.

And you stand there and stand up there and talk to us about tax-and-spend Democrats? You can't balance your budget without the Affordable Care Act. Isn't that a honey? You have done everything to dismantle it, over 50 votes to get rid of it. Now you are using it and the revenues to balance your budget. Ho, ho, ho. How very convenient of you. Their prescription to prevent this impending disaster is exactly what their Randian world view prescribes in the first place.

Tax cuts for the wealthy paid for on the backs of those not so wealthy. Unfortunately, it leads to only one conclusion. The Republican Party does not care about our deficits.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey another 15 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chair, in the words of Vice President—remember him—Dick Cheney, he proclaimed, ''Deficits don't matter.''

So, you have had a call to religion. You have come back. Your budget, the deficit is simply an excuse to cut the social safety net. So I say, let's vote down this phony budget and get on with the real thing, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, just in order to balance the time, I think we will let the gentleman from Maryland yield to another speaker so we can catch up.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If I could just inquire how much time remains.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 20¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 18 minutes remaining.

□ 1330

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the great State of New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a terrific member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend for yielding.

The GOP budget is a product of the same type of extreme philosophy that gave rise to the reckless Republican shutdown last year. It is like a heat-seeking missile aimed directly at the American people. It is a parade of horribles too numerous to catalogue, but in the time that I have allotted I will try to highlight the most egregious aspects.

It will cut $125 billion from the SNAP program, making it difficult for millions of food insecure Americans to get access to the nutrition needed to live a healthy life. It will cut $260 billion from higher education spending, depriving young Americans of the opportunity to get a college education and robustly pursue the American dream. It will cut $732 billion from the Medicaid program, making it hard for older Americans to get access to this vital safety net program. It will turn Medicare into a voucher program—that is a Trojan horse—effectively ending Medicare as we know it. It will balance the budget on the backs of working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, and the afflicted.

The Democratic plan is designed to create progress for the greatest number of Americans possible. The Republican plan is all about prosperity for the few, and for that reason we should vote it down.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, I was Dracula; now I am conducting a parade of horribles and firing heat-seeking missiles at the American people. I am interested to see what comes next.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman and the opportunity to stand and discuss the budget that we have before us.

I find it so interesting that our constituents are watching this. They are paying attention because they are concerned, and with good reason.

As one of my constituents said in a town hall meeting: I have got to tell you, I have got too much month left at the end of my money, and I am tired of it. I am tired of what this economy has been doing to my opportunities—wage stagnation, increases in health care costs.

The American people are over it, and they are ready to see the Federal Government start to live within its means. Think about it like this. This is the week when millions of Americans are sitting around the kitchen table looking at their income tax form, filling it out, trying to make certain that they do it right.

Let me ask you a question: Is it fair, is it right, for the men and women, the taxpayers, hardworking taxpayers in this country, is it right and fair to require them to send money to Washington, money that they don't have, money that causes them to struggle to meet their bills and to live within their means—they are struggling every month, and they have to send money to Washington to a government that refuses to live within its means.

This is what we are talking about, and this is why a budget that actually makes $5.1 trillion worth of spending cuts is important. It is why it is important that we have a budget that says there is a pathway to economic growth. It is because it is what the American people want to see happen.

I think our constituents find it very interesting that our colleagues across the aisle came to the Budget Committee room. What did they want to do? Plus it up, spend more—$1.5 trillion in taxes. More, let's take more from the taxpayer, let's grow the size of the government, let's make it bigger, let's make it more bloated.

That is their solution to how to deal with what we have here in Washington as a spending crisis. We don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem, we have a priority problem, and we see this play out regularly.

Mr. Chairman, it is why it is important for us to have a budget that balances in 10 years. I have to tell you, as a mom and a grandmom, I look a lot at what is happening to our children and our grandchildren.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional minute.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. You can call it draconian, you can call it all of these names, you can call all of us Neanderthals. But let me tell you what this is: this is a budget that is for our children because it is for reduced regulation, reduced taxation, reducing litigation, it is for innovation and job creation. That is what this budget is for. It is for fairness, because if we don't get this under control it will be my 5-year-old and my 4-year-old grandchildren that are facing draconian taxes, draconian rates, draconian cuts in order to be able to stand and live here in America.

So as we look at this, yes, we put the focus on right-sizing government, flexibility for the States, accountability to the American taxpayer, accountability to the children who are going to inherit the consequences of the decisions we make today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady used the term ''draconian'' a couple of times, and the chairman keeps referring to comments that Democrats have made as ''overblown.'' I would just remind the body that it was just a few days ago that the senior Republican, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, called the budget we are debating on the floor of the House draconian. That is what he called it—not a Democrat. So I think Members should keep that in mind as we proceed.

I am now very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a terrific member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The people I know and the people I meet work very hard every day. They want an opportunity for a good job, they want good schools, safe communities, and the promise that when they retire they can live their years in dignity. They want a government that is fair and helps make progress towards the American dream.

But this Republican budget is not for the hardworking people of America. This Republican budget is crafted by the special interests for the special interests. Republicans stack the deck against working families and small businesses. Incomes of CEOs and the top 1 percent are soaring, but everyone else is working harder to get by.

We need an economy that is firing on all cylinders for everybody, creating jobs that pay enough to keep up. Yet the Republican budget raises taxes on middle class families in order to cut taxes for people who earn over $1 million.

Republicans ignore one of the most important ways to cut the debt and the deficit, and that is have more Americans working. If the middle class succeeds, then America succeeds.

Republicans refuse to find one special interest loophole in the Tax Code. If you are incredibly rich, then you are incredibly lucky because this budget is for you. You pay less. But if you are like the vast majority of Americans, hold on, because you are going to pay more.

If you are a student who wants to attend college, Republicans make that harder by cutting Pell grants and student loans.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if you have a job in construction at America's ports or in transportation, this Republican budget could cost you your job and new opportunities.

If you believe America should remain the world leader in medical and scientific research, sorry, the Republican budget slashes research at the National Institutes of Health or in universities and research institutions.

If you are an older American, the Republican budget asks you to pay much more for Medicare, long-term care, and nursing care. It takes away that secure lifeline that has been in place since Democratic Congresses passed Medicare and Medicaid so that you will be able to live your retirement years in dignity without the fear of poverty.

This Republican budget is a cynical, special-interest driven vision of America. I recommend a strong ''no'' vote in opposition.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague.

This budget—I am not going to call somebody Dracula. I am sure it is sincere—but it is all about cutting taxes at the public's expense. It disinvests in America. So we disinvest in R&D, we disinvest in our future. The gentlelady from Tennessee talked about children and the tax burden. What about their education? What about opportunity? What about the roads and bridges and tunnels and transit systems they won't have because they have crumbled because we have disinvested? That is what this budget is all about. It is absolutely on the wrong path and it is handing over our future to foreign competition.

I urge defeat of this budget, and I urge more sensible solutions for the future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, when we call for ''revenue neutral tax reform,'' that means tax reform that keeps raising the same amount of revenue we raise today, do it through a better Tax Code so we are not picking winners and losers, so we can grow the economy and create jobs.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Chairman, when I tour businesses in the Eighth District of Indiana and meet with Hoosier families, they tell me they are concerned about the enormous debt burdening our country.

Just like Hoosier families and businesses that have to make hard decisions when money is tight, Washington must do the same in order to sustain our role as the leader in the free world.

We are over $17 trillion in debt. It is clear Washington, D.C., has a spending problem, and there are two very different pathways to address this issue.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would continue us on the failed status quo pathway of more spending, more taxes, and more debt. Their plan does not address the long-term drivers of our debt. It raises taxes on families who are already struggling to make ends meet and has no intention of balancing, ever. And it does nothing to protect and strengthen the Medicare safety net promised to our seniors. Put simply, their plan does not implement serious reforms necessary to put us on a path to a sustainable future.

Mr. Chairman, our budget has a different vision for America. Our budget plan saves $5.1 trillion over the next decade, pays down our debt, and encourages a growing and healthy economy. Our plan expands opportunities for all Americans by focusing on higher education and job training. We encourage a simpler, fairer Tax Code that saves Americans thousands of hours spent every year on tax compliance. Our plan protects the social safety net programs by encouraging upward mobility and providing States with the flexibility to meet the needs of their residents.

One of the most important aspects of our budget plan provides Social Security and Medicare for our Nation's seniors. We preserve traditional Medicare for those in or near retirement, while also offering options for Medicare that strengthens this vital program so it is still around for future generations.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I support the Ryan budget plan, which puts our country on a pathway back to prosperity.

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

It does not strengthen Medicare to reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, which is exactly what this Republican congressional budget does.

If you are a senior with high prescription drug costs under this budget, it will cost you $1,200 more per year. The whole reason we closed the prescription drug doughnut hole was to prevent seniors in that position from having to undergo such economic hardship. But this Republican budget reopens that doughnut hole now.

With respect to tax reform and picking winners and losers, the reality is that this Republican budget does pick winners and losers. The big winners are people at the very top of the income scale because millionaires will see their top tax rate cut by a full one-third.

The result of that is that middle-income taxpayers are going to have to finance that in order to maintain what they call the deficit neutrality of it. That means that middle-income taxpayers with kids are going to pay an average of $2,000 more to finance the tax cuts for millionaires.

□ 1345

So millionaires are the winners, and middle class taxpayers are the losers. As I said just a moment ago, we gave our Republican colleagues an opportunity in the committee to say no, that is not their intention, but they voted against the amendment to protect American middle class taxpayers.

I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), one of our terrific members of the Budget Committee.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth year in a row that the Republicans have introduced their roadmap for the future.

If they took over the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, what would they do? Who would be the winners and losers?

The chairman of the Budget Committee said this is a win-win budget. It is a win if you are in the top percentile, and it is a win if you are in the second percentile, but the rest of us—the 98 percent—certainly aren't winning.

We lose 1.1 million jobs in 2015 and 3 million jobs in 2016 in the Republican budget. That is like firing every single person in the State of Wisconsin. We lose by slashing investments in infrastructure and science, in transportation and education, and for our seniors. The middle class taxpayers pay for it.

We also lose on the fact that this has fuzzy math. The logic is terrible. To say this actually balances in 10 years is to say that Cheez Whiz is like real Wisconsin cheese. They cut the Affordable Care Act's benefits, but they keep the revenues, and they keep the savings, which is simply impossible.

I hope the American public realizes that, if the Republicans take over, this is their roadmap. These are the cuts you are going to see, so I urge a ''no'' vote on the budget.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Budget Committee and of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, this budget is too weak. It is too weak in all the wrong places and in all the wrong ways. It is weak on opportunity. It is weak on competitiveness. It is weak on dealing with the tax avoidance and loopholes that would allow us to invest in America. The House Republican budget actually grows the deficit—the opportunity deficit.

A strong budget would help our students earn degrees without mortgaging their futures in order to achieve their full God-given potential, and it would enable an educated workforce that will allow us to be competitive in the world economy.

A strong budget would invest in lifesaving medical research, which would grow our economy and would respond to the folks from San Antonio who are here today to ask for more for Alzheimer's research, not by taking it from AIDS or cancer research, but by investing more to get the cures in order to save the lives and create the jobs that America ought to be about.

A strong budget would invest in infrastructure, in roads and rails and bridges and harbors, like the Chinese are doing to move goods and move people and be competitive.

A strong budget would ensure seniors' dignity in retirement, not what AARP says about this budget—that it would weaken the programs that provide the very foundation of health and retirement security for current and future generations.

I urge the rejection of this weak Republican budget in favor of needed investments in our education, our infrastructure, our research, and our retirement security.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Those investments can be made by simply asking those who have been so privileged and who have enjoyed so many tax loopholes to pay their fair share for the future of America. I believe it is an investment for a stronger America, which will afford more opportunity to every family.

I ask for the rejection of this budget in favor of a strong budget that is strong for America, strong for our economy, and strong for opportunity.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, apparently, a strong budget means we need to borrow more from the Chinese to fund our government.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Wisconsinite, Mr. DUFFY, who does know the difference between real cheese and Cheez Whiz.

Mr. DUFFY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as I sit and listen to this debate today, there is no doubt the Democrats' position is let's just keep the status quo, don't change anything, let's continue on with our $17 trillion debt, let's continue to borrow and spend and spend and borrow and never change course.

We know that is their position by way of the amendments they offered in the Budget Committee and by the conversation you hear on the floor today. Mr. Chairman, we also know that, by way of the Senate budget, when they put one out, because it never balances, and we know that because of the President's budget that he puts out, because it never balances.

It passes off this massive liability to the next generation, and their policies have a real impact on the country as a whole.

We talk about seniors. The Medicare trust fund is going broke in 12 years—it is going bankrupt—and my friends across the aisle, Mr. Chairman, don't want to change it. They want to leave our seniors today and our future seniors in jeopardy with a trust fund that is going broke.

It is hard to lead. It is hard to put ideas on the table and say: listen, my friends, let's come together, let's be responsible, let's make it sustainable, let's fix it—when the response is: don't do a darned thing, continue on the course to a bankrupted trust fund.

That doesn't serve our seniors well. That doesn't serve our next generation of seniors well.

Speaking of Medicare, there is only one party in this town that took over $700 billion out of Medicare and used it for ObamaCare—they raided it—and that is the Democrat Party, Mr. Chairman. That is unacceptable, and to come to the floor today and tell us and the American people that they are here to protect it just isn't true.

We are on the course to a fiscal calamity, and if that happens, who are the people who are hurt the most among us? The people who are hurt the worst are the poorest, the ones who are most in need of government assistance.

We should look to our churches and to our communities for that help, but there is a role for government. If you have a debt crisis, if you have a fiscal crisis, and if you have people who have a hard time heating their homes or putting food on their tables or who have kids who want to go to college or if you want to build roads and bridges, there is not money there for those projects.

If you want to be able to invest in your future, you have to make sure you have a budget that is sustainable. When you pay $230 billion in interest alone today, when the Fed is printing money to buy down that interest rate and when the President says, in 10 years, interest on the debt is going to be $880 billion—you can build a lot of roads, bridges, feed a lot of people, and send a lot of kids to school for almost $1 trillion a year.

Let's fix this problem. Let's work together. Let's balance our budget. It starts right here in the House with the Budget Committee.

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

I hope all Members of the House will check the facts with respect to the impact of the Affordable Care Act on Medicare. If you actually look at what has happened since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, the per capita rate of increase in health care costs in this country has actually gone down.

Talk to seniors on Medicare. Anybody who is paying attention right now, I ask them: What has their Part B premium done over the last couple of years? It has been steadier. In fact, this year, it went down in real terms. The value that seniors have gotten under Medicare has actually improved significantly, in part, due to the Affordable Care Act.

Now, unlike the Democratic budget, which used some of the savings from getting rid of overpayments to some of the big insurance companies in Medicare and using those savings to strengthen things like the prescription drug benefit, the Republican budget keeps every dime of the Medicare savings from the Affordable Care Act, but they don't use any of it to strengthen Medicare.

In fact, they reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole. They start charging seniors now for preventative health services. Ultimately, they actually end the Medicare guarantee by turning Medicare into a voucher program, so that, if you actually wanted to stay in traditional Medicare, you would be paying a whopping high premium.

That is not the way we should go, and that is all in a budget that continues to provide tax breaks to the very wealthy in this country. Those are not the right priorities for America.

Now, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee and a Member who has focused on the right priorities for America and who recognizes that small business is the engine of growth and opportunity.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the ranking member for yielding, for fighting, and for being a real fiscal leader for small businesses in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this budget. Far from being a path to prosperity, it is actually a path to the poorhouse. Sadly, just as it falls short in so many other ways, the Ryan budget clearly fails small businesses.

Under this budget, resources that help small companies launch, grow, and hire will be cut by nearly $11 billion. A wide range of resources will be gutted—from contracts, to access to capital, to international trade assistance, to job training.

This budget is not the right budget to help those businesses that are the backbone of the American economy at a time when this economy is still struggling.

Studies have shown that many of these small business programs generate more than $3 in Federal revenue for every dollar spent. What type of economic policy says that you cut programs that generate income for the Treasury?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. We just held a press conference today with so many small business people who have benefited from these types of programs. They are businesses that opened up in 2006. Today, we had a lady who provides IT services to the DOD and to many Federal agencies. Her business has grown from six people to 130 employees. These are the types of programs that we need in place in order to grow our economy.

Republicans like to say that they are the champions of small businesses. They oppose the ACA, claiming it will harm small firms. They oppose Dodd-Frank, saying that it will hinder the ability of small businesses to get lending from traditional financial services; and yet they cut the very lending programs that provide, through the Federal Government, access to capital for small businesses.

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

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. When we look at this budget, we know that the rhetoric does not match the reality. Rather than paying lip service to small businesses, we must invest in the programs that help them grow and create jobs. That is what we need, job creation in our country. We must do better.

Vote ''no'' on this budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank Chairman RYAN for engaging the House in this very important process.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about real alternatives and routes we can take for the future of this country and for the future of our children.

As a father to a 17-year-old daughter and twin 13-year-old boys, writing the fiscal path of this country is the reason that I ran for the opportunity to serve in this institution. Part of serving in this institution is creating a vision for America's financial future. This budget balances.

Putting a budget on the floor of the House and putting forth a vision for America's fiscal future that balances is something that we need to do on a regular basis.

It is sad that I had to fight for a provision to be put into this bill called No Budget, No Pay. As we know, the Senate will not take this budget process up, and they shouldn't be paid. I fought for that proposal because, if Members of Congress are not willing to put in the work to help balance our country's checkbook and fulfill their constitutional duties, they should not be paid.

For hard-working taxpayers, this budget allows you to keep more of your paycheck while, again, balancing our budget. Compare that with the President's budget, which we will have a chance to vote on this week.

I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to vote ''yes'' on the President's budget if you think it is the future for America, but that budget raises taxes by more than $1 trillion, and it never balances.

We have got a clear choice here. For our seniors, this budget ends ObamaCare's raid on Medicare, and it puts seniors back in charge of their health care decisions. This budget also preserves Medicare for our current seniors, and it ensures that this vital program is available for all future generations.

□ 1400

For our students, this budget guarantees Pell grants for those who dream of going to college but need a little help. Right now, the program is estimated to become insolvent by 2016. Every year we don't have a plan, we risk the future of millions of students and contribute to the rising cost of tuition. As someone who represents nine universities and colleges and eight community colleges in my district, having no plan is unacceptable.

For our veterans, this budget maintains advanced appropriations to ensure veterans still receive their benefits, regardless of what happens in Washington. Additionally, this budget would dedicate another $400 million to veterans programs.

I did not come to Washington sit idly by and remain content with the current state of our Nation. I came here to make Washington work and provide the hardworking taxpayers of Illinois' 13th Congressional District with a better vision for America.

This is a better vision for America, Mr. Chairman.

And the attacks will come. Don't let the attacks get in the way of the facts.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee for yielding.

Mr. Chair, our Nation is $17.4 trillion in debt and out-of-control spending here in Washington has no end in sight. In fact, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that, on our current trajectory, we will return to $1 trillion annual budget deficits by the year 2022. This situation is untenable and threatens the Nation that we leave behind for our children and grandchildren.

As I stand here and look at these young adults, they are the ones that are going to have to pay for our lack of courage to do what we need to do to balance this budget and get our country and our spending under control.

The vast majority of Americans agree that the Federal Government should live within its means and that it should balance its budget the same way that American families do. That is why it was so disappointing that President Obama's FY 2015 budget proposal would increase Federal spending and never balance, despite calling for an additional $1.8 trillion in taxes from hardworking Americans. In fact, the President's budget proposal would add an additional $8.3 trillion to the national debt.

The American people and these children deserve better than this. That is why I am proud that my House Republican Budget colleagues and I have again acted where President Obama and the congressional Democrats failed to lead.

This Path to Prosperity is our vision to control Washington spending and to help get our economy moving again so Americans can get back to work. This responsible budget proposal would cut spending by $5.1 trillion, balance the budget in 10 years, and put us on a path to pay off our debt. We accomplish all of this without raising taxes on the hardworking American people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this budget proposal.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip, who has focused on these important issues successfully for a long time.

Mr. HOYER. I have focused on them; how successfully is an item of debate with myself.

I thank the ranking member for yielding.

This Republican budget, as I have said before, is an exercise in how not to achieve fiscal sustainability.

Both the Bowles-Simpson and Rivlin-Domenici bipartisan commissions determined that the responsible approach to achieving fiscal sustainability is through a combination of balanced deficit reduction and strategic investments in long-term economic growth.

The Bowles-Simpson report says: ''We must invest in education, infrastructure, and high-value research and development to help our economy grow, keep us globally competitive, and make it easier for business to create jobs.''

The chairman of the Budget Committee voted against Bowles-Simpson.

This budget disinvests in those priorities, which will help us create jobs and grow our middle class. It undercuts our ability to invest in economic competitiveness and the growth we need to secure the goal of a sustainable fiscal future.

At the same time, the Republican budget does not follow the bipartisan commission's framework for achieving deficit savings: a balanced approach that combines new revenue with spending reductions.

There are no new revenues in this budget, and its spending cuts are severe and irresponsible, cutting even deeper than the painful sequester.

As I said yesterday, GOP Appropriations Committee Chairman HAL ROGERS called those sequester levels ''unrealistic and ill-conceived,'' to which the chairman then rose and said: He said that last year.

He may have said it last year, but the proposals you make are unchanged from last year, essentially; and this year, just a few days ago, he said your cuts were draconian.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I believe the gentleman is supposed to make his remarks to the chairman.

Mr. HOYER. He is correct.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I regret the chairman was taking my remarks personally. Of course, they were meant simply from a policy perspective of how bad the policy is, not the chairman himself, who is a wonderful individual.

In closing, let me say I urge every one of my colleagues who is troubled about our deficits and debt and who is deeply concerned about creating jobs and growing our economy to do the right thing: oppose this budget.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has called the numbers in this budget draconian, apparently intends to vote for it. Mr. Chairman, I don't understand that. If I thought, as I do, that these numbers were draconian, the only alternative I would have is to vote ''no.''

I lament the fact that we are not addressing in a bipartisan, comprehensive way putting America on a fiscally sustainable path. That would be the best economic stimulus that we could do for America. What a shame that, again, we have wasted that opportunity.

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

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

Let me just pick up where Mr. HOYER left off and ask the question: Why would the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee call this Republican budget draconian? After all, the chairman of the Budget Committee has said today: Don't worry. Actually, we're going to continue to grow the government just a little more slowly.

But what that ignores is the fact that the portion of the budget that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has jurisdiction over is that portion of the budget that we have used historically in this country to make investments that help our economy grow. They are investments in our kids' education, from early education, to K–12, to college education.

That is the part of the budget that we have used to invest in research and development with discoveries at places like NASA that have had huge spinoff benefits for the rest of the country and the economy, investments that actually helped lead to the Internet, that have been hugely beneficial to our economy. That portion of the budget doesn't grow a little less slowly. They cut that portion of the budget. In fact, as a share of our economy, it is cut by 40 percent below the lowest level since the 1950s, since we have been keeping track.

And so that is why we are saying that our global economic competitors are going to be cheering this Republican budget. We are talking about we would like to see a Make It In America agenda. This is a ''make it everywhere except America'' agenda. This actually provides tax cuts for U.S. corporations that move jobs overseas, and yet it cuts investments in jobs and economic development right here at home. That is why it is so misguided. That is why the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee says it is draconian.

What is worse, it makes those cuts in our kids' education, basic R&D, and makes the cut in the senior prescription drug benefit while protecting these tax breaks for the most powerful and the very wealthy.

The chairman has referred a number of times to tax expenditures. In fact, he mentioned the other day that, on an annual basis, tax expenditures are over a trillion dollars, in fact, more per year than Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Some of those tax expenditures have worthy policy goals, but a lot of them are there because very powerful special interests have gotten an exemption for themselves to the kind of Tax Code that everybody else has to pay for.

What we have said is we should get rid of some of those tax breaks for the purpose of helping to reduce our deficit so we don't have to hit our kids' education so hard, so we don't have to disinvest from basic R&D, so we don't have to make the kind of cuts that the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee calls draconian. But, no, Republicans don't want to do that. They say every time you close a tax loophole, you have got to use it to reduce the tax rate for wealthier Americans. We don't say, if you identify a spending program that no longer makes sense, you have to go spend it somewhere else. But when it comes to special interest tax expenditures, that is exactly the Republican position. You can only use it to bring down tax rates for multimillionaires.

As a result, while the winners in this Republican budget are those folks at the very top, they sock it to everybody else. They sock it to seniors on Medicare; they sock it to our kids' education; and they sock it to the fundamental economic power of this country when they disinvest in the things that have helped make us a global power, and that is the wrong decision for America.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this Washington Republican budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let me try and translate for the viewer what is happening here.

Every time you hear the word ''invest,'' that means take from hardworking taxpayers and spend in Washington; and then when that is not enough, ''invest'' means borrow—nearly half of which is from other countries—from the next generation and spend in Washington.

Just so you know, when they keep saying invest, invest, invest, or you are not investing enough, disinvest, it means tax, borrow, and spend here in Washington, as if we know better how people should spend their money.

The analysis we hear about jobs lost and how this isn't going to work and it is going to cost all these jobs is the same analysis that said the stimulus was going to be a boon. It is the same analysis they said that if we just borrow and spend $780 billion in Washington on shovel-ready jobs, unemployment will never reach 10 percent and we will create millions of new jobs. It didn't work.

It all comes down to this. Rather than prioritize our spending, rather than holding the Federal Government accountable and more transparent to make sure that taxpayer dollars are being spent wisely and prudently, rather than balancing the budget and paying off debts so the next generation has a debt-free inheritance, rather than taking on the bloated Tax Code that is mired with special interest giveaways and tax breaks and loopholes, rather than opening up this incredible store of oil and gas that could give us a huge renaissance of more jobs and lower gas and home heating prices and a better foreign policy, rather than preserving our military and giving our troops what they need, rather than growing our economy and creating what is estimated by the CBO to give each person an average of $1,100 more in take-home pay because of that faster economic growth, rather than doing any of that, just do more of the same. Stick with the status quo.

That is what this rhetoric is. It is a straw man argument. It is basically an argument that says let's affix certain views to our opponents so that we can defeat these awful views that we say they have and win the debate by default so that we can stick with the status quo and keep doing more of the same.

□ 1415

Mr. Chairman, here is where we are headed. This debt, this red line is the status quo. This is where America is going. It is not a Republican or a Democrat thing. It is a math thing.

What we are saying with this budget is, the status quo isn't working. We can't do more of the same because we are headed in the wrong direction. Everybody in this country knows this.

This is our plan. It is actually a plan. Pay off the debt, grow jobs, and challenge the status quo. And that is why I urge adoption of this budget.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Good afternoon. The biggest challenge facing America today is a Federal Government that simply won't live within its means.

Now, spending cuts can get us back halfway to a balanced budget. But if we want to finish the job, we need to grow our economy so we can not only balance this budget, but begin paying down this dangerous $17 trillion national debt.

Under the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, the Joint Economic Committee, which I chair, provides analysis and recommendations about the goals and policies set forth in the Economic Report of the President to assist the House of Representatives in its consideration of this budget resolution.

During the next few moments, the members of the Joint Economic Committee will answer three questions:

Why has the Obama recovery been so weak and disappointing, when compared with past recoveries?

How would a gradual reduction of Federal spending relative to the size of our economy, as envisioned in the budget resolution, help hardworking Americans by accelerating economic growth, accelerating job creation, and increasing real wages?

And finally, how would the reforms envisioned in the Republican budget help Congress to make better tax and spending decisions in the future?

To call the current recovery a disappointment to the American people, well, it is an understatement. The current recovery ranks either dead last or near the bottom on virtually every economic measure when compared to other recoveries of the past half a century. The economy's poor performance has left the United States with an enormous growth gap.

Real gross domestic product, our economy, our output, has grown at slightly more than half the average of other recoveries. Not surprisingly, given the recovery's anemic rate of economic growth, private sector payroll employment, that is, jobs along Main Street, have also increased by only more than half the average of other recoveries.

If you look at the paychecks, what people have in their budget at home after taxes, well, for middle class Americans, for middle class people, their wages have only increased by one-third of the average of other recoveries, and less than half of the next-worst recovery.

So the middle class is struggling. But Wall Street, it is roaring. The S&P 500 Total Return Index, adjusted for inflation, has more than doubled. This, Mr. Chairman, is the recovery that left Main Street and middle class families behind.

The Joint Economic Committee has compared this recovery to the average of other recoveries over the last 50 years and has identified this dangerous growth gap.

And what is missing from the economy because of this disappointing recovery?

Our economy should be $1.3 trillion larger today, over $1 trillion larger today, if this had just been an average economic recovery, rather than dead last.

And had the number of jobs along Main Street grown at the average rate of others, we would have 5.7 million more Americans working today than what they are under this disappointing recovery.

Last month, we reached a milestone. The number of jobs along Main Street finally matched its peak from when the recession began. This milestone would be good news, except that it comes about 4 years late.

So after all these years, now 6 years, we are just back to breaking even on the number of jobs along Main Street.

If you look at the economy, proportionately, there are fewer adults working today than when the recession ended. We have actually gone backwards as an economy since the recovery supposedly began.

So no matter how you try to slice and dice the numbers, there is no hiding the fact that a smaller percentage of Americans are working today than when the recession ended.

Turning from jobs to income that hardworking families receive, this recovery, regrettably, is even more disappointing. Since the recession ended, real personal income per person has barely edged up. I think it is 3.8 percent, barely noticeable. That is less than half what it should be in an average recovery.

But what does it mean to an average family?

What it means is that the average person in America is missing over $3,000 a year from their paycheck. And an average family of four in America today is missing $1,086 a month from their family budget. Imagine that.

Imagine, for every family in America having an extra $1,000 a month to pay utilities, to save for college, for which costs are exploding, to pay for the new health care costs under the Affordable Care Act, to invest maybe in that new washer, dryer, repair that car.

$1,000 a month is missing from the average family because of the slow growth policies of the White House and, regrettably, congressional Democrats.

That is why middle class families are being left behind. That is why we can no longer stay the course in America. Families like this are missing too much money for Washington to continue to do the same old things that leave them behind.

I could fill this entire hour with different statistics that make the same point, but by every measure the recovery is so disappointing. The question is, why? What is different about it?

Well, some blame the housing bubble, its collapse and the financial panic, for the persistent weakness in our labor markets. Recoveries following the collapse of a debt-financed asset price bubble like this are typically slower than our recovery. We know that.

While the collapse of the housing bubble undoubtedly has had some lingering effects, it is not the main factor, let alone the only factor for this disappointing recovery.

What is unique about this recovery is the combination of the slow growth economic policies that President Obama has pursued.

For example, looking back from 1982 to 2000, Federal spending declined as a percentage of the economy and the private sector boomed, creating more than 37 million jobs.

Under President Obama, the opposite happened. Federal spending exploded to a post-World War II high of 24 percent of the economy, and we lost jobs.

Presidents Kennedy and Reagan, they reduced the aftertax cost for new business investment. The Joint Economic Committee has shown that there is a strong correlation between when businesses invest in building equipment and software and the creation of real jobs along Main Street.

In contrast, President Obama increased taxes on successful small businesses, on capital gains, and dividends, and slowed this recovery.

Looking back, Presidents Clinton and Reagan took a balanced approach toward environmental, health, and safety regulations. By contrast, the Obama administration has launched a regulatory tsunami; red tape at the highest levels the last 3 years, historically high, and that slowed job creation along Main Street.

Presidents Kennedy, Reagan, and Clinton opened new markets for American sales through international trade agreements. Aside from completing the agreements left unfinished by President Bush, and despite having a first-rate trade team in place, opening new markets, tearing down the ''America Need Not Apply'' sign, allowing our companies' workers to compete on a level playing field, that is now stalled under this White House.

Presidents Kennedy, Reagan, and Clinton didn't burden a weak economy with costly new entitlement programs. By contrast, President Obama rammed the Affordable Care Act through Congress on party-line votes.

The controversial Affordable Care Act is heightening uncertainty, boosting taxes by more than $1 trillion, undermining key industries like medical devices and small businesses, and causing millions of Americans, including families in my community, to lose access to doctors and to health insurance plans that they liked.

Now they are paying more for a plan they didn't ask for, and are forced to do it or pay a tax.

Notice that these past approaches to taxes and regulations, international trade were taken by both Republican and Democrat Presidents, approaches that both parties have recognized as good for our economy. Yet President Obama's actions remain remarkably out of sync with those sound policies.

He continues to stay the course, while millions of Americans, they can't find full-time work. Millions more have just given up looking for work. Fewer and fewer people are in the workforce.

It is not the elderly who are retiring, it is younger people, college graduates who spent all that time and all that money, and now they are working behind a cash register.

You have got middle class Americans, again, missing over $1,000 from their monthly budget that could be helping them meet their needs because of the President's economic policies.

What we do know, and what is incorporated in the Republican budget, is an economic policy mix that would do the opposite. It would ignite a boom in our economy through simple and well-known policy, the sound dollar that protects families against inflation and losing their purchasing power.

Gradual decline of Federal spending as a percentage of the economy, that is a key one. Tax reform that lowers the aftertax cost for business investment, grows our economy; balanced regulation and opening new markets around the world for American companies and workers—that is the best way to strengthen our economy, create millions of new jobs, and get America back on the right track again.

The budget resolution proposed by Republicans in the House says no more slow growth. No more stay the course. We will not settle for a second-rate economy.

Our families deserve better. They deserve $1,000 more a month, and this is the path to get us there.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, the budget offered by our Republican colleagues is not, by any stretch of the imagination, the solution to our problems.

It is the problem, because this is not a budget; it is a retreat. It is a retreat from the high ideals, noble goals, and bold dreams that have made this country so great.

As the author and columnist Nicholas Kristof recently pointed out, a new ranking of livability in 132 countries shows that the United States has fallen to 16th, fallen. But apparently, our Republican friends think that is just a little too high.

We now rank 24th in inequality in the attainment of education. But the Republican budget would cut Pell grants that help low-income students afford college.

We rank 29th in life expectancy, and 24th in nutrition and basic medical care, and the Ryan budget would cut funding for food stamps and Medicaid, and raise the eligibility of Medicare.

□ 1430

We rank just 70th in health, and Republicans want to repeal the Affordable Care Act and snatch health care coverage away from millions who just received it.

This is not a budget, Mr. Chair. This is a call to Americans to dream small and aim low. This is an attempt to shift costs onto the shoulders of the middle class, the young, and the elderly in a way that would cripple our ability to compete.

I believe we are a better people than this and a greater Nation. Look at just about any poll on the subject these days, and you can see that Americans are most concerned about jobs and growing our American economy. What the American people want to see from the Congress is a plan that will help accelerate the growth of our economy and create good jobs, but the crushing austerity of the Ryan plan would do just the opposite.

This makes no sense because we know what actually works and what actually grows jobs and what doesn't. We have seen it, and we have lived it. The record speaks for itself. It shows whose ideas actually work in the real world and whose don't.

Since 1961, the private sector has added a total of 66 million jobs. Twenty-four million of them were added under Republican Presidents, and a whopping 42 million were added under Democratic Presidents.

Let's take a look at this chart. Under President Clinton, this country grew a whopping 22.6 million jobs, and he left office running an annual surplus of over $128 billion projected to grow into the trillions. Then, under the 8 years of President Bush, we added only 1.2 million jobs—what a stark difference—and the budget surplus was turned into an annual $1.4 trillion deficit.

When President Obama took office, our economy was shedding over 800,000 jobs a month, and the Bush administration left office with the worst job creation record in 75 years. Nevertheless, in the 5 years since President Obama took office, we have created 4.7 million jobs, nearly four times what was created under President Bush, and we have more than halved the annual deficit.

The actions swiftly implemented by the President and Democratic Congress quickly turned the economy around, and job losses diminished; and, as this next chart shows, those actions have worked. We have been gaining jobs for the last 49 months.

In that time, the economy has added 8.9 million private sector jobs, regaining more than all of the jobs lost during the great recession.

This chart shows what I call the deep red Republican valley, where we were shedding over 800,000 jobs a month. Since President Obama took office with his economic plan, we have been growing jobs.

Democrats understand that, in order to maintain our leadership in the world economy, America needs to continually sharpen its competitive edge; and we understand that, while investing in the future may carry some risk, refusing to do so carries an iron-bound certainty, the certainty of a slow decline and crippling decay.

Instead of investing in the future and in the next generation, the Ryan budget guts funding for education, workforce training, critical infrastructure, scientific research, public health, clean energy, advanced manufacturing, and public safety, all the investments needed to make the American economy of tomorrow competitive and put us on the cutting edge.

Instead of fully preparing the next generation for tomorrow's economy, the Ryan budget cuts funding for early childhood education, K–12 education, special education, and higher education. It slashes grants and charges students more interest on their college loans.

It lets the higher education tax cut expire, saddling our young people with even more student loan debt; and we know now that student loan debt is now larger than credit card debt in our country. It is a crippling concern.

Sadly, the cuts extend far beyond education. The Ryan budget proposes draconian cuts to nutrition assistance, home heating assistance, and rental assistance. SNAP, which provides food security for millions of American children, is cut more than $135 billion, and 200,000 fewer women and children would get basic nutrition through the WIC program.

We can all agree that the economic recovery has been too slow, and yet this Republican budget cuts critical investments to create jobs and enhance our competitiveness.

In 2015 alone, the budget cuts $52 billion from efforts to update our crumbling transportation infrastructure. That amounts to over 1.5 million jobs. The budget cuts the National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation, threatening our edge in medical and scientific innovation.

The Republican budget even eliminates funding for the arts, humanities, and public broadcasting, which support the institutions that enrich our lives and chronicle our cultural and artistic heritage.

Further, the Ryan budget would cut health care funding and increase costs for seniors. It would raise the age to qualify for Medicare to 67 and bring back the dreaded doughnut hole that leaves too many seniors to choose between their medication and putting food on the table.

After nearly a century of talking about doing it, we have finally expanded health care to cover more Americans. Yes, there have been bumps along the way, as there have been with the implementation of transformational social programs, like with Medicare and Part D prescription drugs; but the important thing is that it is working.

Already, 7 million people have signed up through the health insurance marketplaces, and another 3 million young adults have been able to remain on their parents' health plans until they turn 26.

Under the Ryan plan, these 10 million Americans who thought, at long last, they had reliable and affordable health care insurance would have it snatched away from them, but it is even worse than that.

By 2024, a staggering total of 40 million people would become uninsured under the Ryan plan. The CBO projects that 25 million people, who would have gained coverage under the Affordable Care Act, will, instead, have to go without it, and there are another 14 to 20 million people who would lose insurance as a result of the block granting and Medicaid cutting laid out in the Ryan budget.

After 53 failed attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act, the Ryan budget hopes to succeed in taking us backwards to those dark days when people with preexisting conditions couldn't get coverage, when protections against lifetime limits didn't exist.

No-cost preventive services, like mammograms and cervical cancer screenings, would be no more. It would take us back to a time when women were charged more just because they were women and when the insurance companies called the shots.

From the smallest children to the oldest seniors who rely on Medicaid for health care and to cover long-term health bills, the Ryan Medicaid cuts will negatively affect literally millions. Women who make up almost 70 percent of adult Medicaid beneficiaries will especially feel the sting. The most vulnerable will be hurt the most.

Mr. Chair, budgets are about choices, and we face a truly watershed choice now. We can choose to continue to do things that have lifted the hopes of millions, provided unparalleled opportunities, and made our country the envy of the world.

We can choose to continue to help those who need it the most and provide a measure of care to those who have the least; or we can choose to go down a radically different road, concede the future to the bold, defer to others, expect less, and turn our faces away from the downtrodden and the dispossessed.

Yes, we can make that choice; but please, Mr. Chair, let's stop referring to this as a budget and call it what it really is, a retreat, an act of surrender. It is giving up on the America we have always known.

This is not a blueprint. It is a black eye. We are a better people than this and a greater Nation. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.'' America does not retreat.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a key member of the Joint Economic Committee, a businessman who knows that more than half of Americans today believe we are still in a recession, that they have given up and feel like this country is surrendering, and he knows the impact.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I want to just speak for a few minutes in favor of the Republican budget resolution. This is a budget resolution that stands in stark contrast today compared to what the President has offered in his budget.

It is a budget that balances. It is a budget that is responsible. It is a budget that is thoughtful. It addresses the spending side of the ledger to be more fiscally responsible, and it also includes, Mr. Chair, a roadmap for progrowth tax reform to create a healthier economy.

Yes, we need to spend less, but our national debt and our budget imbalance have grown so big that we can't fix them alone by simply addressing spending. We have also got to grow our economy and put people back to work to bring in more revenue.

We are suffering from a growth gap. Normally, the economy doubles every 20 years; but because of excessive Washington spending, budget deficits, high debt, these onerous regulations that come out of Washington, and higher taxes, the economy is now set to double every 30 years; so we have literally added 10 years onto our growth cycle.

What does that mean? The growth gap means this, Mr. Chair: it means, for disposable income, since the end of the recession nearly 5 years ago, every man, woman, and child has been robbed of almost $3,200 every year.

It means that a family of four has been robbed of about $13,000. That is an additional average of aftertax income and disposable income. That is real money to a family. What could you do with $13,000?

Our economy is performing way below average. We can do a lot better than performing below average. This budget expands opportunities for American workers by equipping them with the skills that they need to succeed in a 21st century economy.

It lays a path to reform a broken Tax Code by simplifying and lowering tax rates, by eliminating special interest loopholes, and by moving us to an internationally competitive tax system, so that U.S. employers can compete fairly in a global economy.

We need commonsense tax reform to keep American businesses headquartered here in the U.S., so that we can sell to customers overseas, bring the earnings back, keep our headquarter companies here, keep the innovation here, and keep the jobs here.

This budget also cuts cronyism, corporate welfare, and waste. It ends the Dodd-Frank bailouts of big banks. It eliminates billions in corporate welfare, and very importantly, it protects and strengthens important programs that our seniors rely on and ensures that these programs will be there for future generations.

It is time to stop spending money that we don't have. We can no longer borrow 40 cents of every dollar that we spend.

Finally, Mr. Chair, this budget not only balances by growing our economy and making government more efficient, it also puts the country back on a path to actually paying down the national debt because the longer we wait to address the drivers of our debt, the harder our choices will be later.

This is a budget proposal and a blueprint that puts the country back on track for a balanced and responsible path. I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of the Republican budget.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I now yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), who is a champion of working families.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Chair, since February of 2010, more than 8 million jobs have been create in the our Nation. Over the last year, the unemployment rate has fallen by four-fifths of a percentage point.

These numbers demonstrate the significant progress we have made in growing our economy and putting Americans back to work after the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

However, there is still far more we can do to strengthen our economy and begin to reduce the growing income inequality in our great Nation.

□ 1445

Sadly, instead of proposing a budget that would help us expand the middle class, Republicans have, again, offered a budget that seeks to help the wealthy at the expense of the many. Just as in the years past, the 2015 Ryan budget would slash nondefense discretionary spending without regard for the devastating consequences these cuts would have on the lives of Main Street Americans.

This year's Ryan budget would cut an additional $791 billion from the postsequester funding caps from fiscal year 2006 through fiscal year 2024. As in the past, the budget also offers an ideological wish list of policies that will increase the unemployment rate, hurt low-income families, and harm our seniors—all to protect the interests of the wealthiest among us.

The Ryan budget does not extend emergency unemployment benefits, even though these benefits would help our broader economy, as well as the millions of families that have suffered the devastating consequences of long-term unemployment.

Never before has Congress failed to provide Federal unemployment insurance when the unemployment rate—especially for the long-term unemployed—is as high as it is today.

This budget would also hit middle class families with thousands of dollars in additional taxes every year, while lowering the top tax rate for the rich.

The Ryan budget would repeal the Affordable Care Act, taking health care from millions of middle-income Americans. It would gut Medicaid, taking health care from millions of our poorest families, and it would destroy the commitments we have made to our Nation's seniors by turning Medicare into a voucher program.

This budget would also be devastating for our Federal workforce, the people who care for our veterans, who protect our homeland, who ensure the food we eat is safe, and who conduct the research on which we are relying to find new treatments for cancer and other devastating diseases.

Let me remind my colleagues that the Republicans have been attacking our Federal employees for years, treating them as if they were the piggybank for deficit reduction.

Federal workers have already sacrificed $140 billion towards reducing this Nation's deficit through a 3-year pay freeze and retirement contribution increases. Now, House Republicans want to squeeze another $125 billion out of these middle class workers. How will they do this?

The Ryan budget would increase Federal employee pension contributions to 6.53 percent, an increase of more than 5.5 percentage points for many current Federal workers, but it would not increase any benefits provided to these same workers.

Of course, proposals for increasing the contributions Federal employees make to their pension funds are not new. This year's budget also includes a provision prohibiting new Federal employees from enrolling in the retirement system that has served Federal employees since the 1920s.

Let me make this clear. Under the Ryan budget, one leg of the so-called three-legged stool on which Federal employees have relied for security in their retirement would be ripped out from under them. New Federal employees would be left to rely solely on the savings they accumulate in their Thrift Savings Plan and on Social Security.

As if that wasn't enough, the Ryan budget would also eliminate the student loan repayment program for Federal workers, even though this is a vital recruitment and retention incentive used to attract the best and brightest to serve the American people.

The budget also proposes to cut the Federal workforce by 10 percent. Contrary to the claims of some that our government is growing out of control, the Federal Government has actually cut 85,000 jobs in the last 12 months.

An additional arbitrary workforce reduction isn't likely to yield the savings the Republicans expect because much of the current work of the government would simply be shifted to more expensive contractors. Such a reduction would, however, impede the government's ability to provide needed services to the American people in a timely manner.

I agree that Congress must act to put our fiscal house in order, but we must do this in a balanced manner that increases economic stability and certainty in the marketplace. We must not do this on the backs of our neediest citizens, and we must not do this on the backs of the Federal employees who make government work for our Nation every day.

Republicans fail to understand that we simply cannot cut our way to prosperity. Expanding opportunity and investing in America today will increase government revenues in the years to come and put our economy back on the path to prosperity.

For the good of our Nation, I urge my colleagues to reject the Ryan budget.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we hear all the votes and the claims from our Democrat friends about how great the economy is going and what great leadership they have shown from the White House to get people back to work. They claim millions and millions and millions of jobs, but Americans don't feel that way and for good reason.

Let's put all this job surge in perspective. Now, here is the average economy recoveries—because America does face tough times from time to time. We normally bounce back pretty strongly, but not this time and not under this President.

If you look at job creation in the last 4 years, this is the average of the other recoveries. This is the Reagan average. That was real economic growth, and as you can tell, only twice in the last 4 years or more has the Obama recovery even met average.

Only 2 months out of more than 4 years has this recovery even been merely average, and it has never reached the real strong growth of the Reagan recovery because unemployment, by the way, reached higher points in this recession.

So, clearly, by underperforming, by being so disappointing, what this chart really shows is the millions of Americans—middle class Americans—who have been left behind by this disappointing recovery. You look at this and you wonder: Well, so what does this mean to the economy?

In the next chart, I will show you what is missing. People back home and people all across America are saying that you have got to get this economy going, it is just hurting us so badly; but because, again, this President and our Democratic friends choose to slow the growth of America, we are now missing, gosh, almost $4 trillion—$3.7 trillion, to be exact, is missing from our economy.

That should be in our Main Street businesses. It ought to be in our small businesses. It ought to be driving our economy, instead of trailing China. Instead of being lectured by the rest of the world, America should have a strong economy by now. This is a disappointing recovery.

The Republican budget actually starts to restrain spending and has tax reform to grow the economy. While you have heard some claim that trillions of dollars of cuts will devastate the Federal safety net, the truth is that the Republican budget over the next 10 years grows by about 3 percent a year. That is because America's population is growing as well.

Only in Washington is growth and spending a cut. What it does is it cuts the waste, fraud, and abuse in this big, flat, bloated government, and it makes smart investments, though, in defense, in Medicare, and in infrastructure.

Our Democrat friends are crying today for more emergency unemployment benefits, but those benefits are for when the unemployment rate is going up and getting higher, but, today, in all 50 States, that rate is going down and going lower. What we should be focusing on is getting people back to work, not a check, but a good-paying job.

Instead, the White House has obstinately blocked the Keystone XL pipeline and those thousands of jobs. They have obsessively pushed the Affordable Care Act on our small businesses who are cutting hours, cutting workers, cutting wages, and hurting the economy—and then all the new regulation.

The Republican budget preserves Medicare and Medicaid, and for Medicaid, which is our health care for the poor, the budget grows for them, but it does an important thing. It gives back to the States the ability to tailor health care for their States to meet their patients in their communities and in their regions. That is the way it ought to be done.

The Democrats hollow out our defense, hollow out our intelligence system, and ignore our veterans. The Republican budget restores our military strength to the presequester levels. We focus on our veterans in America. They deserve no less.

The Republican budget saves Medicare both for those who are in or near retirement, but, more importantly, for those who wonder if Medicare will be there for them. It offers options for younger workers, including just staying in traditional Medicare or tailoring a plan that is right for them and their families.

The Democrats ignore the challenges facing America. They ignore this disappointing recovery. They say: just stay the course, the country is doing fine.

But the country isn't doing fine. Our families, they aren't doing fine at all, and they are missing $1,000 a month from their paychecks because this White House and this Democrat Senate continue to stay the course.

Let's change the course for America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. May I inquire, Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on this side?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield myself 1 minute.

Now, my good friend from Texas pointed out that the recovery has been slow, but at least it is a recovery. It is not a loss of jobs, as we see in this chart, the long, red valley of job loss, shedding over 800,000 jobs a month when President Obama took office, and we have job growth.

I would like to see it stronger and better, too, but at least it is job growth. The former President Bush left us with a $1.4 trillion deficit when he inherited a surplus and the worst job growth record in 75 years.

I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Maryland (Mr. DELANEY). He is a former CEO of a public company which has brought great expertise to the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding me this time to stand up, rise, and speak out against Mr. RYAN's budget.

While I have many significant policy objections that are embedded in Mr. RYAN's budget, my main objection is based on the fact that the budget is built upon a fundamentally flawed analytical framework. I think it is important to focus on that when we think about budgets, Mr. Chairman.

The fundamental driver—or the goal of the Ryan budget is to have our deficits at zero in 10 years. I believe Mr. RYAN does this because he thinks it is good political optics, and it sounds good. The problem with this goal is it is fundamentally, economically and fiscally, the wrong goal. It is unnecessary, and it is unrealistic.

It is unrealistic based on the fact of the demographics the country is facing. We are somewhere through the midway of this aging of the population that we like to talk about, Mr. Chairman, where the population of people over 65—our citizens over 65 will double from 1980 to 2020 to 2030. This puts tremendous burdens on the Federal Government.

But it is also an unnecessary goal. A zero deficit is an unnecessary goal if you think about the basic math of deficits and debt. The reason our debt has grown to such a significant level in this country is because, for the last several years, our deficits, as expressed as a percentage of the economy, have exceeded the economic growth on an annual basis for the economy. The math of that results in a growing debt, which is problematic.

Unless we change the direction of our debt, we will have very limited financial flexibility in the future, particularly if interest rates go up; but, in fact, if we get our deficits to a rate below the rate of growth in the economy, then definitionally, the debt in this country will go down.

Most experts agree that we should be targeting deficits of 1 to 2 percent and economic growth of at least 2 to 3 percent. That will cause our debt to go down to historical levels and give this country the financial flexibility that it needs.

So if you seek an unrealistic goal or if you seek the wrong goal in budgeting and forecasting, you are forced to overcorrect. There are two ways to overcorrect in budgets—or at least in the Federal budget. The first way you can overcorrect is to raise taxes to an excessive level. The second way you can overcorrect is to cut spending to unrealistic levels.

Mr. RYAN, obviously, doesn't choose to raise taxes. In fact, he cuts taxes which, again, is an unusual and puzzling conclusion, particularly based on the fact that our tax revenues as a percentage of the economy across the last several years have been lower than the historical 50-year average for this country.

So to think that we should be cutting taxes against that backdrop, again, is a puzzling decision, but since he chooses to cut taxes, he is then forced to overcorrect on the spending side.

To put this into perspective, in very, very simple perspective, the Ryan budget takes discretionary spending, things like education, infrastructure, and investments in basic medical research, to 1.7 percent of our economy.

□ 1500

This is in the context of a historical average for these same investments of 3 percent. We can't really talk about growing or shrinking numbers in absolute dollars; we always have to talk about these numbers, if we want any kind of budget integrity, in terms of a percentage of the economy.

He effectively cuts in half our investments in infrastructure, education, and basic medical research as a percentage of the economy as compared to the 50-year average. That is the overcorrection he does because he is trying to achieve a goal that is both unrealistic and unnecessary.

It is not clear to me, Mr. Chairman, someone who has spent his whole career in the private sector building companies, how anyone with reasonable cognitive abilities would think, in light of the challenges this country faces to create jobs, as we have discussed, to compete in a global economy and to transfer our economy based on what is happening with technology, that it is the right answer—that it is the right answer to cut our investments in research, in infrastructure and education by half.

That is the fundamental flaw in the analytical framework that is embedded behind Mr. RYAN's budget, which only reinforces my conclusion that this is a political document; this is not a substantive document.

This is not a document that was created by looking at the facts, thinking about economics, understanding how deficits and debt interrelate and what we need to actually make this country competitive, create jobs, and put ourselves on a long-term fiscally sound trajectory.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. May I inquire as to the time remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Amid all the predictions of doom and gloom, the truth is the Republican budget grows by 3 percent a year over the next decade. It doesn't shrink; it grows. The population grows, and so that makes sense.

It does cut wasteful spending, and there is a lot of wasteful spending to cut. More importantly, it grows the economy and tackles the biggest challenge America has, which is a broken Tax Code. This resolution begins to rein in the IRS.

This budget begins to save Social Security and Medicare for families and younger generations so they can count on them, and it makes sure that we don't hollow out our defense. This is the only budget that balances. More importantly, it is the only budget that says that is not enough. It begins to pay down the national debt, and it says our goal in America will be to have a debt-free America. Think about that. After all these years of dangerous deficits, America could be debt free, economically the strongest in the world, and financially the strongest in the world.

But today, if we don't change course, look what happens. Today, a baby born in Woodlands, Texas, their share of the debt is almost $50,000. A new baby owes Uncle Sam a Lexus. If we don't change our ways, by the time that child is 13, that child will owe Uncle Sam a second Lexus. By the time that child is 22, finishing college and beginning to start their life and live their dreams, they will owe Uncle Sam another Lexus.

Now, the good news is young people don't actually buy luxury sedans for the Federal Government, but they pay the price in a very different way. All that debt slows the economy, so there will be fewer jobs for them to compete for; and all of that debt means higher taxes and higher interest rates, so there will be fewer jobs to compete for, and they will have less money in their paycheck as a result.

Our Democrat friends say: that is fine, let's stay the course; let's not change anything; the economy is great; our deficits are fantastic, and our country is going the right direction.

But that is not the truth in America today. We need to spend less as a government in a smart way. We need to grow the economy in a strong way. We can't ignore the challenges facing us. We have to save Medicare and Social Security. This is the budget that grows America's future and doesn't shrink it. This is the budget that America needs. We can't afford to stay the course.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman from the great State of Texas says that the Republicans have been cutting the deficit, but the facts are different.

Under President Clinton, we created a stunning 22 million jobs, and he left this country with a surplus. Under George Bush, in 8 years, he only created 1.2 million jobs and left us with a $1.4 trillion deficit. And in the 5 years that President Obama has been in office, he has created 4.7 million jobs, which is 5 times more than his predecessor did, and cut the deficit in half. So the record of cutting deficits is on the side of the Democratic administrations and policies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a newly elected Member and a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Chairman, I have owned a business and know what it is like to be a job creator in this country, and I am very proud of it.

This week, House Democrats introduced our budget alternative, a budget dedicated to the priorities of the American people: creating jobs, raising new ladders of opportunity, and building an economy that works for everyone. It is in stark contrast to the broken priorities of the Ryan budget. The Ryan budget will take $2,000 more in taxes away from American families—that is working class families—without closing one tax loophole for the corporate rich.

The Ryan budget is an attack on seniors, students, workers, and middle class families, all for the sake of protecting loopholes for the wealthy and special interests. The budget will have a devastating impact on jobs. Republicans would lay waste to our commitments to education, lifesaving medical research, clean energy, modern infrastructure, and high-tech manufacturing. The Ryan budget will cripple our growth and surrender the future jobs of American kids to other nations like China, India, and Russia. The Ryan budget devastates our middle class.

The Ryan budget even rejects comprehensive immigration reform. The Ryan budget denies people the important bipartisan legislation that would create 120,000 American jobs each year for the first 10 years should that legislation be passed and empower small businesses, spur innovation, supercharge the economy, and reduce the deficit by over $900 billion.

The Ryan budget is nothing less than a job-killing recipe. Democrats are strengthening the middle class, embracing economic growth, and we want responsible deficit reduction. Comprehensive immigration reform is investing in the future and creating jobs for our future, creating jobs for Americans.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I might point out that President Bush did not leave this country with a deficit; Speaker NANCY PELOSI and her Democrat colleagues left this Nation with a deficit. And it continued to grow. The first year of their governance, the deficit doubled. The second year, it tripled. Then it went to a trillion dollars, trillion dollars, and trillion dollars. And only under a Republican House have we started to cut the growth in the deficit today.

The truth is, on immigration reform, Democrats held the Presidency, the House and the Senate, and they did nothing. When it comes to reducing the deficit, they held the House, the Senate, and the White House, and they did nothing. When it comes time to grow the economy and give the middle class a fighting chance, they held the House and the Senate and the Presidency and did nothing.

Let's not stay the course, because that has got us going the wrong direction. We need to change it. The Republican budget does that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. May I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I was sitting in my office downstairs, and I heard Mr. BRADY make the extraordinary claim that it was the Pelosi leadership that led to the doubling of deficits.

I would remind the gentleman, as he ought to know and I am sure he does know, not a single economic plan was passed in 2007 or 2008 that changed the Bush economic plan, not a single bill. And to make the assertion that the deepest recession he and I have experienced, Mr. Chairman, in our lifetimes, which occurred under the Bush administration with Bush economic policies was somehow the responsibility of a Pelosi-led Congress is absolutely absurd, incorrect, and the gentleman ought to know better.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, I know the facts hurt. I know they hurt, Mr. Whip. The deficit doubled the first year under Speaker PELOSI and your leadership.

Mr. HOYER. Does the gentleman refer to 2007?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. The deficit tripled under your leadership.

The CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman from Texas has the time. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I know the facts hurt. I know these deficits hurt real people. And I know the Democrats now want to revise history: they didn't create the deficits; they didn't create this slow economic recovery; everything is going great. But it is not.

You created record deficits. You took what was turning into lower and lower deficits and a trend toward a balanced budget and you exploded it, and our American families are hurting today. Millions more can't find a job. Young people with college degrees are working behind a cash register. The deficits are frightening and scaring America. It came under Democrat leadership and it has continued under this Democrat Presidency. I know the facts hurt, but those are the facts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield myself 30 seconds.

The facts speak for themselves. George Bush's administration left us with a $1.4 trillion deficit. They cut taxes, led us into two wars, and they blew the deficit.

Look at the Democratic deficit. We had a surplus from Bill Clinton, and President Obama halved the deficit.

I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I tell the gentleman from Texas, I do know the statistics: 800,000 jobs lost in the last month of the Bush administration; 800,000 jobs in 1 month, the worst job production since Herbert Hoover under the Bush administration.

Yes, this administration has had tough times because we inherited such a struggling, devastated economy from the Bush administration. The gentleman knows those figures are accurate, and he ought to admit those facts.

The budget deficit went up 87 percent under George Bush when he inherited a balanced budget. He inherited a balanced budget. The gentleman ought to be truthful with the American people, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The President doesn't allocate funding. He doesn't spend one dime Congress doesn't give him. A Republican Congress balanced the budget for President Clinton. And under President Bush, a Democrat Congress doubled and tripled and then went to trillion-dollar deficits. This Congress, your legislative branch, you passed a nearly trillion-dollar stimulus without one Republican vote. You passed trillions of dollars with the Affordable Care Act that has continued to destroy the economy and drive deficits even higher. That is the truth. Those are the facts. I know they hurt, but we are not revising history today. We are talking about changing the course of this country away from deficits, away from this second-rate economy toward a country that actually can grow, and grow stronger.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The Chair again reminds Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, we don't have the time, but I would like to take the time at some point in time to discuss the facts with the gentleman from Texas, and I will take a Special Order out to do exactly that, to discuss the economic success of Democratic administrations and Republican administrations and bringing down the deficit.

And let me say further, I will repeat to the gentleman, no change in the Bush economic program was affected in 2007 and 2008 because George Bush was the President and would have vetoed anything we passed. So the representation to the contrary, Mr. Chairman, is inaccurate.

□ 1515

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Whip, I am your huckleberry. I will be glad to have the debate with you in a Special Order or anywhere else. The fact is this country is struggling. Your leadership has failed us as a Democrat governance in this White House. It is time to change course.

The CHAIR. Again, the Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just say: When do you stop blaming the former President? For goodness' sake, we are in the fifth year of the Obama Presidency. Here is the problem. The first year of Ronald Reagan's second term, the growth rate, the economic growth rate, was 7½ percent. For goodness' sake. Ronald Reagan was able to turn things around that quickly. We are meandering along, bouncing along at a pathetic 2 percent growth rate. We could be so much better if we had the right policies in place and pass the right kind of budget and the right kind of vision for the country. That is the point the gentleman is making. Quit blaming George Bush. We are in the fifth year of the Obama Presidency. If you want to look to a comparison: the fifth year of Ronald Reagan's Presidency, a 7½ percent growth rate.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Our economy is recovering from the depths of the Great Recession, but too many Americans are still left behind. This budget kicks them even further back with draconian cuts. We were sent here to create jobs, not eliminate them.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Ryan austerity plan would slow our economy and cost us jobs over the next 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget would make life harder for the vulnerable Americans from cradle to grave. It represents a choice to be less competitive and less compassionate.

Voting for this budget is voting to slow our recovery, lower our hopes, and dim our dreams. It is not a budget; it is a retreat, and Americans deserve better.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this draconian Republican budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I would inquire of the gentlelady if you would like to make your concluding remarks, or have you done so?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I have made mine within the timeframe we had.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I will close out as well, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, if you like the direction the country is going, I guess there is no reason to change. If we want young people who don't believe they will ever earn as much or have a standard of living as their parents do, let's just stay the course. If we want a Nation with a second-rate economy where millions of people have given up looking for work, where the average family is missing over $1,000 every month from their paycheck, let's just stay the course. If we want a Nation that continues that debt and debt and debt and debt—we are now becoming financially weaker each year rather than financially stronger—well then let's stay the course. If you want a Medicare and Social Security that a lot of younger people have given up hope will be there for them and many seniors are worried won't last for them either, well then let's just stay the course. And if we want a President who will hollow out our defense and our intelligence, who will continue to waste money the taxpayers have earned, then let's just stay that course.

Or we can take a different direction for this Nation. We can impose smart spending cuts that actually get us back toward a balanced budget. We can grow the economy through tax reform and balanced regulation that actually gets Main Street pumping again, gives people hope again.

We believe there is a brighter future for America, but first it starts with living within our means, it begins with growing this economy, and it concludes with increasing the wages of women and men and fathers and sons and young people and women and minorities who now today have given up hope.

The Republican budget is about opportunity. It is about not giving up on America, it is about not settling for a second-rate economy in a financially strapped Nation that can no longer compete against China, Brazil, Europe, and our other competitors around the world. It really is about changing the direction of this Nation in a way that gives power to people, that gives power to Main Street, gives power to middle class families rather than taking it all for Washington.

We know the path we are on isn't working. We can no longer stay the course. It is time to change so the Republican budget spends less, grows the economy, solves the biggest challenges in America, and gives us hope that America can continue to be the strongest economy in the world through the next 100 years.

That is the goal America should be setting, that is the direction the Republican budget puts in place. It uses two smart, I think, revolutionary ideas: dynamic scoring, so we know the real-life effect of this budget and our growth; it focuses on controllable spending as a percentage of the economy, that is the right way to measure how we are doing as a Nation; and it uses a number of innovative approaches, again, to grow the economy, to shrink the deficit, and what I like most of all, it doesn't merely balance the budget, it puts us on a path to a debt-free America. That is something that can give us hope, that can give us opportunity, that is the direction that we ought to go.

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

The CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 96

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2015 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2024:

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

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

Fiscal year 2015: $2,533,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,676,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,789,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,890,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,014,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,148,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,294,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,456,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,626,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,807,452,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $0.
Fiscal year 2016: $0.
Fiscal year 2017: $0.
Fiscal year 2018: $0.
Fiscal year 2019: $0.
Fiscal year 2020: $0.
Fiscal year 2021: $0.
Fiscal year 2022: $0.
Fiscal year 2023: $0.
Fiscal year 2024: $0.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $2,842,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,858,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,957,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,059,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,210,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,360,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,460,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,587,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,660,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,706,695,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $2,920,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,889,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,949,261,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: $3,034,773,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,185,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,320,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,433,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,577,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,632,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,676,374,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: -$386,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$213,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$159,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$144,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$170,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$172,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$138,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$121,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$6,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $131,078,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: $18,304,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,627,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,172,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $19,411,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,773,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $20,227,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $20,449,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $20,822,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $20,981,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $21,089,365,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $13,213,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,419,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,800,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,860,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $14,080,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $14,427,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $14,579,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $14,940,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $15,080,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $15,176,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $528,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $566,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $573,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $597,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $584,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $611,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $624,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $611,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $638,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $653,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $640,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $669,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $661,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $687,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $672,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $706,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,796,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $38,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $40,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $41,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $42,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $43,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $44,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $45,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $46,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,667,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $47,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,624,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $27,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $28,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $29,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $29,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $30,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $31,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $31,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $32,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $33,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $33,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,304,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $3,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $2,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $1,851,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$16,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$1,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,188,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$6,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,699,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $34,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $35,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $33,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $36,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $38,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $36,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $38,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $39,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $40,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,752,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $19,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $20,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $18,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $19,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $19,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $20,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $20,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,131,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$3,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$14,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$4,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$18,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$23,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$24,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$6,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$28,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$3,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$26,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$4,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$20,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, -$4,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$23,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$5,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$24,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$5,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$25,793,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $34,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $68,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $74,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $75,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $77,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $78,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $79,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $80,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $81,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,872,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $83,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,024,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $14,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $15,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $15,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $15,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $15,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $15,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $15,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $15,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $15,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,490,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $16,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,910,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $73,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $82,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $86,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $89,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $85,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $86,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $87,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $89,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $90,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $92,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,926,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $419,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $416,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $367,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $377,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $375,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $376,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $377,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $390,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,404,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $415,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $405,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $419,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $418,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $433,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $432,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $449,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $447,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $472,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,312,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $519,196,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $519,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $558,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $558,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $570,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $590,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $591,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $651,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $651,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $692,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $692,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $737,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $738,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $815,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $817,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $836,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $837,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $859,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $866,262,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $505,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $505,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $487,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $490,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $489,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $487,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $492,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $484,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $493,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $490,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $512,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $508,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $520,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $529,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $530,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $525,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $525,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,225,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $31,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,138,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $57,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $153,027,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $152,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $164,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $163,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $162,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $174,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $173,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $179,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $183,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $182,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $195,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $192,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $189,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $188,262,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $54,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $56,932,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $56,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $56,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $58,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $60,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $62,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $64,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $66,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $69,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $71,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,568,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $23,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,064,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $21,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $23,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $24,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $24,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $25,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $26,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $27,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $27,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,491,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $365,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $416,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $416,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $482,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $482,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $553,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $553,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $611,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $611,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $659,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $659,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $693,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $693,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $723,805,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $723,805,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $751,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $751,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $770,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $770,124,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$36,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$47,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$36,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$51,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$45,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$54,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$49,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$56,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$53,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$61,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$58,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$64,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$61,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$66,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$63,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$68,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$66,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$65,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$64,338,000,000.
(20) Government-wide savings (930):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$14,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$1,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$30,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,482,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$38,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$27,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$46,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$35,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$55,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$44,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$63,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$53,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$75,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$64,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$87,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$75,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$117,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$96,353,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$78,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$78,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$83,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$83,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$83,974,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$83,974,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$84,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$84,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$91,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$91,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$93,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$93,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$98,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$98,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$101,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$101,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$105,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$105,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$113,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$113,422,000,000.
(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $85,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $29,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $29,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $29,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $29,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $29,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $11,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $4,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,827,000,000.

TITLE II—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS

SEC. 201. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

The following are the recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels for each of fiscal years 2030, 2035, and 2040 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—The appropriate levels of Federal revenues are as follows:
Fiscal year 2030: 18.8 percent.
Fiscal year 2035: 19.0 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 19.0 percent.

(2) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are not to exceed:
Fiscal year 2030: 18.5 percent.
Fiscal year 2035: 17.9 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 17.2 percent.

(3) DEFICITS.—The appropriate levels of deficits are not to exceed:
Fiscal year 2030: -0.3 percent.
Fiscal year 2035: -1.1 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: -1.8 percent.

(4) DEBT.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are not to exceed:
Fiscal year 2030: 43.0 percent.
Fiscal year 2035: 31.0 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 18.0 percent.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that only consists of a full repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REFORM OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms or replaces the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

SEC. 306. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that implements a trade agreement, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under Public Law 106–393 in the future and would not increase the deficit or direct spending for the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, or the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

TITLE IV—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 401. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic president reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the five years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This budget applies the lessons of welfare reform to both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid.

(B) For Medicaid, this budget assumes the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs, indexed for inflation and population growth. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that has tied the hands of State governments. Instead, each State would have the freedom and flexibility to tailor a Medicaid program that fits the needs of its unique population. Moreover, this budget assumes the repeal of the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of its crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, this budget assumes the conversion of the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. The allotment would increase based on the Department of Agriculture Thrifty Food Plan index and beneficiary growth. Such a reform would provide incentives for States to ensure dollars will go towards those who need them most. Additionally, it requires that more stringent work requirements and time limits apply under the program.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 5.7 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this budget advances policies to put seniors, not the Federal Government, in control of their health care decisions. Those in or near retirement will see no changes, while future retirees would be given a choice of private plans competing alongside the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program. Medicare would provide a premium-support payment either to pay for or offset the premium of the plan chosen by the senior, depending on the plan's cost. The Medicare premium-support payment would be adjusted so that the sick would receive higher payments if their conditions worsened; lower-income seniors would receive additional assistance to help cover out-of-pocket costs; and wealthier seniors would assume responsibility for a greater share of their premiums. Putting seniors in charge of how their health care dollars are spent will force providers to compete against each other on price and quality. This market competition will act as a real check on widespread waste and skyrocketing health care costs.

(B) In keeping with a recommendation from the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, this budget calls for Federal employees—including Members of Congress and congressional staff—to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

TITLE V—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 501. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts referred to in subsection (c)(1) or identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations''.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2016, the aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) $58,662,202,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(A) Medical Services;

(B) Medical Support and Compliance; and

(C) Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(2) $28,781,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b).

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 502. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing for a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly.

SEC. 503. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—If a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2015 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO FUND OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—In order to take into account any new information included in the budget submission by the President for fiscal year 2015, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism or the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations set forth in the report of this concurrent resolution to conform with section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as adjusted by section 251A of such Act).

(c) REVISED CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE BASELINE.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from technical and economic assumptions in the most recent baseline published by the Congressional Budget Office.

(d) DETERMINATIONS.—For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution on the budget in the House, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2015 and the period of fiscal years 2015 through fiscal year 2024 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust such applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 504. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, if the provisions of such measure have the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of $5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning with fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 505. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—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 report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget or 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 Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying sections 302(f) and 311 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.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, if such adjustments do not cause a net increase in the deficit for fiscal year 2015 and the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

SEC. 506. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels made pursuant to this concurrent 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 concurrent resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMPLIANCE.—The consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 504.

SEC. 507. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Costs of Federal housing loans and loan guarantees are treated unequally in the budget. The Congressional Budget Office uses fair-value accounting to measure the costs of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, but determines the cost of other Federal loan and loan-guarantee programs on the basis of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (''FCRA'').

(2) The fair-value accounting method uses discount rates which incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length. In contrast, FCRA accounting solely uses the discount rates of the Treasury, failing to incorporate all of the risks attendant to these credit activities.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office estimates that if fair-value were used to estimate the cost of all new credit activity in 2014, the deficit would be approximately $50 billion higher than under the current methodology.

(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office for a measure under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, ''credit reform'', as a supplement to such estimate shall, to the extent practicable, also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the ''fair value'' of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

(c) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepares an estimate pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 of the costs which would be incurred in carrying out any bill or joint resolution and if the Director determines that such bill or joint resolution has a cost related to a housing or residential mortgage program under the FCRA, then the Director shall also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the ''fair value'' of assets and liabilities affected by the provisions of such bill or joint resolution that result in such cost.

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (b) or (c), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

SEC. 508. TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND THAT INCREASE PUBLIC INDEBTEDNESS.

For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 509. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the ''first fiscal year'' and the ''total of fiscal years'' shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2015. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism under section 302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation. The Committee on Appropriations may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under section 302(b) of such Act. Spending that counts toward the allocation established by this section shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, for purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2015, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 510. 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 of Representatives, 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 VI—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 601. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Although the United States economy technically emerged from recession nearly five years ago, the subsequent recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound. Real gross domestic product (GDP) growth over the past four years has averaged just over 2 percent, well below the 3 percent trend rate of growth in the United States.

(2) The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) did a study in late 2012 examining why the United States economy was growing so slowly after the recession. They found, among other things, that United States economic output was growing at less than half of the typical rate exhibited during other recoveries since World War II. CBO said that about two-thirds of this ''growth gap'' was due to a pronounced sluggishness in the growth of potential GDP—particularly in potential employment levels (such as people leaving the labor force) and the growth in productivity (which is in turn related to lower capital investment).

(3) The prolonged economic sluggishness is particularly troubling given the amount of fiscal and monetary policy actions taken in recent years to cushion the depth of the downturn and to spark higher rates of growth and employment. In addition to the large stimulus package passed in early 2009, many other initiatives have been taken to boost growth, such as the new homebuyer tax credit and the ''cash for clunkers'' program. These stimulus efforts may have led to various short term ''pops'' in activity but the economy and job market has since reverted back to a sub-par trend.

(4) The unemployment rate has declined in recent years, from a peak of nearly 10 percent in 2009-2010 to 6.7 percent in the latest month. However, a significant chunk of this decline has been due to people leaving the labor force (and therefore no longer being counted as ''unemployed'') and not from a surge in employment. The slow decline in the unemployment rate in recent years has occurred alongside a steep decline in the economy's labor force participation rate. The participation rate stands at 63.0 percent, close to the lowest level since 1978. The flipside of this is that over 90 million Americans are now ''on the sidelines'' and not in the labor force, representing a 10 million increase since early 2009.

(5) Real median household income declined for the fifth consecutive year in 2012 (latest data available) and, at just over $51,000, is currently at its lowest level since 1995. Weak wage and income growth as a result of a sub-par labor market not only means lower tax revenue coming in to the Treasury, it also means higher government spending on income support programs.

(6) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by $311 billion.

(7) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy and more job creation.

(8) Reining in government spending and lowering budget deficits has a positive long-term impact on the economy and the budget. According to CBO, a significant deficit reduction package (i.e. $4 trillion), would boost longer-term economic output by 1.7 percent. Their analysis concludes that deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation.

(9) The greater economic output that stems from a large deficit reduction package would have a sizeable impact on the Federal budget. For instance, higher output would lead to greater revenues through the increase in taxable incomes. Lower interest rates, and a reduction in the stock of debt, would lead to lower government spending on net interest expenses. According to CBO, this dynamic would reduce unified budget deficits by an amount sufficient to produce a surplus in fiscal year 2024.

(b) POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustainable path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty holding back job creators. Reforms to the tax code to put American businesses and workers in a better position to compete and thrive in the 21st century global economy. This resolution targets the regulatory red tape and cronyism that stack the deck in favor of special interests. All of the reforms in this resolution serve as means to the larger end of growing the economy and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

SEC. 602. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all three counts – it is notoriously complex, patently unfair, and highly inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Over the past decade alone, there have been more than 4,400 changes to the tax code, more than one per day. Many of the major changes over the years have involved carving out special preferences, exclusions, or deductions for various activities or groups. These loopholes add up to more than $1 trillion per year and make the code unfair, inefficient, and highly complex.

(3) In addition, these tax preferences are disproportionately used by upper-income individuals.

(4) The large amount of tax preferences that pervade the code end up narrowing the tax base. A narrow tax base, in turn, requires much higher tax rates to raise a given amount of revenue.

(5) It is estimated that American taxpayers end up spending $160 billion and roughly 6 billion hours a year complying with the tax code – a waste of time and resources that could be used in more productive activities.

(6) Standard economic theory shows that high marginal tax rates dampen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(7) Roughly half of United States active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a ''pass-through'' basis, meaning the income flows through to the tax returns of the individual owners and is taxed at the individual rate structure rather than at the corporate rate. Small businesses, in particular, tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the top Federal rate on such small business income reaches 44.6 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(8) The United States corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) sums to just over 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages and discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(9) By deterring potential investment, the United States corporate tax restrains economic growth and job creation. The United States tax rate differential with other countries also fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate behaviors intended to avoid the tax, which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(10) The ''worldwide'' structure of United States international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

(11) Reforming the United States tax code to a more competitive international system would boost the competitiveness of United States companies operating abroad and it would also greatly reduce tax avoidance.

(12) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, on consumers in higher prices, and on investors in diminished returns.

(13) Revenues have averaged about 17.5 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 18.4 percent of the economy by the end of the 10-year budget window.

(14) Attempting to raise revenue through tax increases to meet out-of-control spending would damage the economy.

(15) This resolution also rejects the idea of instituting a carbon tax in the United States, which some have offered as a ''new'' source of revenue. Such a plan would damage the economy, cost jobs, and raise prices on American consumers.

(16) Closing tax loopholes to fund spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(17) The goal of tax reform should be to curb or eliminate loopholes and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board—not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Tax reform should be revenue-neutral and should not be an excuse to raise taxes on the American people. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through revenue-neutral fundamental tax reform that—

(1) simplifies the tax code to make it fairer to American families and businesses and reduces the amount of time and resources necessary to comply with tax laws;

(2) substantially lowers tax rates for individuals, with a goal of achieving a top individual rate of 25 percent and consolidating the current seven individual income tax brackets into two brackets with a first bracket of 10 percent;

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reduces the corporate tax rate to 25 percent; and

(5) transitions the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation.

SEC. 603. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The President's health care law has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised. Health care premiums were supposed to decline by $2,500. Instead, according to the 2013 Employer Health Benefits Survey, health care premiums have increased by 5 percent for individual plans and 4 percent for family since 2012. Moreover, according to a report from the Energy and Commerce Committee, premiums for individual market plans may go up as much as 50 percent because of the law.

(2) The President pledged that Americans would be able to keep their health care plan if they liked it. But the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates 2 million Americans with employment-based health coverage will lose those plans.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi, said that the President's health care law would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the law will reduce full-time equivalent employment by about 2.0 million hours in 2017 and 2.5 million hours in 2024, ''compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the ACA.''.

(4) The implementation of the law has been a failure. The main website that Americans were supposed to use in purchasing new coverage was broken for over a month. Since the President's health care law was signed into law, the Administration has announced 23 delays. The President has also failed to submit any nominees to sit on the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a panel of bureaucrats that will cut Medicare by an additional $12.1 billion over the next ten years, according to the President's own budget.

(5) The President's health care law should be repealed and replaced with reforms that make affordable and quality health care coverage available to all Americans.

(b) POLICY ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's health care law must not only be repealed, but also replaced, for the following reasons:

(1) The President's health care law is a government-run system driving up health care costs and forcing Americans to lose their health care coverage and should be replaced with a reformed health care system that gives patients and their doctors more choice and control over their health care.

(2) Instead of a complex structure of subsidies, ''firewalls,'' mandates, and penalties, a reformed health care system should make health care coverage portable.

(3) Instead of stifling innovation in health care technologies, treatments, and medications through Federal mandates, taxes, and price controls, a reformed health care system should encourage research and development.

(4) Instead of instituting one-size-fits-all directives from Federal bureaucracies such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Independent Payment Advisory Board, individuals and families should be free to secure the health care coverage that best meets their needs.

(5) Instead of allowing fraudulent lawsuits, which are driving up health care costs, the medical liability system should be reformed while at the same time reaffirming that States should be free to implement the policies that best suit their needs.

(6) Instead of using Federal taxes, mandates, and bureaucracies to address those who have trouble securing health care coverage, high risk pools should be established.

(7) Instead of more than doubling spending on Medicaid, which is driving up Federal debt and will eventually bankrupt State budgets, Medicaid spending should be brought under control and States should be given more flexibility to provide quality, affordable care to those who are eligible.

(8) Instead of driving up health care costs and reducing employment, a reformed health care system should lower health care costs, which will increase economic growth an employment by lowering health care inflation.

SEC. 604. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Congressional Budget Office—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2026 and unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6 percent per year over the next ten years, and according to the Congressional Budget Office's 2013 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare is projected to reach 5 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2040 and 9.4 percent of GDP by 2088.

(3) The President's health care law created a new Federal agency called the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) empowered with unilateral authority to cut Medicare spending. As a result of that law—

(A) IPAB will be tasked with keeping the Medicare per capita growth below a Medicare per capita target growth rate. Prior to 2018, the target growth rate is based on the five-year average of overall inflation and medical inflation. Beginning in 2018, the target growth rate will be the five-year average increase in the nominal GDP plus one percentage point, which the President has twice proposed to reduce to GDP plus one-half percentage point;

(B) the fifteen unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats of IPAB will make decisions that will reduce seniors access to care;

(C) the nonpartisan Office of the Medicare Chief Actuary estimates that the provider cuts already contained in the Affordable Care Act will force 15 percent of hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, and home health agencies to become unprofitable in 2019; and

(D) additional cuts from the IPAB board will force even more health care providers to close their doors, and the Board should be repealed.

(4) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in or near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits and offer future beneficiaries the same health care options available to Members of Congress.

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in or near retirement.

(2) For future generations, when they reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs.

(3) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as an option.

(4) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(5) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

SEC. 605. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the ''three-legged stool'' of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2016, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2033, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2033, benefits will be cut nearly 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent CBO projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of $1.7 trillion over the next 10 years.

(4) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower-income Americans' retirement security.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), between 1970 and 2012, the number of people receiving disability benefits (both disabled workers and their dependent family members) has increased by over 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. David Autor and Mark Duggan have found that the increase in individuals on disability does not reflect a decrease in self-reported health. CBO attributes program growth to changes in demographics, changes in the composition of the labor force and compensation, as well as Federal policies.

(6) If this program is not reformed, families who rely on the lifeline that disability benefits provide will face benefit cuts of up to 25 percent in 2016, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(7) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the ''Greenspan Commission'' which helped to address Social Security shortfalls for over a generation.

(8) Americans deserve action by the President, the House, and the Senate to preserve

and strengthen Social Security. It is critical that bipartisan action be taken to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to make Social Security sustainably solvent. This resolution assumes reform of a current law trigger, such that:

(1) If in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund annual Trustees Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees shall, no later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th-year. Recommendations provided to the President must be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees.

(2) Not later than December 1 of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit their recommendations, the President shall promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress including his recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader of the House shall introduce the President's legislation upon receipt.

(3) Within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction to which the legislation has been referred shall report the bill which shall be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures.

(4) Legislation submitted by the President shall—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who count on Social Security the most, including those with disabilities and survivors;

(C) improve fairness for participants;

(D) reduce the burden on, and provide certainty for, future generations; and

(E) secure the future of the Disability Insurance program while addressing the needs of those with disabilities today and improving the determination process.

(c) POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system.

SEC. 606. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.

(a) FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) 19.5 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the last decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2002-2003 Academic Year and the 2012-2013 Academic Year—

(A) published tuition and fees for in-State students at public four-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 5.2 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation;

(B) published tuition and fees for in-State students at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.9 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation; and

(C) published tuition and fees for in-State students at private four-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.4 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation.

(4) Over that same period, Federal financial aid has increased 105 percent.

(5) This spending has failed to make college more affordable.

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted that, ''We can't just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we'll run out of money.''.

(7) American students are chasing ever-increasing tuition with ever-increasing debt. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, student debt more than quadrupled between 2003 and 2013, and now stands at nearly $1.1 trillion. Student debt now has the second largest balance after mortgage debt.

(8) Students are carrying large debt loads and too many fail to complete college or end up defaulting on these loans due to their debt burden and a weak economy and job market.

(9) Based on estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, the Pell Grant Program will face a fiscal shortfall beginning in fiscal year 2016 and continuing in each subsequent year in the current budget window.

(10) Failing to address these problems will jeopardize access and affordability to higher education for America's young people.

(b) POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.—It is the policy of this resolution to address the root drivers of tuition inflation, by—

(1) targeting Federal financial aid to those most in need;

(2) streamlining programs that provide aid to make them more effective;

(3) maintaining the maximum Pell grant award level at $5,730 in each year of the budget window; and

(4) removing regulatory barriers in higher education that act to restrict flexibility and innovative teaching, particularly as it relates to non-traditional models such as online coursework and competency-based learning.

(c) FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—The House finds the following:

(1) Over ten million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with trained personnel.

(4) According to a 2011 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, in fiscal year 2009, the Federal Government spent $18 billion across 9 agencies to administer 47 Federal job training programs, almost all of which overlapped with another program in terms of offered services and targeted population.

(5) Since the release of that GAO report, the Education and Workforce Committee, which has done extensive work in this area, has identified more than 50 programs.

(3) Without changes, this flawed system will continue to fail those looking for work or to improve their skills, and jeopardize economic growth.

(d) POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—It is the policy of this resolution to address the failings in the current workforce development system, by—

(1) streamlining and consolidating Federal job training programs as advanced by the House-passed Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act (SKILLS Act); and

(2) empowering states with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce, including the development of career scholarships.

SEC. 607. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold $739 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2014.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure beyond the fiscal year for which they are provided.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from unneeded balances of funds.

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—Congressional committees shall through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of the Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans' affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should continue to make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

SEC. 608. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The budget for the House of Representatives is $188 million less than it was when Republicans became the majority in 2011.

(2) The House of Representatives has achieved significant savings by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.—It is the policy of this resolution that:

(1) The House of Representatives must be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources and therefore must identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members and committees of the House, and should identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room.

(2) No taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

(3) Retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

SEC. 609. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (''GAO'') is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs ''could potentially save tens of billions of dollars.''

(3) In 2011, 2012, and 2013 the Government Accountability Office issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) 209 Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of $3 billion annually;

(B) 200 separate Department of Justice crime prevention and victim services grant programs with an annual cost of $3.9 billion in 2010;

(C) 20 different Federal entities administer 160 housing programs and other forms of Federal assistance for housing with a total cost of $170 billion in 2010;

(D) 17 separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent $37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) 14 grant and loan programs, and 3 tax benefits to reduce diesel emissions;

(F) 94 different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage ''green building'' in the private sector; and

(G) 23 agencies implemented approximately 670 renewable energy initiatives in fiscal year 2010 at a cost of nearly $15 billion.

(4) The Federal Government spends about $80 billion each year for approximately 800 information technology investments. GAO has identified broad acquisition failures, waste, and unnecessary duplication in the Government's information technology infrastructure. Experts have estimated that eliminating these problems could save 25 percent – or $20 billion – of the Government's annual information technology budget.

(5) GAO has identified strategic sourcing as a potential source of spending reductions. In 2011 GAO estimated that saving 10 percent of the total or all Federal procurement could generate over $50 billion in savings annually.

(6) Federal agencies reported an estimated $108 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2012.

(7) Under clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(8) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2015, 32 laws will expire, possibly resulting in $693 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

(9) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

SEC. 610. POLICY STATEMENT ON UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.

It is the policy of this resolution that the committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively. Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees' judgment should continue to receive funding.

SEC. 611. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Excessive regulation at the Federal level has hurt job creation and dampened the economy, slowing our recovery from the economic recession.

(2) In the first two months of 2014 alone, the Administration issued 13,166 pages of regulations imposing more than $13 billion in compliance costs on job creators and adding more than 16 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(3) The Small Business Administration estimates that the total cost of regulations is as high as $1.75 trillion per year. Since 2009, the White House has generated over $494 billion in regulatory activity, with an additional $87.6 billion in regulatory costs currently pending.

(4) The Dodd-Frank financial services legislation (Public Law 111–203) resulted in more than $17 billion in compliance costs and saddled job creators with more than 58 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act to date has added 132.9 million annual hours of compliance paperwork, imposing $24.3 billion of compliance costs on the private sector and an $8 billion cost burden on the states.

(6) The highest regulatory costs come from rules issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); these regulations are primarily targeted at the coal industry. In September 2013, the EPA proposed a rule regulating greenhouse gas emissions from new coal-fired power plants. The proposed standards are unachievable with current commercially available technology, resulting in a de-facto ban on new coal-fired power plants. Additional regulations for existing coal plants are expected in the summer of 2014.

(7) Coal-fired power plants provide roughly forty percent of the United States electricity at a low cost. Unfairly targeting the coal industry with costly and unachievable regulations will increase energy prices, disproportionately disadvantaging energy-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction, and will make life more difficult for millions of low-income and middle class families already struggling to pay their bills.

(8) Three hundred and thirty coal units are being retired or converted as a result of EPA regulations. Combined with the de-facto prohibition on new plants, these retirements and conversions may further increase the cost of electricity.

(9) A recent study by Purdue University estimates that electricity prices in Indiana will rise 32 percent by 2023, due in part to EPA regulations.

(10) The Heritage Foundation recently found that a phase out of coal would cost 600,000 jobs by the end of 2023, resulting in an aggregate gross domestic product decrease of $2.23 trillion over the entire period and reducing the income of a family of four by $1200 per year. Of these jobs, 330,000 will come from the manufacturing sector, with California, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Indiana, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Georgia seeing the highest job losses.

(b) POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATION.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the public burdened by excessive regulation, enact legislation that—

(1) seeks to promote economic growth and job creation by eliminating unnecessary red tape and streamlining and simplifying Federal regulations;

(2) pursues a cost-effective approach to regulation, without sacrificing environmental, health, safety benefits or other benefits, rejecting the premise that economic growth and environmental protection create an either/or proposition;

(3) ensures that regulations do not disproportionately disadvantage low-income Americans through a more rigorous cost-benefit analysis, which also considers who will be most affected by regulations and whether the harm caused is outweighed by the potential harm prevented;

(4) ensures that regulations are subject to an open and transparent process, rely on sound and publicly available scientific data, and that the data relied upon for any particular regulation is provided to Congress immediately upon request;

(5) frees the many commonsense energy and water projects currently trapped in complicated bureaucratic approval processes;

(6) maintains the benefits of landmark environmental, health safety, and other statutes while scaling back this administration's heavy-handed approach to regulation, which has added $494 billion in mostly ideological regulatory activity since 2009, much of which flies in the face of these statutes' intended purposes; and

(7) seeks to promote a limited government, which will unshackle our economy and create millions of new jobs, providing our Nation with a strong and prosperous future and expanding opportunities for the generations to come.

SEC. 612. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Commerce Department estimates that every $1 billion of United States exports supports more than 5,000 jobs here at home.

(2) A modern and competitive international tax system would facilitate global commerce for United States multinational companies and would encourage foreign business investment and job creation in the United States

(3) The United States currently has an antiquated system of international taxation whereby United States multinationals operating abroad pay both the foreign-country tax and United States corporate taxes. They are essentially taxed twice. This puts them at an obvious competitive disadvantage.

(4) The ability to defer United States taxes on their foreign operations, which some erroneously refer to as a ''tax loophole,'' cushions this disadvantage to a certain extent. Eliminating or restricting this provision (and others like it) would harm United States competitiveness.

(5) This budget resolution advocates fundamental tax reform that would lower the United States corporate rate, now the highest in the industrialized world, and switch to a more competitive system of international taxation. This would make the United States a much more attractive place to invest and station business activity and would chip away at the incentives for United States

companies to keep their profits overseas (because the United States corporate rate is so high).

(6) The status quo of the current tax code undermines the competitiveness of United States businesses and costs the United States economy investment and jobs.

(7) Global trade and commerce is not a zero-sum game. The idea that global expansion tends to ''hollow out'' United States operations is incorrect. Foreign-affiliate activity tends to complement, not substitute for, key parent activities in the United States such as employment, worker compensation, and capital investment. When United States headquartered multinationals invest and expand operations abroad it often leads to more jobs and economic growth at home.

(8) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass the international competition.

(b) POLICY ON TRADE.—It is the policy of this resolution to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive United States international tax system in order to promote job creation in the United States.

SEC. 613. NO BUDGET, NO PAY.

It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should agree to a concurrent resolution on the budget every year pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. If by April 15, a House of Congress has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget, the payroll administrator of that House should carry out this policy in the same manner as the provisions of Public Law 113-3, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013, and place in an escrow account all compensation otherwise required to be made for Members of that House of Congress. Withheld compensation should be released to Members of that House of Congress the earlier of the day on which that House of Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution on the budget, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or the last day of that Congress.

The CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–405.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–405.

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

The 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:

SEC. 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2015 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2024:

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

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

Fiscal year 2015: $2,579,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,756,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,960,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,131,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,281,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,465,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,663,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,860,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,069,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,283,190,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $84,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $107,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $152,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $175,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $158,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $171,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $190,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $207,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $231,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $249,190,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $3,207,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,269,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,415,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,577,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,782,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,978,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,151,262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,341,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,509,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,671,785,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $3,143,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,291,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,409,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,527,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,752,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,923,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,103,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,309,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,443,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,580,858,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: -$563,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$534,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$448,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$395,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$471,490,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$458,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$440,075,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$449,351,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$374,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: -$297,668,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: $18,686,049,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,486,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $20,239,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,940,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,652,866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,361,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $23,052,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,737,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,380,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $24,980,565,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $13,591,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,256,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,843,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,370,490,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,981,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,602,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $17,213,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,849,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $18,440,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $18,986,039,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $636,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $631,280,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $569,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $592,448,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $577,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,212,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $586,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,662,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $594,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,786,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $603,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $591,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $612,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $601,232,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $622,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $637,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $623,036,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $654,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $638,219,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $38,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,086,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $35,823,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,886,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $38,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,463,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $44,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $47,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $49,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,482,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $52,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $53,605,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,735,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $29,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,098,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $30,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $31,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $31,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $32,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $33,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $34,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $34,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $35,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,174,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $7,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $5,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $3,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $4,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $2,046,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $4,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,274,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $40,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $41,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $43,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $43,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $44,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $46,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $46,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,031,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $16,805,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $26,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $24,721,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,482,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $18,284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $18,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $18,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $18,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $18,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $18,363,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,773,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$5,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$30,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$2,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$31,493,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$5,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$32,398,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$5,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$34,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $649,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$26,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $9,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$23,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$24,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $7,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$26,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $8,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$28,684,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $103,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $104,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $105,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $107,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $90,760,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $92,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $94,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $96,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $98,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $102,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,224,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $43,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $11,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,398,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $12,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $13,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,958,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $14,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $14,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $14,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,897,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $119,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $112,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $118,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $123,214,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $126,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $129,820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $132,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,395,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $135,231,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $136,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $136,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,733,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $522,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $512,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $547,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $549,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $571,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $596,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $597,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $626,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $627,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $668,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $657,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $690,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $689,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $727,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $724,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $765,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $763,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $804,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $802,627,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $532,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $574,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $574,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $581,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $595,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $594,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $654,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $654,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $696,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $696,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $743,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $743,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $824,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $823,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $850,147,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $849,958,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $870,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $869,945,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $537,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $535,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $546,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $549,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $551,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $548,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $558,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $547,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $577,957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $590,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $582,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $603,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $622,482,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $619,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $631,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $623,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $639,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $625,245,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $32,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $35,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $38,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $46,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $49,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $53,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $57,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $62,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $66,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,591,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $161,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $169,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $175,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $184,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $192,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $201,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $198,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $209,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $206,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $218,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $228,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $225,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $238,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,121,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $54,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $56,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,934,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $59,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,223,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $58,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $59,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $60,986,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $62,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $63,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $65,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $69,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,171,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $26,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $27,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $29,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $31,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $34,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $36,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $38,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $41,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $44,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $46,638,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,944,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $348,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $348,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $410,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $410,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $483,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $483,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $565,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $565,227,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $641,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $705,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $705,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $759,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $759,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $807,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $807,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $855,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $855,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $894,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $894,074,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $45,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $60,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $64,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $66,398,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $66,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $58,284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,613,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $68,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $41,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $49,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $60,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,591,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$79,627,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$79,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$87,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$87,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$82,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$82,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$83,164,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$83,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$88,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$88,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,601,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$92,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$92,827,000,000.

TITLE II—DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 201. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimate average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) Earned Income Tax Credit Reforms:

(i) Expand EITC for workers without qualifying children.

(ii) Conform treatment of State and local government EITC and child tax credit (CTC) for SSI.

(B) Health-Related:

(i) Align Medicare drug payment policies with Medicaid policies for low income beneficiaries.

(ii) Increase income-related premium under Medicare Parts B and D.

(iii) Modify Part B deductible for new enrollees.

(iv) Introduce home health co-payments for new beneficiaries.

(v) Introduce a Part B premium surcharge for new beneficiaries who purchase near first-dollar Medigap coverage.

(vi) Encourage the use of generic drugs by low-income beneficiaries.

(vii) Limit Medicaid reimbursement of durable medical equipment based on Medicare rates.

(viii) Rebase future Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) allotments.

(ix) Reduce fraud, waste, and abuse in Medicaid.

(x) Strengthen the Medicaid drug rebate program.

(xi) Exclude brand-name and authorized generic drug prices from Medicaid Federal upper limit (FUL).

(xii) Improve and extend the Money Follows the Person Rebalancing Demonstration through 2020.

(xiii) Provide home and community-based services to children eligible for psychiatric residential treatment facilities.

(xiv) Create demonstration to address overprescription of psychotropic medications for children in foster care.

(xv) Permanently extend Express Lane Eligibility (ELE) option for children.

(xvi) Expand State flexibility to provide benchmark benefit packages.

(xvii) Extend the Qualified Individuals (QI) program through CY2015.

(xviii) Extend the Transitional Medical Assistance (TMA) program through CY2015.

(xix) Prohibit brand and generic drug companies from delaying the availability of new generic drugs and biologics.

(xx) Modify length of exclusivity to facilitate faster development of generic biologics.

(xxi) Ensure retroactive Part D coverage of newly-eligible low-income beneficiaries.

(xxii) Establish integrated appeals process for Medicare-Medicaid enrollees.

(xxiii) Create pilot to expand PACE eligibility to individuals between ages 21 and 55.

(xxiv) Accelerate the issuance of State innovation waivers.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 5.7 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-test direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) Opportunity, Growth, and Security Initiative:

(i) Reduce subsidies for crop insurance companies and farmer premiums.

(ii) Reform the aviation passenger security user fee to more accurately reflect the costs of aviation security.

(iii) Offset Disability Insurance (DI) benefits for period of concurrent Unemployment Insurance (UI) receipt.

(iv) Enact Spectrum License User Fee and allow the FCC to auction predominantly domestic satellite services.

(v) Limit the total accrual of tax-favored retirement benefits.

(B) Surface Transportation Reauthorization:

(i) Invest in surface transportation reauthorization.

(C) Early Childhood Investments:

(i) Support Preschool for All.

(ii) Extend and expand voluntary home visiting.

(D) Agriculture:

(i) Reauthorize Secure Rural Schools.

(ii) Enact Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) fee.

(iii) Enact bio based labeling fee.

(iv) Enact Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) fee.

(v) Enact Animal Plant and Health Inspection Service (APHIS) fee Education.

(E) Education:

(i) Recognize Educational Success, Professional Excellence, and Collaborative Teaching (RESPECT).

(ii) Reform and expand Perkins loan program.

(iii) Provide mandatory appropriation to sustain recent Pell Grant increases.

(iv) Expand and reform student loan income-based repayment.

(v) Implement College Opportunity and Graduation Bonus Program.

(vi) Establish State Higher Education Performance Fund.

(F) Energy:

(i) Reauthorize special assessment from domestic nuclear utilities.

(ii) Establish Energy Security Trust Fund Enact nuclear waste management program.

(iii) Enact nuclear waste management program.

(G) Health and Human Services:

(i) Reduce Medicare coverage of bad debts.

(ii) Better align graduate medical education payments with patient care costs.

(iii) Reduce Critical Access Hospital (CAH) payments from 101 percent of reasonable costs to 100 percent of reasonable costs.

(iv) Prohibit CAH designation for facilities that are less than miles from the nearest hospital.

(v) Reduce fraud, waste, and abuse in Medicare.

(vi) Accelerate manufacturer discounts for brand drugs to provide relief to Medicare beneficiaries in the coverage gap.

(vii) Suspend coverage and payment for questionable Part D prescriptions and incomplete clinical information.

(viii) Establish quality bonus payments for high-performing Part D plans.

(ix) Adjust payment updates for certain post-acute care providers.

(x) Equalize payments for certain conditions commonly treated in inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRFs) and skilled nursing facilities (SNFs).

(xi) Encourage appropriate use of inpatient rehabilitation hospitals by requiring that 75 percent of IRF patients require intensive rehabilitation services.

(xii) Adjust SNF payments to reduce hospital readmissions.

(xiii) Implement bundled payment for post-acute care.

(xiv) Exclude certain services from the in office ancillary services exception.

(xv) Modify the documentation requirement for face-to-face encounters for durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) claims.

(xvi) Modify reimbursement of Part B drugs.

(xvii) Modernize payments for clinical laboratory services.

(xviii) Expand sharing Medicare data with qualified entities.

(xix) Clarify the Medicare Fraction in the Medicare DHS statue.

(xx) Implement Value-Based Purchasing for SNFs, Home Health Agencies (HHAs), Ambulatory Surgical Centers (ASCs), and Hospital Outpatient Departments (HOPDs).

(xxi) Strengthen the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) to reduce long-term drivers of Medicare cost growth.

(xxii) Enact survey and certification revisit fees.

(xxiii) Invest in CMS Quality Measurement.

(xxiv) Increase the minimum MA coding intensity adjustment.

(xxv) Align employer group waiver plan payments with average MA plan bids.

(xxvi) Allow CMS to reinvest civil monetary penalties recovered from home health agencies.

(xxvii) Allow CMS to assess a fee on Medicare providers for payments subject to the Federal Payment Levy Program.

(xxviii) Extend special diabetes program at the National Institutes of Health and Indian Health Services.

(xxix) Permit HIS/Tribal/Urban Indian Health programs to pay Medicare like rates for outpatient services funded through the Purchased and Referred Care program.

(xxx) Extend Health Centers.

(xxxi) Create a competitive, value-based graduate medical education grant program funded through the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

(xxxii) Extend the Medicaid primary care payment increase through CY2015 with modifications to expand provider eligibility and better target primary care services.

(xxxiii) Invest in the National Health Services Corps.

(xxxiv) Program management implementation funding.

(xxxv) Provide dedicated, mandatory funding for Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program (HCFAC) program integrity.

(xxxvi) Continue funding for the Personal Responsibility Education Program and Health Profession Opportunity Grants.

(xxxvii) Repurpose Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Contingency Fund to support Pathways to Jobs initiative.

(xxxviii) Establish hold harmless for Federal poverty guidelines.

(xxxix) Expand access to quality child care.

(xl) Modernize child support.

(xli) Provide funding for Aging and Disability Resource Centers.

(xlii) Reauthorize Family Connection Grants.

(xliii) Support demonstration to address over-prescription of psychothropic medications for children in foster care (funding in Adminstration for Children and Families).

(H) Homeland Security:

(i) Permanently extend and reallocate the travel promotion surcharge.

(I) Housing and Urban Development:

(i) Provide funding for Project Rebuild.

(ii) Provide funding for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

(J) Interior:

(i) Establish dedicated funding for Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) programs.

(ii) Provide funding for a National Park Service Centennial Initiative.

(iii) Extend funding for Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT).

(iv) Enact Federal oil and gas management reforms.

(v) Reform hard rock mining on public lands.

(vi) Repeal geothermal payments to counties.

(vii) Terminate Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) payments to certified States.

(viii) Establish an AML hard rock reclamation fund.

(ix) Increase coal AML fee to pre–2006 levels.

(x) Reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2000 (FLTFA).

(xi) Permanently reauthorize the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA).

(xii) Increase duck stamp fees.

(xiii) Extend the Palau Compact of Free Association.

(K) Labor:

(i) Create Back to Work Partnerships for the long term unemployed.

(ii) Establish a New Career Pathways program for displaced workers.

(iii) Establish Summer Jobs Plus program for youth.

(iv) Support Bridge Work and other work-based UI program reforms.

(v) Enhance UI program integrity.

(vi) Extend Emergency Unemployment Compensation.

(vii) Implement cap adjustments for UI program integrity activities.

(viii) Strengthen UI system solvency.

(ix) Improve Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) solvency.

(x) Provide the Secretary of the Treasury authority to access and disclose prisoner data to prevent and identify improper payments.

(xi) Reform the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA).

(L) Transportation:

(i) Establish a mandatory surcharge for air traffic services.

(ii) Establish a co-insurance program for aviation war risk insurance.

(M) Treasury:

(i) Establish a Pay for Success Incentive Fund.

(ii) Reauthorize and reform the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program.

(iii) Authorize Treasury to locate and recover assets of the United States and to retain a portion of amounts collected to pay for the costs of recovery.

(iv) Increase delinquent Federal non-tax debt collections by authorizing administrative bank garnishment for non-tax debts.

(v) Increase levy authority for payments to Medicare providers with delinquent tax debt.

(vi) Allow offset of Federal income tax refunds to collect delinquent State income taxes for out-of-State residents.

(vii) Reduce costs for States collecting delinquent income tax obligations.

(viii) Implement tax enforcement program integrity cap adjustment.

(ix) Provide authority to contact delinquent debtors via their cellphones.

(x) Reauthorize the State Small Business Credit Initiative.

(N) Veterans Affairs:

(i) Establish Veterans Job Corps.

(ii) Extend round-down of cost of living adjustments (compensation).

(iii) Extend round-down of cost of living adjustments (education).

(iv) Provide burial receptacles for certain new casketed gravesites.

(v) Make permanent the pilot for certain work study activities.

(vi) Increase cap on vocational rehabilitation contract counseling.

(vii) Increase annual limitation on new Independent Living cases.

(viii) Improve housing grant program.

(ix) Extend supplemental service disabled veterans insurance coverage.

(O) Corps of Engineers:

(i) Reform inland waterways funding.

(P) Environmental Protection Agency:

(i) Enact pre-manufacture notice fee.

(ii) Establish Confidential Business Information management fee.

(Q) International Assistance Programs:

(i) Mandatory effects of discretionary proposal to implement 2010 International Monetary Fund (IMF) agreement (non-scoreable).

(R) Other Defense—Civil Programs:

(i) Increase TRICARE pharmacy copayments.

(ii) Increase annual premiums for TRICARE-For- Life (TFL) enrollment.

(iii) Increase TRICARE pharmacy copayments.

(iv) Increase annual premiums for TFL enrollment.

(S) Office of Personnel Management:

(i) Streamline FEHBP pharmacy benefit contracting.

(ii) Provide FEHBP benefits to domestic partners.

(iii) Expand FEHBP plan types.

(iv) Adjust FEHBP premiums for wellness.

(T) Social Security Administration:

(i) Provide dedicated, mandatory funding for program integrity (benefit savings).

(ii) Allow SSA to electronically certify certain RRB payments.

(iii) Eliminate aggressive Social Security claiming strategies.

(iv) Establish Workers Compensation Information Reporting.

(v) Extend SSI time limits for qualified refugees.

(vi) Improve collection of pension information from States and localities.

(vii) Lower electronic wage reporting threshold to 25 employees.

(viii) Move from annual to quarterly wage reporting.

(ix) Reauthorize and expand demonstration authority for DI and SSI.

(x) Terminate step-child benefits in the same month as step-parent.

(xi) Use the Death Master File to prevent Federal improper payments.

(U) Other Independent Agencies:

(i) Dispose of unneeded real property.

(ii) Create infrastructure bank.

(iii) Enact Postal Service financial relief and reform.

(W) Multi-Agency:

(i) Enact immigration reform.

(ii) Auction or assign via fee 1675–1680 megahertz.

(iii) Reconcile OPM/SSA retroactive disability payments.

(iv) Establish a consolidated TRICARE program (mandatory effects in Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration).

(v) Special Immigrant Visa extension.

(c) IN GENERAL.—

(1) This section is required by section 3(e) of H. Res. 5 (113th Congress), which requires information related to Means-Tested and Nonmeans-Tested programs and is required to be included in a proposed concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The reforms of programs listed herein are derived from Table S-9 (page 177) included in the Budget Volume of the President's Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2015.

(3) All the reforms of both Means-Tested and Nonmeans-Tested programs are hereby incorporated into this section by reference as they are detailed in the President's Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2015.

TITLE III—POLICY STATEMENT

SEC. 1. POLICY STATEMENT ON PRESIDENTIAL DATA AND POLICIES.

The budgetary assumptions underlying this concurrent resolution are based on the data and policies contained in the ''Fiscal Year 2015 Budget of the U.S. Government'', prepared by the Office of Management and Budget on behalf of the President and submitted to Congress on March 4 and March 10, 2014, pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code. This concurrent resolution adopts and incorporates by reference all data, policy provisions and information contained therein.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 544, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

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

It is good to be back this year to once again offer the President's budget as an amendment to the Republican budget. That is right; it is the President's budget that I will be offering again this year.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that I did this two years ago in an effort to try and drive a debate over what I thought was a misguided document, a document that the President had offered us that I thought offered bad ideas for the future of this country. I came in and offered an amendment—as none of my Democratic colleagues saw fit to do so—and for various reasons failed to get a single vote on that particular amendment.

My colleagues at that time, Mr. Chairman, took the position that my amendment really was not the President's budget. In hindsight, there were things that we could have tightened up, and we did. We tightened up all the loose ends. There is no question now we specifically reference the President's budget in this amendment. This is the President's budget.

Last year, I tried to come and do it again. Last year, I came in with a blank piece of paper. Last year I came in with a blank piece of paper because the President had not offered his budget in a timely fashion, as required by law. Perhaps rightly so, I was ruled out of order, and we did not have a chance to have a vote on that particular amendment last year.

The President has solved that problem for us this year. Still a little late, but at least we have the President's budget now in time to debate it here on the floor during budget week, and I am looking forward to doing that. I am looking forward to doing that, Mr. Chairman, because this budget does a lot of things that I disagree with. It does a lot of things that folks on the other side may agree with. But I think it merits a debate. Any time the President of the United States takes the time and the energy to produce a budget, I think it at least merits 20 minutes of debate on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I look forward to doing that today, and I look forward to having my friends defend a budget that does things such as continuing the Affordable Care Act, adopting immigration reform, supporting common core, creating a new infrastructure bank, creating a $1 billion climate fund, increasing airport fees on passengers, making Pell grants a mandatory spending program, creating a preschool program for everybody, increasing duck stamp fees, extending emergency unemployment compensation, increasing costs for TRICARE on our veterans, and extending the Federal health benefit programs to same sex partners.

I think it is a valid discussion that we should have every year. I was very glad to learn, by the way, that I am not the first person to do this. I was talking to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), who did this with President Reagan's budget back in the 1980s. I would like to see it become a regular feature in this House, and look forward to the debate as we go forward today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, some things never change. As the gentleman from South Carolina said, he offered this political stunt 2 years ago, and it is no less of a political stunt today than it was 2 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of the President's budget and of the President's policies. This is not a vote on the President's budget and his policies.

Do you know what I wish it were? I wish the Speaker of this House would bring up the President's proposal to shut down those tax incentives that actually encourage multinational corporations to ship American jobs overseas and instead use some of those savings to invest in jobs here at home. I wish the Speaker of this House would let us vote on that President's policy. I wish the Speaker of this House would bring up the bipartisan immigration bill. One has already passed the Senate. We have a version over here in the House. Mr. Chairman, let's vote on that President's policy. I wish the Speaker of the House would let us vote on the President's minimum wage proposal, to make sure that more people would be able to prosper in our economy. We haven't had a vote on that. Mr. Chairman, I wish that we could have a vote on the President's proposal to extend emergency unemployment compensation. The Senate has passed that. Let's have a vote over here.

This is a political stunt, just like it was before and, by the way, the White House sees it as a political stunt again this year, just as they were right to call it that the other year.

This is, in fact, the President's budget right here, right here. This is it, Mr. Chairman.

It is interesting to hear our Republican colleagues who claim to be in favor of transparency, accountability, saying that this is the President's budget and then allocating 10 minutes per side. I thought we didn't even want to take up thousand-plus page bills, we don't even want to take those up. Yet, now supposedly we are going to debate and vote on something that is over 2,000 pages, less time on the President's budget than on any of the other proposals before the House. Give me a break.

If this was serious, it would be a total abuse of process. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office hasn't even had a chance, Mr. Chairman, to evaluate and score the President's budget yet. So you have got the House Republican budget, and you have got the Democratic party, all those are written to CBO, but CBO hasn't had a chance to go through that this quickly. I am surprised to hear the gentleman thinks the House can go through this in 20 minutes. So let's not play games.

The White House has made clear if you want to support the President's priorities and the framework of the President's budget going forward, you should support the Democratic alternative, which I will offer tomorrow.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from South Carolina for bringing this budget forward. In fact, this is President Obama's budget.

I wouldn't be surprised if President Obama referred to his budget as a ''political stunt.'' If you look at the history of President Obama's budget, which he is legally required to file every year, he is in the sixth year of his Presidency. Do you know that 5 of those 6 years President Obama failed to meet the legal deadline to file his budget?

During that 5 out of 6-year period, every single year of those 6 years, President Obama made time to fill out his Final Four brackets.

□ 1530

Now, if his Final Four brackets do about as good as his budget does for the country—because if you look at the President's budget, which we're here debating, and I am speaking against, as my colleague from South Carolina is, the President's budget shows his priorities for the country, just like we are lying about our priorities for the country to get our budget back into balance, to get our economy moving again.

What does President Obama do? President Obama raises over $1 trillion in new taxes, job-crushing taxes, that will pull our economy even further back than he has already brought it, but you would think, if you listen to liberal orthodoxy that that $1 trillion is going to get us to a balanced budget, right?

They always say they need more money and former taxes to balance the budget. Look what happens, Mr. Chair, the President's budget never, ever gets to balance, with over $1 trillion in new taxes that he takes out of this economy, killing jobs across America, never gets to balance.

Our budgets that we are bringing forward do not raise a dime in new taxes and, in fact, gets to balance within the 10-year window, which underscores the difference in our visions for the country. We show through real policy that actually controlling the spending in Washington, forcing Washington to live within its means, is what gets our economy moving again and what gets us to balance.

President Obama proves with his own budget that, with over $1 trillion in new job-crushing taxes he never, ever gets to balance; but, again, 5 out of the President's 6 years in office, only one time has he actually met the legal deadline to file his budget.

He always met the deadline to make his Final Four picks. I think he's shown what his priorities are. We are showing ours.

I urge a ''no'' vote on President Obama's budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, the gentleman referred to the House Republican budget a couple times. Just to remind my colleagues that the House Republican budget claims to balance in 10 years. It also claims to get rid of all the Affordable Care Act, all of ObamaCare, but the reality is it has over $2 trillion in revenues and savings from the Affordable Care Act.

Here is what The Heritage Foundation had to say about the budget:

Perhaps the biggest shortcoming of this budget is that it keeps the tax increases associated with ObamaCare.

So our Republican colleagues keep saying their budget balances in 10 years, then they keep saying they are repealing all of Affordable Care Act. Both things cannot be true.

Now, what is true about the House Republican budget is the priorities it reflects, and, once again, it protects and rigs special interests tax breaks for very powerful groups at the expense of the rest of the country.

Yes, as I indicated earlier, the President has proposed that we get rid of some of the tax breaks that actually have a perverse incentive for companies to ship jobs overseas, to close those tax breaks, use that revenue to invest in our infrastructure and help power our economy right here at home.

From a Republican colleague's perspective, oh, no, you can't cut one special interest tax break, not for hedge fund owners, not for Big Oil companies. No, no, you can't do that.

But you know what you can do? You can come after the senior prescription drug benefit by reopening the doughnut hole, costing seniors another $1,200 a month. You can come after our kid's education. You can charge college students higher interest to raise about $40 billion, higher interest while they are still in school, before they get a job.

You can do all that, but, hey, hands off the big special interests. So I am glad that the previous speaker reminded us exactly what this Republican budget does

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition, like I assume everyone who speaks on this amendment is going to do today. It is amazing the other party—everyone is opposed to it.

Here is what it does simply: you cut to the chase, it hollows out national defense, it raises trillions in new taxes over the next 10 years, add about $8 trillion to the national debt—from $17 trillion to approximately $25 trillion—it does all that, never, ever, ever getting to balance.

Sometimes, we talk about numbers. Here is why it matters. In the end, you think about what makes the country special, moms and dads making sacrifices, so their kids can have a life better than they did, that they can get to their goals.

With this kind of vision and this kind of budget, this kind of plan for where we are going to go, it will make it that much tougher for young people to get the opportunities they need to experience the American Dream.

That is why it is so important. All those policies that the ranking member mentioned in his opening statement, they are in this budget. This is not a political stunt. This is just putting up what the President says is actually going to make the country better. We know it is going to make the country worse. We are offering a chance for the Democrats to stand up and defend this, and they won't.

So I would urge a ''no'' vote on this. It is same old, same old; cut national defense, raise taxes, add to the debt, never ever balance, and continue to create this environment that is not conducive to economic growth.

Again, as I said to the minority whip in an earlier debate, in the fifth year of Ronald Reagan's Presidency, we were growing at 7½ percent. Here, we are in the fifth year of the Obama Presidency, meandering along, bumping along at 2 percent growth rate, that is the problem.

This budget will continue that same poor economic performance, and that is why we should vote against it.

I thank the gentleman for bringing it to the floor.

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chair, we are finished with our speakers and reserve the balance and right to close.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has the right to close.

Mr. MULVANEY. Then I will yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chair, my friend from Maryland made a couple of different points. He said that he wishes he could vote for the things in the President's budget. I will say to him again here, I'll say it to you, I will say to anyone listening the same thing I said to the Rules Committee, the same thing I have said the last 3 years: I keep waiting for one of my colleagues across the aisle to do exactly that.

You think I want to be here offering the President's budget? If my colleagues across the aisle would like the opportunity to vote on the President's budget and the items that are contained in it, they have the ability to do so by simply offering this particular amendment.

Failing that, they will have an opportunity to hear today because, if you look at our amendment, it specifically says that the budgetary assumptions underlying this current resolution are based on the data and the policies in the President's budget.

It goes on to say that the concurrent resolution adopts and incorporates by references all data, policy provisions, and information contained therein.

Everything that is in the President's budget is in this amendment. They have plenty of opportunity to vote on this. They can do it themselves. They can vote for what I have offered here today.

Lastly, I will address the point, and my good friend makes a point every single year that this is a political stunt. I want to tell a story as to why it is not this year. It is a real story. It happened to me. It happened to you. It happened to everybody here who represents folks back home.

I get a letter, Mr. Chairman, from the Social Security Administration, telling me that they were closing the field offices in my district.

By the way, they closed field offices in everybody's district. In the letter, they said they did that because we had cut their budget by $1 billion for 3 years in a row.

I am no longer on the Budget Committee, but as Mr. VAN HOLLEN knows, I used to serve on that committee, and I don't remember us cutting the Social Security Administration by $1 billion each of the last 3 years.

So I wrote them a letter and said: you said you are closing the field offices in my district because we cut your budget. Would you please provide me with evidence of that?

What they wrote back is a letter that said: we got $1 billion less from Congress than the President asked for in his budget.

They got more than they did the year the year before and more than they did the year before that. The actual money they had to spend went up, but because they didn't get what the President asked for in his budget, they closed the offices in our districts that serve our constituents.

This is a very important document. Clearly, the Social Security Administration thinks it is an important document. It is at least important enough for us to vote on in the House of Representatives.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 5 minutes remaining.

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

The gentleman just mentioned Social Security Administration funds for operations. Let me tell you, if you vote for the House Republican budget today, you are going to be decimating the funds available for those kind of ongoing operations because they cut that part of the budget that allows for the administration of the Social Security Administration and cut it big time.

So it is interesting to hear my colleague talk about the President's budget in that regard, but I would suggest he look at the impact from the House Republican budget.

Let me just say, Mr. Chair, I indicated earlier that we with like to vote on the President's policies. We have been waiting a very long time to vote on comprehensive immigration reform. In fact, we filed a discharge petition to do it.

We would like to vote on increasing the minimum wage. We filed a discharge petition to do it. We would like to vote on emergency unemployment insurance. We filed a discharge petition on that.

The Speaker of the House has refused to allow democracy to work. Now, we have what is clearly a stunt. As I said, I am a supporter of the President's budget; I support the President's policy. I think it is a stunt. The White House recognizes it as a stunt. We will have, tomorrow, the Democratic alternative that has the support of the White House.

I still find it incredulous that our colleagues are telling us that they really are giving 10 minutes per side of debate to what they claim is before us, which is 2,000 pages, right?

These are our colleagues that went around the country calling for transparency and accountability. They really want Members to vote on something that the Congressional Budget Office has not had a chance to score?

Apparently, they are going to do it next week because they are in the process of looking through the President's budget. So even if this were on the level, which it is not, you can't compare apples to apples without the Congressional Budget Office analysis.

So I am so glad our Republican colleagues were able to speed-read through this thing in 10 minutes and make judgments. The good news for them is that is not the President's budget either.

So let's not play games. Let's recognize that, as we debate these budgets, we are debating the country's priorities. We are debating very different priorities. Once again, the House Republican budget chooses to double down on rigging the rules for very powerful special interests.

If you are a millionaire, you are going to get a one-third cut in your tax rate under the House Republican budget. You know who is going to pay for it? Middle-income taxpayers will have to pay more to finance that tax break for the wealthy—in fact, $2,000 for a family with kids, on average.

You know who else is going to have to pay for that? Our kids' education, Early Head Start, Head Start, K–12, college kids.

You know what else is going to pay? Our competitiveness as a country because we are not going to make the investments that, historically, have helped power this country forward in the area of transportation and infrastructure.

Republican budget, you know when the trust fund goes insolvent? This summer. Nothing in there, nothing in the Republican budget to address that issue, just swoosh, down the tubes insolvent.

Hopefully, we will have an opportunity to actually vote on the President's proposal, as I said, to eliminate some of the special interests tax breaks that encourage companies to move jobs overseas, close those down, so we can invest in our transportation right here at home.

So let's not fall for this political stunt. I mean, I have to believe that if my colleagues seriously wanted a debate a 2,000-page document, that even they would agree that it merits more than 10 minutes, even they would agree that we should have the benefit of the Congressional Budget Office's analysis before we ask this body to take on that responsibility.

So let's not fall for sham. Let's reject the amendment by Mr. MULVANEY; and then, tomorrow, let's vote in support of the Democratic alternative.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MS. MOORE.

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–405.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), I have an amendment at the desk.

The 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 2015.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2015 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2024:

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

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

Fiscal year 2015: $2,697,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,852,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,984,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,104,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,240,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,385,490,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,547,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,725,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,915,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,112,238,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $163,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $176,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $195,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $214,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $225,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $236,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $253,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $269,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $288,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $304,785,000,000.

(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 2015: $3,443,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,400,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,473,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,601,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,809,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,000,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,166,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,397,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,555,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,711,021,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $3,257,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,448,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,518,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,610,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,806,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,968,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,139,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,372,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,516,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,657,148,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: -$560,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$595,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$533,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$505,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$566,793,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$582,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$591,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$646,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$600,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: -$544,910,000,000.

(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 2015: $18,429,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,181,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,926,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,661,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,438,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,222,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $23,007,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,827,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,633,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $25,419,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $13,338,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,973,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,554,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,109,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,744,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,421,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $17,137,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,944,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $18,732,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $19,505,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $529,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $569,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $577,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $586,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $595,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $586,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $604,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $613,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $604,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $624,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $619,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $639,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $627,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $656,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $637,835,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $50,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $48,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $49,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,793,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $50,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $52,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $52,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $55,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,339,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $56,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,465,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $32,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $32,138,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $36,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $37,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,582,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $11,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $7,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $5,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $5,902,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $5,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $6,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $6,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $6,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $6,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,270,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $45,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $43,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $41,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $44,969,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $44,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $46,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $47,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $48,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,617,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $18,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $21,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $21,887,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $22,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $22,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $23,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $23,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,932,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $12,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $11,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $11,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $11,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$10,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,715,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$8,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $14,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $14,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $14,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,172,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $224,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,667,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $156,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $111,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $101,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $100,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $101,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $110,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $102,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $104,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $110,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $105,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $106,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,299,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $49,327,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $28,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $18,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,759,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $14,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $14,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $14,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $14,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $14,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $15,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,704,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
(A) New budget authority, $216,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $158,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $125,492,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $118,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $115,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $117,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $118,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $120,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $122,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $124,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,548,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $507,449,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $556,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $614,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $634,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $666,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $666,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $710,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $700,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $737,724,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $736,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $776,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $775,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $816,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $815,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $858,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $857,258,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $523,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $570,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $585,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $610,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $672,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $672,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $720,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $720,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $771,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $770,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $854,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $854,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $883,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $883,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $913,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $913,119,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $548,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $537,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $552,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $551,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $555,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $551,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $552,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $547,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $572,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $569,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $585,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $599,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $618,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $627,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $621,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $635,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,020,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $31,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,138,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $57,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $158,993,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $170,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $169,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $168,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $168,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $167,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $179,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $184,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $183,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $188,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $187,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $200,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $197,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $196,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $194,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $193,155,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $71,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $62,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $61,045,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $61,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $63,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $65,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $67,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,906,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $70,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $72,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $77,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,291,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $27,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $27,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $28,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $29,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $30,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $30,952,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $31,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,326,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $32,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,227,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $33,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, $34,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,979,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $367,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $426,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $506,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $595,624,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $670,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $670,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $733,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $733,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $786,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $786,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $837,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $837,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $889,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $889,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $934,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $934,712,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $7,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $3,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $8,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $14,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $21,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,164,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$78,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$78,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$83,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$83,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$83,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$83,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$83,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$83,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$91,882,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$91,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$95,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$95,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$98,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$98,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$101,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$101,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$107,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$107,098,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $85,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $25,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $6,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $2,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $35,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000.

SEC. 4. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent under current law.

(3) This concurrent resolution retains the social safety net that has lifted millions of Americans out of poverty and protects both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid from draconian spending cuts.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 5.7 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-test direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this budget rejects proposals 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. Such proposals will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks, and they will weaken the traditional Medicare program. Instead, this budget builds on the success of the Affordable Care Act, which made significant strides in health-care cost containment and put into place a framework for continuous innovation. This budget supports comprehensive reforms to give physicians and other care providers incentives to provide high-quality, coordinated, efficient care, in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability. It makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare.

(B) Any savings derived from changes or reforms to Medicare and Social Security should be used to extend the solvency of these vital programs and not be used to offset the cost of cutting taxes.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 544, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I am so proud to be here with my distinguished colleagues from the Congressional Black Caucus to present our budget for fiscal year 2015.

□ 1545

We have spent the last week, 2 weeks analyzing the House Republican budget, and you have heard here on this floor today the flaws in this budget: it doesn't reflect the needs of our Nation; it achieves deficit reduction by imposing more austerity provisions at the expense of our most vulnerable populations; and it stifles economic growth and our ability to compete on a global scale.

But instead of just criticizing the majority's budget, the Congressional Black Caucus once again has done the due diligence to put together a budget alternative which we believe meets the highest priorities of all Americans.

First of all, it reduces the deficit responsibly. Secondly, it constructs a meaningful job creation package, something Americans desperately need. It invests in our infrastructure and education so we can grow our economy. It ends the ongoing threat of spending cuts due to sequestration. It raises revenue through the Tax Code fairly. We just cannot cut our way to prosperity. And, finally, it extends a compassionate hand towards those who live in poverty, which is the signature and the heart of the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank you for yielding.

As chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am proud to once again propose a fiscally sound and morally responsible alternative budget.

The CBC has a long history of introducing an alternative budget that protects and invests in programs that are vital to our communities. Our budget emphasizes the CBC's commitment to eradicating poverty in America by increasing economic opportunities through robust investments in education and infrastructure, affordable housing, domestic manufacturing, small businesses, and job training.

Though tough decisions are required to ensure our country's fiscal future, we do not believe the well-being of the most vulnerable in this Nation must be sacrificed for us to remain on the path to economic recovery. The CBC alternative budget for fiscal year 2015 remains true to the principle of opportunity for all.

The Ryan budget, on the other hand, completely misses the mark. It disregards the fact that millions of Americans struggle to feed their families and find jobs. It requires sacrifices of the most vulnerable, including the youngest and eldest among us.

As reported by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, some 69 percent of the cuts in Chairman RYAN's budget come from programs that serve people of limited means. These disproportionate cuts, which account for $3.3 trillion of the budget's $4.8 trillion in nondefense cuts over the next decade, contrast sharply with the Ryan budget's rhetoric about helping the poor and promoting opportunity. Need I say more about that?

To my colleagues in the House, the CBC substitute budget is the best blueprint. Let's build a stronger, better, and more fiscally responsible America together. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the budget substitute offered by the Congressional Black Caucus is a good faith effort to lift a growing portion of our population out of chronic poverty and despair, a goal all of us share. It attempts to do so over the next 10 years by raising $2.3 trillion of taxes on corporations and the wealthy and running up an additional $4.3 trillion of debt to increase overall Federal spending by $6.7 trillion to fund so-called stimulus spending relative to the Republican budget. My fear is that it will accomplish exactly the opposite of what it intends, harming the very people it is trying to help.

Let's start with some fundamentals on tax policy.

First, we need to understand that businesses do not pay business taxes. There are only three possible ways for business taxes to be paid: they are paid by consumers as higher prices; they are paid by employees as lower wages; and they are paid by investors as lower earnings—your 401(k) or pension plan, for example.

Secondly, we need to understand what a trillion dollars is. Divided by the number of U.S. households, it comes to about $8,200 for every family in America.

As much as we like talking about taxing the wealthy, there aren't enough wealthy people in this country to make more than a dent in these numbers. Indeed, many of the so-called wealthy are actually small businesses filing under subchapter S.

Raising taxes by $2.3 trillion ultimately, then, means that families, on average, will have $18,000 less to spend on their own needs that they will pay through higher prices in stores, through lower wages at work, or as lower retirement savings.

In addition, the CBC budget would plunge our Nation $4.3 trillion further into debt after 10 years relative to the House Republican budget. That is more than $35,000 per household. That is not a theoretical number. That amount, plus interest, will have to be paid back in future taxes just as surely as if it appeared on your credit card statement. In fact, families will be required to pay this debt back before they pay their credit card, and the IRS is quite insistent that they do.

Again, not all of that will be direct taxes. Much of it will be hidden in higher prices, lower wages, and lower retirement savings for families. But make no mistake; it must all be paid back, and families will bear that burden.

Let's look at the massive increase in spending designed to jump-start the economy. That policy has already failed us, and failed us miserably, and here is why:

Government cannot inject a single dollar into the economy until it has first taken that dollar out of the economy. If I take a dollar from Peter and give it to Paul, it is true Paul is going to have an extra dollar to spend. He is going to take it into a store. The storekeeper is going to order more inventory, the manufacturer is going to order more resources, and that dollar will ripple through the economy.

But we have completely forgotten the other half of that equation. Peter now has one less dollar to spend in that economy—one less dollar to ripple through it. So, in the end, we have not stimulated the economy at all. That is why the trillions of dollars we have already spent trying to stimulate the economy have not worked.

Indeed, this does great damage to the economy because we are transferring huge amounts of capital from the productive sector, which invests its money based on the highest economic return of a dollar, to the public sector, which invests based on the highest political return of the dollar. Those are two very different things. Indeed, that is the difference between FedEx and the post office; it is the difference between Apple Computer and Solyndra; it is the difference between the Reagan recovery and the Obama recovery.

So I beg my colleagues to reconsider. We have tried these policies and they do not work. Under this administration, we have seen record tax increases, record spending increases, and record debt. The result is tragic.

The poverty rate for Americans of African heritage has grown from 12 percent in 2008 to 16.1 percent today. Median income for White households has declined by 3.6 percent during this administration, but it has dropped by 10.9 percent for African American households. Compare that to the Reagan years, when median income increased for all Americans by 4.4 percent but grew by 4.5 percent for African American households.

No one doubts the sincerity of the Congressional Black Caucus in bringing this budget substitute to the floor, but there is an old saying: You can't fix a broken bucket by pouring more water in it; at some point, you have to fix the bucket.

The House Republican budget does this by reducing the tax and regulatory burdens that are choking investment in job creation and that are causing the long, cold winter that our country has endured. If we want to see morning again in America, we need to restore the policies that have produced it before.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant minority leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget and in support of the alternative put forth by the Congressional Black Caucus.

Put simply, the Republican budget is bad for seniors, bad for young people, and bad for America's economic future. It may be a path to prosperity for the investor class in our society, but it is a path to permanent struggle for America's working families.

The Republican budget is a disaster for our senior citizens. It brings back the doughnut hole for Medicare prescription drugs. We eliminated the doughnut hole with the Affordable Care Act, but this Republican budget brings it back.

The Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee of earned benefits and replaces it with a risky voucher scheme. American workers deserve the guarantee of earned benefits. This Republican budget slashes $732 billion from Medicaid. Mr. Chairman, two-thirds of Medicaid's funds serve seniors and disabled Americans.

The Republican budget is a disaster for our children and young people. It guts Head Start and cuts school lunches and Pell grants.

This budget repeals the Affordable Care Act provision that allows young people to stay on their parents' health plans until their 26th birthday. It allows discrimination against people with preexisting conditions like diabetes, heart disease, and asthma.

This Republican budget rigs the system so that only the children of the well-off and well-connected can get ahead, while the children of the less well-off are consigned to a life of permanent struggle.

This budget rejects the one measure that could immediately unleash more economic activity and grow our economy: comprehensive immigration reform.

In contrast, the CBC budget continues our long history of fiscal soundness and moral responsibility. We make tough choices to secure our financial future, but we do not believe that the most vulnerable in our Nation should be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

The CBC budget focuses on eradicating poverty in America through robust investments in education, infrastructure, affordable housing, manufacturing, and small business development. Our budget targets funds to needy communities.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MOORE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CLYBURN. It contains our 10–20–30 initiative, requiring that at least 10 percent of Federal funds in certain accounts are directed to areas that have had a poverty rate of 20 percent or more for the last 30 years.

Mr. Chairman, our budgets should reflect our Nation's values and establish what kind of future we want for our citizens. It is fundamentally unfair that 69 percent of the cuts in the Republican budget come from services to low-income and hardworking Americans.

We can do better. We must do better. The CBC budget is better. We should support it and reject the Republican budget.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), the former Governor.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank my colleague.

I rise in respectful opposition to the CBC budget for the reasons that my colleague from California just enumerated.

I have listened to this debate over the last few minutes, and the Ryan budget has been called a draconian budget, a phony budget, an extreme budget, a reckless budget, a heat-seeking missile aimed at the American public budget, but what it has not been recognized as is a brave budget. And I say that because it gets at what no other budget in this process gets at, which is entitlement spending. The President's budget doesn't. The CBC budget doesn't. The Democratic alternative doesn't. The Progressive budget doesn't. It's only this budget that really begins to address the elephant in the room.

Is it perfect? No.

Will I vote against some of the appropriations bills that come along in its wake? I suspect, yes.

□ 1600

But it has been said that a journey of a thousand miles begins with that first step. And to the credit of the Ryan—the Republican budget, it begins that first step at addressing entitlement reform in a way that has not been the case because, to do nothing would, indeed, be to launch a heat-seeking missile into the pocketbook, the wallet, the purse of every American as we wait for the day of reckoning to occur, which is 2025.

In 2025, there will only be enough money for interest and entitlements and nothing else. So we can talk about all these other worthy programs, but without addressing that terminal date of 2025, we are in real trouble.

I think that there are particular problems with this amendment. As you look at taxes going up by $2.3 trillion, you look at spending going up by $6.7 trillion, and you look at an additional $4.3 trillion of debt, it says we have real problems.

But, again, the operative number is what happens to the value of our currency, to future inflation, and to the value of our savings if we do nothing, which is, again, addressed in this Ryan budget with its address of entitlement spending. To do nothing is indeed extreme, and it is reckless.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy now to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the leader of the Congressional Black Caucus' Budget Task Force.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more credible and responsible alternative than the underlying Republican budget.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Committee budget starts off by cutting taxes by $4 trillion and claims this can be revenue neutral.

Simple arithmetic, therefore, requires a $4 trillion tax increase, and the budget doesn't mention a word about where that money is going to come from, not a loophole closing or any other tax increase. And therefore, the budget starts off with a $4 trillion hole in it.

Their budget then expects people to believe that they will make $4 trillion in cuts by repealing the Affordable Care Act provisions for tax credits and Medicaid changes that have resulted in millions of people getting insurance for the first time. They are going to lose that coverage.

Do they think that is going to happen?

Do they think they are going to be able to increase the age for Medicare recipients and reopen the doughnut hole?

Do they think they are going to be able to make the cuts in the budget to Medicaid, denying access to health care to millions of low-income Americans, requiring millions to lose their nursing home coverage?

We know that that is not credible. Neither is it credible that over $100 billion in cuts to supplemental food assistance—we know that is not credible. They tried to cut $40 billion last year, then $20 billion, couldn't do that. They ended up with 8. Now they are going to say, well, all of a sudden we can do 100.

The budget fails to say where the other cuts are going to come from, whether it is going to come from education or job training or research or transportation, or other.

You have unspecified cuts. And to the extent that they are unspecified, that $4 trillion isn't going to happen. So they have a $4 trillion hole in revenues. They have a $4 trillion hole in spending cuts, $8 trillion hole in their budget.

You can talk about it being balanced, but until you come up with the specifics of where that $8 trillion is going to come from, it is just not a serious budget.

In stark contrast, the Congressional Black Caucus budget puts numbers on the page. We show our math. We show not only that we can raise $2 trillion in revenues, we show where it can come from by laying out over $4 trillion in options, specifics, not $4 trillion unspecified, but $4 trillion specified, $2 trillion needed to make the budget.

We eliminate sequestration. We have proposed a $500 billion jobs package that will end the recession by putting millions back to work, and approximately $400 billion for an antipoverty initiative that will restore cuts to the social safety net and enable people to get job training and education to make them able to work their way out of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, this is simple, straightforward arithmetic.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Our budget calls for policy changes and comprehensive immigration reform, a public option for health care, and others, and it will be scored at $1.8 trillion, real live reduction in the deficit, compared to the CBO baseline.

Our budget is a credible, job-creating alternative to the unrealistic, draconian plan offered by our Republican colleagues, which has an $8 trillion hole in it.

I ask you to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, it has been the honor of a lifetime to serve on the Budget Committee under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), to whom I yield such time as he may consume.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. And I also want to thank the CBC for offering a budget. I think that is what is important that is happening here, people are coming to the floor of Congress offering their ideas, offering their solutions.

One of the things that they are so clearly concerned about, that they have their method of dealing with in the budget is, what do you do about poverty. This is something that we are also deeply concerned about.

A year ago we decided to look at our strategies from the Federal Government's perspective on fighting poverty because, after all, we are in the 50th year, the 50th anniversary of the so-called War on Poverty.

We wanted to say, is there a good accounting of all those Federal poverty programs that we can look at to see if they are working well, if they need updating, because, after all, they were put in place largely in the mid- to late part of the 20th century.

No such accounting occurred. So we spent the last year looking through all these programs, looking at all the audits and the Government Accountability Office reports and the inspector general reports and outside academics' opinions of these things. We took it all together, and we realized that the Federal Government has nearly 100 programs aimed at fighting poverty, spending about $800 billion a year doing so.

And look at the results. We have the highest poverty rate in a generation. Deep poverty is the highest, on record. Forty-six million people are living in poverty.

So we are asking ourselves, does one more program from the Department of Health and Human Services, is that going to do the trick all of a sudden?

It is not working. So our concern is that we have moved from a war on eradicating poverty to simply treating the symptoms of poverty to make it more tolerable, to manage poverty.

We are measuring our success—and this is how this debate always goes—based upon how much money we throw at programs, based on inputs, not based on outcomes.

How many people are we truly getting out of poverty?

As we look at these programs, the best thing we should do is go and listen to people who are fighting poverty; go listen to people who have successfully fought poverty.

I got up real early Monday morning in Martindale-Brightwood—it is a low-income neighborhood in Indianapolis, Indiana—to learn from people who are successfully fighting poverty, who are really doing amazing things, seeing potential and great lives realizing their potential.

We can learn a lot by getting out of this town, by finding out what works, and getting behind them and helping make sure what works continues.

But if we suffocate this debate with more one-size-fits-all, with more Washington knows best, with one more program, you know, the 93rd one is going to be the charm, then we are not going to get at the root cause of the problem.

The goal here is to get at the root cause of poverty to break the cycle of poverty, so I think there is a lot we all need to learn about this.

Hopefully, what we are accomplishing here, in our budget, is letting people who are closer to the problem have a little more flexibility, a little more discretion, so that they can customize and tailor solutions to meet the unique and particular needs of the people in their communities who are actually striving and fighting poverty.

One more point. When we stack all these programs on top of each other, we have done something inadvertently in this government, and that is, we have built barriers toward self-sufficiency. We have made it harder for a rational person to leave benefits and go into work because they lose more when they do that.

We have got tax rates, single moms making less than $40,000 a year with kids that are, like, 80 percent, meaning, you go to work, you lose more in benefits than you gain going to work. We have got to do something about that. That should not be a Republican, Democrat thing. That is just plain old economics.

So I think we need to rethink our approach, and not measure based on inputs, not measure based on how much money we can throw at programs, but measure based on what is working, who is doing a good job, how can we support them, how can we learn and listen from them.

Oh, and why don't we start measuring success based on outcomes?

That is what we are trying to achieve.

We have got a long ways to go, but I hope that that is the kind of conversation we can get to.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 4¾ minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am so happy at this time to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the chair of the Democratic whip's Task Force on Poverty and Opportunity, and also a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me thank Congresswoman MOORE for your very bold leadership on the Budget Committee, and also for leading us today in this debate.

And too, of course, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, the chair of our Congressional Black Caucus. Just want to thank you all for bringing forth really what is a very pro-American budget.

I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. I just have to say, Chairman RYAN and I, we constantly talk about how to lift people out of poverty. I have to say that his poverty report, and I just have to respond to what he said because we know that the War on Poverty and the programs and the safety net, they have worked. They have saved millions and millions of people from falling into the ranks of the poor, and have lifted people out of poverty.

If we raised the minimum wage right now, these single moms that you talk about, who rely on food stamps and Medicaid because they can't get a decent living wage, yeah, they would be very happy. And I think the country would be a lot better, if, in fact, we raised the minimum wage, which, of course, the Congressional Black Caucus budget promotes and allows for and invests in in terms of job creation and in terms of ensuring that the safety net is preserved.

Instead of ending subsidies for Big Oil, tax breaks for corporate jets, tax breaks for companies that site offshore, the Republican budget cuts at least $125 million from SNAP.

In stark contrast, the CBC budget provides $388 billion to eradicate poverty in America, restoring cuts to SNAP, extending unemployment insurance, and targeting resources to those most in need.

Our budget also addresses health disparities and protects and strengthens Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, restoring the cuts the Ryan budget would make.

This budget provides $230 billion to revitalize our Nation's infrastructure and creates a $500 billion jobs program to our initiatives in our budget to accelerate the Nation's economic recovery, including $7 billion in a summer jobs program.

A budget is a moral document. It reflects who we are as a country. The CBC's budget reflects the best of American values.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this balanced, pro-growth, pro-jobs budget.

Finally, it ends the overseas contingency account. This perpetual spending on war needs to end. Nation-building at home must begin.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, we are ready to close when the gentlelady has finished her presentation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a freshman on the Budget Committee.

□ 1615

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady, my good friend, from the Badger State for her leadership.

Mr. Chair, 50 years ago, President Lyndon Baines Johnson came to this very Chamber and declared a war on poverty, and as a result of the legislative efforts that were brought about in connection with the Great Society vision, tens of millions of Americans were lifted out of an impoverished condition and set on the trajectory toward the middle class.

The CBC is here today because we recognize that there is still a lot of work that needs to be done, particularly in the aftermath of the collapse of the economy, the Great Recession, the worst economic condition since the Great Depression.

That is why the CBC budget invests in the American economy, invests in job training and education, invests in transportation and infrastructure, invests in research and development, invests in affordable housing, invests in creating manufacturing jobs.

The CBC budget would renew unemployment compensation in order to make sure that the long-term unemployed, who are collateral damage of the Great Recession, can get back into the mainstream of our economy.

The CBC budget will give Americans a raise to $10.10 an hour by lifting the minimum wage. By the way, that will help grow the economy because we have a consumer demand problem, and as a result of the increase in spending resulting from the minimum wage increase, everybody in America will benefit.

The CBC does this in a fiscally responsible way that will reduce the deficit, but it does it in a manner that does not balance the budget on the backs of working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, and the afflicted; and that is not even an exhaustive list of what the Ryan budget does.

So I am urging all of our colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the CBC alternative, invest in America, invest in our economy, and invest in our workers.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I thank all of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus who have worked hard on this budget.

I was so happy that the chair of the Budget Committee came to the floor. We, obviously, don't have time to continue this conversation on poverty, and I think that there is much to talk about since we shouldn't blame poverty programs or blame the poor; but we need to look at inequality, the state of our economy, and an unfair Tax Code.

Indeed, 2007 and 1928, 2 years that ushered in the Great Depression and the Great Recession, chronicled the highest inequality in our country, and that might, in fact, talk about where our budget priorities ought to be. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is human nature, I think, to resist concluding that our beliefs have been disproven by experience. The more we invest in our mistakes, the less willing we often are to recognize and correct them; but sooner than later, we have to acknowledge from our own experience that certain policies work and certain policies don't, whether they are tried by Republicans or Democrats.

My Democratic colleagues are right to praise the Clinton administration's handling of the economy; but we must ask: What were those policies?

In 1995, he announced that the era of Big Government is over. Working in cooperation with the Republican Congress, they reduced Federal spending by a miraculous 4 percent of GDP. They enacted what amounted to the biggest capital gains tax cut in American history.

They reformed entitlement spending by abolishing the open-ended welfare system. They produced four budget surpluses in a row, and the economy flourished, and it expanded for all Americans.

My colleagues are also right to heap scorn on George W. Bush's handling of the economy; but we have to ask again: What were those policies?

Well, he increased Federal spending by 2 percent of GDP. He enacted the biggest expansion of entitlement spending since the Great Society. He began the era of stimulus spending. He ran up what, at the time, were record budget deficits. Don't my colleagues see that they are advocating the same policies that got us into this mess?

My objection to President Obama is not that he has changed Bush's policies, but, rather, that he has not changed them. He has taken the worst of them and doubled down on them. The CBC substitute takes us further down this path of debt and doubt and despair.

In 1862, Abraham Lincoln sent this message to the Congress—and I think that they are words meant for us today. He said:

> The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

I invite my friends to think anew and act anew; to disenthrall ourselves from the policies that have failed; and to return to the policies of individual liberty, constitutionally limited government, and personal responsibility that produced the most prosperous, happy, and free society in the history of civilization. In short, freedom works, and it is time that we put it and our country back to work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus's budget alternative to the extreme Republican-led Ryan budget. Congressional Republicans have offered up a budget that continues their legislative reign of terror completely undermining our Nation's future by protecting the wealthiest.

The CBC has put forth a "real" budget that finds responsible ways to reduce our Nation's deficit and recommits the Federal Government to eradicating poverty. In Los Angeles County, where my district is located, we have the highest poverty rate among all of the Californian counties. The CBC budget works to help districts like mine by making a $500 billion investment over three years into jobs to accelerate our Nation's economic recovery and put Americans back to work.

Many Californians find it difficult to make ends meet without the support of Federal safety net programs. Our budget strengthens and protects the social safety net by restoring cuts to the SNAP program, extending emergency unemployment insurance and increasing economic opportunities through targeted investments in education, infrastructure, affordable housing, domestic manufacturing, small businesses, and scientific research.

Mr. Chair, it is clear that the Republican Leadership is not serious about putting our Nation back on the track to prosperity. It is time for a change. Therefore, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the right thing and make a true investment into our Nation's future by voting for the Congressional Black Caucus's budget alternative.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chair, on January 8, 1964, President Johnson came before the nation to deliver his State of the Union address and declared a war on poverty. It has been 60 years since President Johnson gave us that charge, but we have yet to achieve a country free from the burdens of poverty. As President Johnson said all those years ago, "It will not be a short or easy struggle, no single weapon or strategy will suffice, but we shall not rest until that war is won. The richest nation on earth can afford to win it. We cannot afford to lose it."

Well, Mr. Chair, President Johnson was correct. The struggle has been neither short nor easy, but he was also right when he said we would not rest until the war on poverty was won. There is no silver bullet, no single weapon or strategy for confronting something as complex as our nation's struggle with poverty. That is why I rise today in support of the budget put forth by the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC). This budget is neither a single weapon nor a single strategy, but rather a multi-faceted dynamic approach to responsible governing that will strengthen our economy and reduce our deficit by approximately $1.8 trillion over the next ten years.

Mr. Chair, a budget can act as a mirror; a mirror that reflects the priorities, ideals and morality of a nation. When we hold the budget proposed by Chairman RYAN up to the mirror, we see an image that distorts the ideals that provide the foundation for this country. We see an image that prioritizes protecting the wealthy over championing middle class families, small businesses and the poor. We know what we need to do to help those Americans who are struggling. We need to extend emergency unemployment insurance; we need to raise the minimum wage; we need to support the Affordable Care Act; invest in education; invest in job training; and we certainly have to invest in our infrastructure. We need a plan to create jobs. Mr. Chair, the dynamic budget proposed by the CBC addresses all of these issues and more. Under Mr. RYAN's Path to Poverty, these critical issues are not addressed. In fact, they are purposely ignored.

Mr. Chair, our tax code is hurting many Americans. It is a code that rewards and protects the rich at the expense of middle class families and the poor. Taken together, the ideas proposed by the CBC would equal roughly $4.3 trillion in revenue enhancement over the next decade in ways that are fairer to more Americans. The CBC only directs the appropriate committees in the House and Senate to find $2.0 trillion in revenue enhancements.

Those of us who champion the CBC budget provide a number of ways to reach that $2.0 trillion mark. For instance, we could end special tax breaks and close tax loopholes available only to the wealthiest Americans. This alone could get us $1 trillion over the next ten years. We could also stop the wealthiest among us from using overseas tax havens to avoid paying their fair share. Along these same lines, let us rid our tax code of ridiculous loopholes like deductions for yachts and the loophole for corporate jets. Additionally, we could find $880 billion over the next decade if we taxed capital gains and dividends as ordinary income. We all have constituents back home who work hard all week. They put in their 40 hours, often times more, to provide for their families. At the end of the week they get a check from which taxes have been withheld at rates for ordinary income. This amount is taxed higher than the gains made in from stocks. The Congressional Research Service (CRS) has said that these rates are "the single greatest driver of income inequality over a recent 15 year period was runaway income from capital gains and dividends." It does not seem to me, Mr. Chair, unreasonable to ask that the Wall Street banker sitting on a stock portfolio, to pay the same tax rates as a teacher in Florida or a factory worker in Maine.

Mr. Chair, we have a truly disturbing income inequality situation in this country. Such inequality is unfair to those who work diligently to create growth for this country, but who do not get to reap the benefits there from. This inequality is bad for the social fabric that binds this country together. While corporations and top level executives make record profits and payout larger and larger bonuses, middle class Americans are left further and further behind as they struggle through this jobless recovery.

Additionally, sequestration did not do any favors for the middle class or poor. Sequestration was the brutal swing of a cudgel of despair aimed right at the hopes and dreams of poor and middle class families. Head Start programs were scaled back, summer sessions were cut, instructors were cut, and students were put on waitlists rather than in classrooms. Seniors were placed in danger of facing food insecurities when Meals on Wheels had to cut down on their deliveries. Sequestration led to federal funding being cut for education including science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). This was done at the K–12 level and the college level. It will be absolutely impossible for this country to maintain its advantage in an increasingly advanced and complex world economy if we do not invest in STEM education at all levels. These are but a few reasons the CBC Budget responsibly puts an end to Sequestration.

Mr. Chair, our country cries out for a jobs bill that will accelerate economic recovery and helps Americans across this nation. The CBC budget answers these cries by proposing a jobs program totaling $500 billion. This responsible approach to governing will grow our economy by establishing a National Direct Job Creation Program that puts people to work repairing our schools, community centers, parks and playgrounds. This program will add 2.8 million jobs. This responsible approach to growing our economy also includes a plan to modernize our schools. Many of the schools around this country were built decades ago. These schools are approaching the point where we cannot adequately train our young people for the challenges ahead. In order to meet the demands and challenges of the future, our students need facilities that can handle the cutting edge technologies that will undoubtedly form the basis of any decent job of the future.

Mr. Chair, the CBC's responsible approach to governing calls for an immediate investment in our country's infrastructure. Not only will an immediate investment in our infrastructure lead to hundreds of thousands of jobs dedicated to upgrading this country's crumbling roads, bridges and railways, but by strengthening our infrastructure, we help businesses small and large alike grow by giving them access to the tools they need to ship goods throughout the country.

The CBC's responsible approach to governing also acknowledges the fact that the housing crisis continues to ripple throughout many of our neighborhoods. That is why the budget calls for significant funding to help communities rebuild and helps families facing foreclosures remain in their homes. Furthermore, the CBC budget, acknowledges the fact that a person may come into this economy with one set of skills, but through no fault of their own, find that they need a new set of skills to be competitive in a rapidly changing economy. The budget makes sure that these hard working Americans are not left behind by giving them access to technical training, career services, graduate and certificate programs and other job training programs.

Mr. Chair, every day, homeless Americans face constant instability and must cope with difficult and often unhealthy lifestyles. For those living without permanent housing, everyday life is extremely difficult. Storing and preparing food is nearly impossible, and much of the homeless population relies on temporary shelters and soup kitchens to survive. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) provides working poor Americans with badly needed nourishment. Cutting funding for this program will only add to the difficulties so many are facing. The CBC budget recognizes this reality, and uses the program savings that will come from raising the minimum wage to help improve and streamline the benefits and ensure that this critical lifeline remain available for those who need it most.

The budget proposed here today is a budget that protects the poor, while providing security for middle class families. It is a budget that protects the social fabric holding together the greatest experiment in democracy the world has ever known. It is a budget that responsibly rewards innovation, while closing gross inequalities in wealth. It is a budget that helps teachers instill in our young people a thirst for knowledge. It is a budget that invests in this country's roads and bridges to help our small businesses. It is a budget that will bring us further down the road towards ending the War on Poverty, not further down the Road to Ruin that the Republicans want to take us.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus (CPC) Budget because it would replace H. Con. Res. 96, the "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2015," with a rational approach for budgetary reform and address the needs of real people.

I oppose H. Con. Res. 96, in its current form because it is irresponsible and a reckless approach to fiscal policy that the House majority has championed for years, with disastrous results.

The CPC's "Better Off Budget" would raise enough new revenue to provide $3.7 trillion for major new investments in education, infrastructure, state and local aid, nutrition, housing and research. It is estimated to create 8.8 million new jobs and to reduce the deficit by $4 trillion.

The CPC budget asks the wealthy to contribute their fair share of taxes.

Millions of American adults remain under- or unemployed, while millions more youth are desperately seeking their first work experience.

We have millions of people living in our Nation, paying taxes and contributing to the success of this nation, but are denied an opportunity to earn citizenship.

The CPC's budget reflects the reality of everyday working America—but it sees working people as worthy of dignity and recognition for what they do every day to keep this nation strong.

The CPC's Budget is pro-worker, pro-family, pro-women, pro-education, pro-healthcare, and pro-senior which are the values that are missing in the current language of H. Con. Res. 96.

Members of the Progressive Caucus understand that the devastating cuts to federal budgets by House Republicans coupled with Sequestration have significantly hampered our Nation's economic recovery.

The country was under the control of Republicans when the economy crashed in 1929 and then they wholeheartedly embraced austerity measures which pushed the nation into the "Great Depression."

Eighty years later the House Republicans still have not learned the lessons regarding austerity during dire economic times.

The nation continues to struggle after the collapse in 2008 as the results of the Great Recession continue.

In 2013, on December 28, three days after Christmas, 1.3 million people nationwide lost their federal unemployment insurance due to House Republicans refusing to extend unemployment benefits.

Connecting the dots on the economic damage done to the nation by that decision is easy.

Nationally 72,000 unemployment insurance recipients will lose their benefits each week during the first half of 2014.

According to the White House Council of Economic Advisers and the Department of Labor–3.6 million additional people will lose their unemployment insurance benefits by the end of 2014 if nothing is done to restore benefits.

TEXAS

64,294 unemployed Texas residents lost their unemployment insurance benefits.

Each week an additional 4,112 Texans will lose their unemployment insurance benefits.

Unemployment insurance payments provide partial income replacement to unemployed workers who meet the requirements of state law.

According to the White House Council of Economic Advisers and the Department of Labor, Texas will lose 11,766 jobs if unemployment insurance payments are not reinstated.

To compound this economic reality the nation's families and workers are struggling to make it in a weak private sector economy that is recovering, while federal, state and local government jobs are going unfilled.

Public sector hiring is at its lowest point in 47 years, when the nation's population was over 146 million. In 2013, the U.S. population was over 317 million.

The need for public services is greater than they were in 1947, and the generation of public jobs should keep pace with domestic population growth.

The government shutdown last year was a direct result of the majority not believing that public employees make contributions to the quality of life in the United States or make a significant contribution to the nation's overall economic wellbeing.

The Better Off Budget rectifies this inaccurate view of the role of government at all levels, by ending the ill advised austerity measures enacted by the Budget Control Act, sequestration, and SNAP benefit cuts, and replacing them with solutions to create 8.8 million jobs by 2017.

The CPC budget would enact comprehensive immigration reform and at the same time reduce the federal budget deficit by $700 billion over the next 20 years.

The CPC budget would also enact a tax code that makes sense for all Americans by introducing tax fairness and implementing a "Hard Work Tax Credit," expanding EITC, and stronger regulatory measures to reduce the incidence of extreme volatility in financial markets with the introduction of a Financial Speculation Tax.

The CPC's Better Off Budget outlines a viable alternative to H. Con. Res. 96 with a perspective on the future that allows for an improving economy to be factored into how spending and appropriations decisions should be made.

America's economy at this point could be said to be in the early recovery phase of a very bad case of the flu, the Ryan Budget would turn it into the early stages of pneumonia.

The CPC budget makes a clear and unambiguous commitment to our nation's children and their future that H. Con. Res 96 does not.

The CPC budget understands that children are our nation's greatest asset. Children are not small adults, they are growing and their bodies must have certain things that are non-negotiable.

Children need safe, correctly prepared, nutritious food; clean drinking water, adequate shelter, seasonal clothing, safe toys, excellent education, healthcare, and safe environments to grow and learn so that they have a good chance of reaching their full potential.

In addition, children with disabilities must also have competent caregivers who are knowledgeable on how to best help them successfully engage the world during their day to day lives in preparation of them living independently.

Children with chronic conditions like asthma, sickle cell anemia, autism, respiratory disorders, cognitive disorders, brain injuries, physical disabilities, muscular dystrophy or other serious medical conditions should not be robbed of a childhood or their independence as adults.

All children can benefit from efforts that are aimed at keeping them safe from preventable injury, illness, and death.

Parents and families fill an indispensible role in the lives of children, and the CPC budget recognizes that there is a strong public interest in ensuring that children have the opportunity to achieve their full potential.

It is in the public interest that children are free of disease, illness, injury, violence, consume sufficient amounts of foods with high nutritional value that support health growth, arrive to the learning environment ready to learn. Parents, teachers, communities and students should be empowered to decide for themselves how best to build strong collaborative relationships to reach these basic goals in support of their children.

The interconnectedness of economies makes the welfare of children in the United States critical to the future of our nation. If we are to remain globally relevant we must understand that our nation's ability to remain first in the areas of innovation, commerce, science, engineering, and global relevance is tied to how well the next generation is physically, mentally and emotionally prepared to lead, support, or engage their futures.

We are at a point where children receive less than 8 percent of the federal budget. Since the peak in 2010, totaling $35 billion in spending on children there has been a 16 percent drop. Total spending on children has declined for three years in a row according to First Focus, a bipartisan children's advocacy organization dedicated to improving the lives of children and families.

The CPC Budget plan will protect and strengthen programs that support children and their families as well as address the needs of our recovering economy, reduce the deficit in a responsible way, while continuing to invest in the things that make our country strong like education, health care, innovation, and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, this Republican budget is bad for America but the CPC's budget is the cure.

1. If the Republican budget resolution were to become the basis of federal fiscal policy, 3,435,336 Texas seniors would be forced out of traditional Medicare and into a voucher program. Under the Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it, Texas seniors will receive a voucher instead of guaranteed benefits under traditional Medicare.

2. For the 3,435,336 Texans aged 45–54, the value of their vouchers would be capped at growth levels that are lower than the projected increases in health care costs. Previous analyses showed that this type of plan would cut future spending by $5,900 per senior, forcing them to spend more out of pocket and diminishing their access to quality care.

3. Additionally, private insurance plans will aggressively pursue the healthiest, least expensive enrollees, thereby allowing Medicare—currently the lifeline for 3,187,332 Texas seniors—to "wither on the vine."

4. If the Republican budget resolution were to be adopted by Congress, 206,304 Texas seniors would pay more for prescription drugs next year.

5. The Republican plan would re-open the "donut hole," forcing seniors to pay the full cost of their prescription drugs if their yearly drug expenses are more than $2,970 for the year.

6. Seniors reaching the prescription drug "donut hole" would pay an average of $828 more in prescription drug costs in 2014 and approximately $13,000 more from now through 2022.

7. Under the Republican budget, the 2,445,462 Texas seniors who utilized free preventive services currently covered by Medicare in 2012 will face increased costs in the form of higher deductibles, co-insurance, and copayments for certain services, including even cancer screenings and annual wellness visits.

8. The Republican budget slashes $31.71 billion in nursing home care and other health care services for 754,500 Texas seniors and disabled who currently rely on Medicaid for their long-term care needs.

9. The draconian cuts included in the Republican budget would have a devastating impact on the 1,191 certified nursing homes in Texas that serve 91,717 seniors, with more than half relying on Medicaid as their primary payer. As a result, nursing homes would be forced to slash services, turn away seniors, or close their doors.

Mr. Chair, the Better Off Budget enhances programs that close the growing wealth gap, including ensuring equal access to job opportunities, properly funding public education and enhancing programs that allow American families to get through tough times. Women and communities of color have been disproportionately impacted by recent budget cuts, particularly at the state and local levels.

The CPC budget increases the Education, Training and Social Services budget function by $243 billion and the Income Security budget function by $323 billion over 10 years.

Specifically, the Alternative Budgets proposed by the CPC: help create more jobs now; replace the sequester; make key education investments; invest in research and development and clean energy; invest in long-term infrastructure; preserve Medicare as we know it; protect health reform's benefits for seniors; protect Medicaid for seniors in nursing homes; preserve Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP); reduce the deficit through a smart, targeted, and steady approach provides tax relief for working families and ends tax breaks for the wealthy; take a balanced approach to reducing the long-term deficits and debt; and put the budget on a sustainable path.

It is said often, Mr. Chair, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values. As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

"The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped."

For that reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility. To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a "moral test."

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards. The Democratic alternatives do not. For these compelling reasons, I stand in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 96 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this ill-conceived and unwise measure.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–405.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) to offer amendment No. 3, the Congressional Progressive Caucus' Better Off Budget substitute.

The 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 2015.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2015 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2014 and for fiscal years 2016 through 2024.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2024:

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

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

Fiscal year 2014: $2,267,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,831,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,212,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,374,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,506,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,641,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,802,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,981,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,177,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,381,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,601,863,000,000

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

Fiscal year 2014: -$18,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $297,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $536,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $585,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $616,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $627,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $653,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $687,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $721,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $755,118,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $794,410,000,000.

(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 2014: $3,247,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,519,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,641,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,702,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,807,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,993,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,179,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,345,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,582,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,737,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,885,880,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $3,208,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,501,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,620,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,679,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,783,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,959,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,128,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,307,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,545,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,687,974,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,823,437,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: −$941,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$669,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$408,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$305,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$276,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$317,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −$326,121,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$325,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −$367,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: −306,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: −$221,574,000,000.

(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 2014: $18,065,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,906,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,464,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,967,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,459,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $20,980,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,501,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,019,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $22,553,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $23,061,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $23,520,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $13,106,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,815,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,256,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,594,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,908,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,287,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $15,701,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,148,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $16,671,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $17,159,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $17,607,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2014 through 2024 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $613,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $611,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $529,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $531,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $547,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $544,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $541,996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $557,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $545,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $571,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $585,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $599,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $615,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $607,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $631,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $647,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $628,997,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $60,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,493,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $60,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $66,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $65,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $63,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $64,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $66,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $66,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $70,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $72,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,968,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $33,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $39,888,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $39,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $40,035,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $40,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $41,514,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $42,624,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $43,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $44,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,844,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,109,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $26,624,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,988,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $23,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,773,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $39,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $45,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $48,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $48,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $49,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $50,492,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $52,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $52,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $55,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $57,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,347,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,773,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $19,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $20,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $20,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $20,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $20,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $21,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,418,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority,- $78,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $19,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,793,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $18,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $21,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$1,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $22,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $23,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,069,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $160,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $201,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $208,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $172,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $173,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $164,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $169,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $160,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $166,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $151,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $157,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $154,327,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $156,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $159,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $162,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,501,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $20,813,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $28,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $27,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $27,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $27,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $27,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $27,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $28,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $29,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,623,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $261,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $258,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $230,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $230,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $160,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $135,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $131,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $131,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $127,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $129,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $130,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $133,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $136,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,505,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $140,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,546,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $424,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $513,727,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $504,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $579,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $632,324,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $630,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $653,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $654,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $688,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $688,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $734,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $724,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $765,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $764,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $807,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $806,128,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $850,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $848,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $897,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $896,110,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, $525,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $525,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $537,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $537,667,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $578,698,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $584,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $584,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $607,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $607,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $668,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $667,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $713,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $713,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $761,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $761,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $844,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $844,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $870,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $870,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $894,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $894,776,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $609,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $601,095,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $679,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $667,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $698,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $691,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $650,569,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $645,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $636,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $630,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $643,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $639,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $660,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $656,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $679,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $674,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $704,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $703,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $721,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $714,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $737,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $725,532,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $28,711,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $31,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,138,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $57,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $155,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $150,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $167,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $184,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $180,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $181,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $180,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $177,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $189,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $188,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $194,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $193,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $198,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $197,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $211,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $209,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $208,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $207,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $206,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $204,744,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $56,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $74,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $69,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $67,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $68,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,113,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $69,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $71,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $73,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $77,002,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $79,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $85,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,553,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $24,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $25,605,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $26,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $27,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $27,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $28,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $29,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $30,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,078,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $31,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $32,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,886,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $337,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $372,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $431,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $431,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $506,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $587,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $651,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $651,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $704,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $704,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $745,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $745,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $785,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $785,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $822,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $822,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $854,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $854,052,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $1,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $1,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $1,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $2,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,355,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$72,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$72,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$78,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$78,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$83,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$83,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$83,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$83,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −83,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$83,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −90,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$91,882,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$91,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$95,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −95,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$98,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$98,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$101,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$101,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, −$107,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$107,098,000,000.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 201. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.8 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act expanded a number of tax credits targeted at working families to boost relief during hard economic times. The Better Off Budget retains the improvements made to the Earned Income Tax Credit (qualifying children and phase-out range), Child and Dependent Care Credit, and the American Opportunity Tax Credit. These credits fuel demand for American businesses by putting money in the hands of families. The Better Off Budget also adopts the EITC improvements proposed in President Obama's Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request, which would double the maximum credit and increase the income level at which the credit is fully phased out. The proposal would also make the credit available to young adult workers and raise the upper age to 67, which harmonizes it with recent increases in the Social Security full retirement age. With this reform, the Better Off Budget would help reduce poverty for childless households and provide substantial relief to approximately 13.5 million low-income workers.

(B) As a part of its response to the recent financial crisis, Congress wisely enacted tax provisions in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and subsequent job creation legislative packages that provided direct assistance to working individuals. The expiration of both the Making Work Pay tax credit and the temporary cut to the payroll tax have slowed our country's economic recovery and taken money out of the pockets of hard-working Americans. The Better Off Budget implements a new Hard Work Tax Credit to reward Americans for their hard work. This policy would provide a refundable tax credit for 2014 and 2015 for up to $600 for working individuals earning less than $95,000 and up to $1,200 for households earning less than $190,000. The credit would be continued in 2016 with the maximum amount of $300 for individuals and $600 for households. Through the enactment of the Hard Work Tax Credit, the Better Off Budget would immediately increase the disposable income of low and middle income families.

(C) The unemployment rate is still far higher than it was when President George W. Bush signed the emergency benefits program into law. Cutting unemployment benefits has damaged our economic recovery. The Better Off Budget extends Emergency Unemployment Compensation to allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment benefits in high-unemployment states for up to two years. According to the Economic Policy Institute, this would boost real GDP growth by 0.4 percentage points and increase employment by 539,000 jobs in 2014.

(D) The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act temporarily increased benefit levels for beneficiaries of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. The Better Off Budget would reverse recent SNAP cuts adopted in the Agricultural Act of 2014 and return benefits to ARRA levels. These reforms will help combat hunger and boost economic growth.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For non means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 5.7 percent.

(2) For non means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.0 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for non means-tested direct spending:

(A) Medicare is a cornerstone of the American health care system for more than 45 million American seniors. It is an exemplary program that provides the most efficient care to a segment of the population that costs more to treat. The Better Off Budget protects beneficiaries and makes the system even more efficient. It amends Part D of Medicare to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prescription drug prices with pharmaceutical manufacturers, as the Department of Veterans Affairs currently does, which will save Medicare $157 billion over 10 years and will reduce costs for seniors. The budget adopts policies to prohibit ''pay for delay'' agreements that reduce competition and modifies periods of exclusivity to increase availability of needed therapies. The budget also accelerates the use of bundling payments as an alternative to fee-for-service payments. It builds on Affordable Care Act efficiencies in administration of information and payments. Using standardized electronic systems of administration information such as claims, billing payments and eligibility creates a more efficient and less fragmented health care system.

(B) The Better Off Budget recognizes that the economic security of veterans, retirees, and the disabled has eroded during the recent economic recession. The Better Off Budget would reverse this trend by expanding benefits for these Americans by adopting the Experimental Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) to calculate cost-of-living adjustments for federal retirement programs other than Social Security. Affected programs include civil service retirement, military retirement, Supplemental Security Income, veteran's pensions and compensations. CPI-E is the most sensible and accurate measure of the real costs that seniors face in retirement. Other measures do not adequately take into account rising expenditures in retirement, such as health care costs, and amount to cutting benefits for those on fixed incomes.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

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 for all programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(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 2015 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2015.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 544, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Progressive Caucus brings to the House a budget that is a blueprint for economic growth and opportunity for all Americans.

In the course of the last few weeks and certainly the last few days, we have heard over and over from our colleagues in various hearings and here on the floor about the growth gap in America, and the policies that are being reinforced in the Ryan budget, in my estimation, created that growth gap.

We are here today with a budget that assures that we deal with all the gaps that the American people have, income inequality gap, wage disparity gap, education gap, the minimum wage gap, the gender pay gap between men and women, and the jobs gap that is present in our country at this point.

The best way to get out of poverty is to go to work. Everybody knows that. Our budget, within 3 years, creates 8.8 million jobs.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the abbreviated remarks by my friend, the chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, belie the challenge before us with this budget. The Congressional Progressives, the far left in the House, don't disappoint with the budget that they bring to the floor today.

What is the top line? Taxes, increasing taxes by $6.6 trillion over current policy; spending, increasing spending by $3.3 trillion dollars over current policy.

What about that all-important issue of defense in a very dangerous world? A $7 billion increase—a $7 billion increase at a time when our Nation is seeing significant and increasing threats.

Does it ever come into balance? Never—never does this budget come into balance.

One would think that, given the challenges that we have from the debt—the $17 trillion-plus in debt—that this would be an irresponsible budget, and one would be correct in saying so.

Let's look at some of the particulars here. Taxes, relative to the Republican budget, this alternative increases taxes by roughly $6.6 trillion over 10 years. This caucus budget contains trillions of dollars in new tax increases focused on penalizing those who are creating wealth and creating jobs in this country.

This budget that is being proposed today would actually decrease the number of jobs available. These are tax policies that are motivated out of a notion of ''fairness,'' but a warped notion of fairness, where the Tax Code's primary purpose is to redistribute income and equalize outcome. These policies clearly end up hampering growth and job creation.

What about spending? Mr. Chairman, this budget that is being proposed spends a whopping $8.4 trillion more than the Republican budget—$8.4 trillion, as if we had it growing on trees.

It doubles down on the Obama administration's failed economic policies and stimulus program by calling for trillions of dollars of new domestic spending, borrowing more and more money from overseas, compromising our kids' and our grandkids' future.

In the area of health—people look at the budget of the United States. They recognize that the biggest challenges that we have are in the area of health care spending, particularly Medicare and Medicaid, both of those programs going broke. Both of them going broke, bankrupt.

What does that mean? It means that those programs, in a relatively short period of time, won't have the resources to be able to provide the services to seniors and those on Medicaid that have been promised to them, unless something is done.

What does this budget do? It further increases the overreach of the Federal Government in the area of health care, putting the government in charge of health care, as opposed to individuals. It embraces a policy that would lead directly—directly—to completing the government takeover of health care.

However, I do want to mention a bright light in this budget. The Progressive budget actually recognizes that the alternative, utilizing a block grant of Federal funding to the States, is a wise idea. We call it State flexibility, giving States greater flexibility with the use of resources; and I want to commend the Progressive Caucus for recognizing that that is a reasonable method of proceeding.

What about job training? This budget expands the current broken Federal job training system by calling for more spending, despite the GAO's findings that dozens of Federal programs that already exist overlap and are duplicative. In fact, they harm the ability of jobs to be created.

In January of 2011, the Government Accountability Office issued a report that found 47 overlapping Federal job training programs that spent approximately $18 billion in 2009. Does this budget do anything to decrease that duplication and redundant efforts? No, not a doggone thing.

Then defense, as I mentioned at the beginning, Mr. Chairman, this substitute fails in the Federal Government's first responsibility, providing for the common defense. This substitute guts the defense budget by calling for $569 billion in cuts to the Pentagon, compared to the Republican budget. These are levels that would reduce military readiness and hollow out our forces.

This is a very dangerous world, Mr. Chairman. You don't have to take my word for it. Listen to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, who recently testified:

> Our current security challenges are more formidable and complex than those we faced in downturns following war in Korea, Vietnam, and the cold war. There is no foreseeable ''peace dividend'' on our horizon. The security environment is increasingly competitive and dangerous.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that decreasing the ability of our men and women standing in harm's way and defending our liberty and freedom at this time is an absolutely reckless and irresponsible move.

I know that our colleagues in the House of Representatives recognize that it is important to have all sorts of alternatives being proposed.

I commend the Progressive Caucus for proposing this alternative, but any review of this budget recognizes that it spends more than it should, it taxes more than it should, it expands the role of government more than it should, and it doesn't address the real challenges of the day in a way that brings about positive and real solutions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, we hear over and over again from Republicans about how we can't afford to make investments in education and infrastructure and science and medical research, and we can't keep our promises to seniors; but at the same time, over the past 5 years, we have raised less Federal revenue, as a percent of GDP, than in any 5-year period since 1941.

But this country, my colleagues, has never been richer. The Wall Street Journal said last month:

> U.S. wealth rises, but not all benefit.

The top 1 percent of earners have received 95 percent of the income gains in this country since 2009, and at least eight Americans earned more than $5 billion in income last year.

So what is the disconnect? Why are we richer than ever before, but unable to invest in basic priorities?

□ 1630

The answer is that PAUL RYAN and the House Republicans refuse to raise a dime from the millionaires, billionaires, and multinational corporations that dodge their fair share of taxes. It would even pad the pockets of the wealthiest Americans. The Ryan budget says, if you make $1 million next year, that budget would give you a $200,000 tax break.

Our budget presents a stark contrast to the austerity proposals peddled by this Republican Congress. In order to add 8.8 million jobs to the economy over the next 3 years and provide Americans an opportunity to get a good education, find a job, live in a safe and secure home, and afford decent food, we raise revenue that is needed. We do so by asking millionaires and billionaires to pay their fair share—yes, we do—and by closing egregious corporate loopholes, including incentives to ship jobs overseas. We would also cut $4 trillion from the deficit over the next decade.

Look, we can't build the economy for the many—not just the monied—unless we make significant investments in our future. Those investments can and should be made by raising revenue and growing our economy.

I urge my colleagues to support the Better Off Budget.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Progressive Caucus' Better Off Budget is really a bigger government budget. The Progressive Caucus substitute increases total spending relative to the Republican budget by $8.4 trillion over the next 10 years. American families, and particularly our children and our grandchildren, cannot afford this next year, and absolutely not for the next 10 years. This bigger government budget creates new taxes, more regulation, duplicative Federal programs, and will stifle progress across the board.

People, this is not complicated. We need a budget that will grow our economy. Higher taxes, higher deficits, and bigger regulation will never grow the economy. If we put folks back to work, we solve a lot of problems. We solve unemployment problems, deficit problems, poverty problems, income inequality problems, crime problems, drug problems, and problems across the board.

The number one issue in my district, and I believe the number one issue in this Nation, is jobs. Five years after the Great Recession, the economy continues to struggle, and far too many Americans remain out of work. Mr. Obama's Big Government economy has failed.

We can solve this problem. It is not rocket science. We can build our economy and put hardworking Americans back to work if only we will take a few steps to make America more competitive. Just like counties across the country compete for jobs, just like States lower tax rates and streamline regulations to attract industry and jobs—and you can look at States and see what they are doing and how they are successful—we must adopt an attitude here in Washington that we will compete in the world if we expect to stop sending our jobs overseas and bring American jobs back home.

If we retain the world's highest corporate tax rate, how can we expect to compete in the world? If Washington continues to spend more than we take in, threatening our entire economy, how can we expect to compete in the world? If we continue to build upon our already oppressive regulatory burden, how can we expect to compete in the world?

This is where I believe my friends across the aisle miss the mark. They seem to believe and preach that somehow making this country competitive benefits only the wealthy. But the truth is that people with high assets and high skills do well in a global environment. They can compete from anywhere.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. But the longer we wait to enter the global competition for jobs, the more we damage the hardworking folks in the middle class. We will not grow our economy or put people back to work by expanding entitlements. We will never solve the problems of poverty and inequality through bigger government.

If America will enter the global competition for jobs, our economy will accelerate and the sky is the limit. This is not a Republican issue. This is not a Democrat issue. This is an American issue. We are so blessed that if we simply decide to compete, no one can stop us.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, it should be noted for my colleague that the Republican budget, according to the Economic Policy Institute, will slow the recovery, costing 1.1 million jobs in fiscal year 2015, rising to costing nearly 3 million jobs the next year. That is not a budget of growth.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), the cochair.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, our Republican colleagues have been saying for maybe 100 years that if we don't regulate and have fair, good rules for health and safety and financial markets and in other areas of our economy, and if we don't tax people, the wealthy and corporations, then our economy will take off. They have been saying this for years. They didn't just start saying it with Bush or Reagan. They were saying it back in the thirties.

Thank God the American people did not listen to them, because it was in the thirties that we put up the SEC, we put regulations on banks, and we put other sorts of health, safety, and commonsense regulations in place. Because of that, between 1948 and about 1975, we had an expanding economy. Sometimes tax rates were way higher than they are now.

They are wrong. They don't know economic history, and so they continue to repeat Herbert Hoover-type myths that were dispelled decades ago. Oh, but they came back and they deregulated the economy in the late 1990s, and then in the early 2000s they cut taxes on the wealthy, and we have had a dismal jobs economy since that time.

The Better Off Budget is here to present a better alternative that involves investment in our Nation's economy to put Americans back to work. The Better Off Budget puts 8.8 million Americans back to work by doing something that everyone—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—agrees that everyone needs: we invest in infrastructure. We put $820 billion into fixing our roads, our bridges, and our smart grids, into our transit systems and our wastewater treatment systems. We invest in our Nation's infrastructure.

Just like under the great Republican President Dwight Eisenhower, as we invest in infrastructure, we put people to work building it, and we make our economy more productive as we use it. This is exactly what this version of Republicans—my goodness—doesn't understand, that you have got to invest in the economy in order to reap benefits from the economy.

The Better Off Budget puts 8.8 million people back to work. The Ryan budget puts 3 million people out of work. Vote ''yes'' on the Better Off Budget today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I request the remaining time on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 5¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 9¾ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE, the leader in the Progressive Caucus.

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank our cochairs, Congressmen GRIJALVA and ELLISON, for their very hard work on this budget, which is a better-off budget. As former cochair of the Progressive Caucus, I rise in proud support of this budget because each year this budget continues to get better and better.

As a member of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees, I was really, once again, appalled by the devastating cuts that the Ryan Republican budget makes to the safety net.

The number one priority of our budget is fixing the jobs crisis, and that is exactly what the CPC budget would do. The Progressive Caucus budget asks the wealthiest 1 percent—Big Oil and huge corporations—to pay a little more, just a little more, so that we can afford to invest in the American people and create over 8 million jobs over the next 3 years alone. The CPC budget replaces the disastrous sequester by supporting critical spending in education, infrastructure, and rejecting benefit cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

While the Republican budget continues to keep the American Dream out of reach for all Americans, it would increase spending for the already-bloated Pentagon budget.

Chairman RYAN's report on poverty refuses to acknowledge the fact that Head Start and all of the Great Society initiatives have kept millions out of poverty. They have worked. Raising the minimum wage for single mothers provides a pathway out of poverty. Mr. RYAN's report does not acknowledge the facts. Taxpayers, for example, subsidize corporations to the tune of over $200 billion just to keep people in the ranks of the working poor.

The CPC budget eliminates the Overseas Contingency Operations slush fund and supports a modern military able to face real, 21st-century threats. Once again, we provide economic growth and jobs in our budget, and we require the Pentagon—the largest single Federal agency with the highest waste, fraud, and abuse—to pass an audit and to pass it now.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentlelady an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. I just want to conclude by saying that we simply can't continue to write a blank check for spending on war if we are really going to have any chance of getting our fiscal house in order. We can't do this to America's struggling families and the working poor. That is what the American people deserve. With our budget, the Better Off Budget, our country will be better off.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, many of our Democratic colleagues have already spoken about what is wrong with the House Republican budget and how it slashes our investments in education, infrastructure, research and development, job training, and medical research; how it repeals all the benefits of the Affordable Care Act; how it leaves 7 million Americans without health insurance, ends the Medicare guarantee, and institutes massive cuts to our most vulnerable populations; how it pays for new tax cuts for millionaires by taking away tax breaks that help the working poor and the middle class—and that is all true. But I want to talk about the alternative vision for this country that we in the Progressive Caucus have crafted.

The Better Off Budget meets the challenges that our communities face head-on. It expresses our belief that America's future is bright and worth investing in.

One of the pieces I am most proud of is the application of the CPI-E to all Federal retirement programs. The CPI-E uses the most accurate and sensible measure of the real costs that seniors face for programs like civil service retirement, military retirement, Supplemental Security Income, and the veterans' pensions.

Seniors deserve a cost of living that accounts for the rising costs of retirement, such as health care. I urge my colleagues to support a better deal for our seniors, support a better future for our middle class, and support a vision that will leave us all better off. The Better Off Budget offers all of this.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE), a productive and active member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, they call it the Better Off Budget, but I am wondering who is really better off?

It is certainly not the small business woman from California who, under this plan, maybe she is earning $260,000 a year—not a billionaire and millionaire like they claim—and she will see her combined taxes, Federal taxes and State taxes, exceed 51 percent. She is certainly not better off.

How about the people she might have hired if she didn't have this tax increase? Well, they are not better off. Or maybe the people who work for her now who can't get a raise because she now is extended here? They are not better off. It is certainly not the businessowner who might provide a piece of equipment that this small business woman might buy but she no longer can afford. He is no longer better off. I can't see anybody who is better off under this system.

Here I would ask—and I want to talk a little bit about freedom in this last minute. Imagine this same businesswoman getting up on January 1, going to work and working all of January. She gets her paycheck, and it is zero because 100 percent was sent to Washington, D.C. she does it again in February, and it is zero because 100 percent gets sent to Washington, D.C.

□ 1645

She does it again in March and April and May, 100 percent of all her effort comes here. She doesn't get to keep a penny of it. All of the month of June, it all goes to government. This is not a free person. Mr. Chairman, I ask, is that free or is it indentured servitude?

We have a free country where people should, in fact, be better off, and the way to make them better off is to let them keep what they earn, and that is what the House Republican budget does, and that is why I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Progressive budget and vote ''yes'' on the House Budget Committee's budget.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, it should be noted the Republican budget, the Ryan budget, raises taxes for middle class families with kids by an average of $2,000 in order to coddle, I guess, the very wealthy in this country. They are better off; that middle class family is not.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a member of the Budget Committee and the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, the Better Off Budget will make our country more competitive and will create 8.8 million jobs through investments, repairing our roads and bridges, modernizing our waterways, and educating our young people. It is the only budget that gets America back to full employment, and does it within 3 years.

The Better Off Budget puts an end to a system where CEOs pay a lower tax rate than their secretaries and corporations get unneeded tax breaks. This budget restores full funding to food stamps and strengthens Medicare and Medicaid. It makes a clear choice to support working and middle class families, seniors and those in need, and to reinstate fairness in our economy.

For the fourth year in a row, Republicans choose to hurt the many while lavishing benefits on the wealthy few. They choose to slash 3 million jobs and destroy the safety net. They choose to dismantle Medicare and Medicaid and slash aide to college students. They choose huge tax cuts for billionaires and tax increases for the middle class. The Republican budget makes a clear choice—billionaires before working Americans and seniors.

The Better Off Budget is about building an economy that creates jobs and supports working and middle class families, not just the richest 1 percent. I urge my colleagues to invest in this country and support the Better Off Budget.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. May I inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, the House has put out a responsible budget under the Budget Committee that balances in 10 years. But this is an opportunity for us to actually see the vision, the ideas of the Democratic Party. If they were in control, what would they give us to try to bring America to a more sustainable path?

What they give us, Mr. Chairman, is $6.6 trillion in new taxes. If I had $1 for every time I hear, ''If we just had a balanced approach and we could raise taxes on a millionaires and billionaires,'' if I had $1 for each one of those comments, I think we would balance the budget.

If that were the case, raise taxes on millionaires and billionaires, you would think that they would come up with a budget that actually balances. The bottom line, my friends across the aisle, even raising taxes on millionaires and billionaires, their budget never balances. In their ideal budget, the Medicare trust fund still goes bankrupt in 12 years. If you are going to raise taxes, let's fix the problems. This is rife with huge issues.

Listen, I think the real secret here that my friends on the other side of the aisle are not telling the American people is that they do have a way to pay for this, and the way to pay for it is not through millionaires and billionaires. They are going to pay it by taxing hardworking middle class families, raising their taxes in a way to pay for greater government spending. It is a budget that actually looks to government programs, government giveaways, instead of looking to the private sector to actually grow our economy.

Listen, I think you couldn't have a better example of two different views about what direction you take the country: one of big government and big taxes on millionaires and billionaires and middle class Americans, or a responsible budget that reforms the way we spend, makes government responsible, and actually keeps our promises to the American people.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, budgets are about choices. We choose investment. We choose not to cut Medicare benefits to give tax breaks to the very wealthy, millionaires and billionaires in the country. It is a choice.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the caucus.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, the Better Off Budget would create 8.8 million jobs over its first 3 years by investing in infrastructure, education, training, and research. It would invest $100 billion in teachers and schools and $81 billion in science.

A person or a country invests with the hope and expectation that investing some resources now will give us a better future, give us savings, give us a better quality of life so that we will be better off. America's optimistic outlook has made America great and strong.

The Ryan budget is a very pessimistic document. It is based on the premise that we cannot afford to invest in infrastructure and in science and education. We have to cut, we have to shrink, we have to reduce our efforts and hunker down. We can't afford to do things, anything.

The wealthiest Nation on Earth should invest as if we have a future. Quite simply, the Better Off Budget invests as if we will have a tomorrow. It ends the absurd, pessimistic cuts of the Budget Control Act and the pessimistic Ryan budget.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 3¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the Progressive Caucus' Better Off Budget is optimistic. It is about investing in America in job growth by investing in infrastructure, public works, and education. By repealing sequestration cuts, restoring funding for SNAP benefits and unemployment insurance and investing in programs to hire police, firefighters, and health care workers, the Better Off Budget will create 8.8 million good jobs by 2017. It also embodies our American values by implementing comprehensive immigration reform that includes a pathway to citizenship and protects our environment by addressing climate change. The Better Off Budget stands for our Nation's commitments by supporting veterans, protecting Medicare and Social Security, and implementing a fair tax system.

I urge my colleagues, be optimistic about America. Make America better off by voting for the Progressive Caucus budget.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the caucus and the Budget Committee.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from northwest Wisconsin is right: let's put the budgets side by side.

The Better Off Budget will create 8.8 million jobs. The Republican PAUL RYAN budget will cut 3 million jobs. That is equivalent to the entire workforce of the State of Wisconsin.

If you have family with kids going to school, the Better Off Budget invests into hiring more teachers, invests in our schools and pre-K, invests in our college students. The PAUL RYAN Republican budget, it cuts $18 billion in early education, $89 billion in K–12 education, and $205 billion in higher education. Oh, and if you get Pell grants, another $145 billion cut.

Senior citizens, we invest in Medicare and Medicaid and we make sure you can negotiate for your drug prices. Seniors under the Republican budget, you voucherize Medicare and you will lose $732 billion in Medicaid. And, oh, yeah, we are going to open up the doughnut hole and you will pay more for prescription drugs.

Finally, on taxes, we close corporate loopholes for gas and oil companies. We make sure that companies sending jobs overseas don't get tax breaks. The Republican budget, it cuts taxes on millionaires on average $200,000 each. And you know how it gets paid for? On the backs of the middle class, $2,000 per family.

The head of the Budget Committee said it is a win/win budget. It is a win for the top 1 percent. It is a win for the second percentile, and the other 98 percent of us pay the difference.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this budget is about choice. The Better Off Budget believes in the American people. It believes in investing in the American people and in their future. It is the best road to economic health and full economic opportunity in this country.

Our budget does not look at government or the American people with disdain. We feel that government has a role, quite frankly, to stimulate, to support, and to take care of the American people as we grow our economy. We can't cut our way out of what we are in; we need to grow our way out. The Ryan budget continues the same pattern of austerity that is sinking us deeper into unemployment, lack of jobs, and lack of investment in the American people.

I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the Congressional Progressive Better Off Budget. We feel it is a strong budget and that it represents the ideals of the American people. We trust the American people, and we invest in the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot about this budget, a lot of information, and a lot of numbers have been tossed around. My friends on the other side say that their budget will create 8.8 million jobs; where does that come from? It was made up. They say that our budget slashes 3 million jobs; where does that come from? It was made up. They say our budget will increase taxes on the middle class; where does that come from? It was made up.

What is a fact about jobs? A fact about jobs is the President's health care law, the Congressional Budget Office has said, will decrease the equivalent of 2.5 million jobs. That is a fact. That is a fact.

So if my friends, my colleagues in the House here, if you want to increase taxes by $6.6 trillion, vote for their budget. If you want $8.4 trillion in more spending over the next decade, vote for their budget. If you want to increase debt by $8.2 trillion more than the Republican budget, vote for that budget.

We believe there is a better way, that there are real solutions. We recognize this is a dangerous world; therefore, we increase spending on defense and making certain that our men and women who stand in harm's way have the resources they need. We believe that opportunity needs to be expanded and pro-growth tax policies are the things that get the economy rolling again and get jobs being created.

We understand that Medicare and Medicaid are in difficult straits financially, something that our friends on the other side of the aisle bury their heads in the sand about, so we put in place in our budget a program to save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid, recognizing that patients need to be in charge of health care, not the Federal Government.

We recognize that energy policy needs to be expanded so that we responsibly utilize the blessing and the resources that have been provided so that we can become energy independent as a country and not rely on nations that don't like us.

We also recognize that balancing the budget is imperative if we are going to get our fiscal house in order and get our economy back on track. Our budget is the only budget that is being presented on the floor of this House, compared to the other side of the aisle, that gets to balance. Our budget, compared to the other side of the aisle, not only gets to balance, gets us on a path to paying off our entire debt. It is a positive, optimistic budget. I urge support of the Republican budget and defeat of the Progressive budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–405 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 2, noes 413, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

AYES—2

Kaptur
Moran

NOES—413

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Bass
Burgess
Carter
Farenthold
Flores
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Lewis
McAllister
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Ross
Runyan
Schwartz
Williams

□ 1724

Messrs. BROUN of Georgia and ROKITA changed their votes from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 116, noes 300, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

AYES—116

Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeLauro
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—300

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy

Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Bass
Carter
Farenthold
Flores
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Lewis
McAllister
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Ross
Runyan
Schwartz
Tiberi
Williams

□ 1731

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 89, noes 327, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

AYES—89

Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Lee (CA)
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
Pallone
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—327

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Bass
Carter
Farenthold
Flores
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Lewis
McAllister
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Ross
Runyan
Schwartz
Valadao
Williams

□ 1743

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXPATRIATE HEALTH COVERAGE CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4414) to clarify the treatment under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of health plans in which expatriates are the primary enrollees, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.