

Business Agency will strengthen businesses on the verge of recovery.

I look forward to seeing this agency continue to create jobs and prosperity both in Florida and across our country.

□ 0915

KELSEY HIRSCH

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we all know that April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month, but what you all may not know is about the amazing accomplishments of a young freshman at South Forsyth High School down in my district. Her name is Kelsey Hirsch.

Having been affected by all of the events that she saw in the media around our part of the world, she founded a group in my neighborhood. It is called Bands4RAINN. RAINN is the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network, and she came up with the idea of selling wristbands to raise money for that network.

She set a goal for herself of raising \$600. She ended up raising more than \$10,000. She ended up winning the HOPE Award for RAINN. She ended up founding a group at her high school called WarEagles4RAINN, and this weekend, she is holding a Concert4Courage and Hoops4Hope, which are two more fundraising events, to draw attention to sexual assault and violence, particularly among young people.

Mr. Speaker, one person can make a difference, and in my district, it is Kelsey Hirsch, a freshman at South Forsyth High School.

LOUIS ZAPATA

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a giant whom we lost in the Fort Worth community—Louis Zapata, the first Hispanic ever elected to the Fort Worth City Council.

Mr. Zapata held the post for 14 years. He was one of the longest-serving city council members in the city's history.

Mr. Zapata was so proud of the city's north side, which he represented well. He did so many wonderful things for the community, like advancing the arts and protecting the Rose Marine Theater. Mr. Zapata was also someone who was interested in raising the quality of life for all of our city's citizens.

In addition to his duties on the Fort Worth City Council, he was also a union member and a union representative at Bell Helicopter, one of the city's largest employers, where he worked tirelessly to make sure that every man and woman who worked at the plant enjoyed a better quality of life.

I want to thank Mr. Zapata for everything that he did to help make our

city better and to help make our community better. He will be missed. He is one of the legends of the Fort Worth City Council, and he is someone who will always be remembered fondly in our city.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material into the RECORD on H. Con. Res. 96.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

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 bill, H. Con. Res. 96.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly take the chair.

□ 0917

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. Con. Res. 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 Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 9, 2014, amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113-405 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113-405.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 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 2015 through 2024.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2015.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

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

TITLE II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 201. Limitation on advance appropriations.
Sec. 202. Concepts and definitions.
Sec. 203. Adjustments of aggregates, allocations, and appropriate budgetary levels.
Sec. 204. Limitation on long-term spending.
Sec. 205. Budgetary treatment of certain transactions.
Sec. 206. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 207. Congressional Budget Office estimates.
Sec. 208. Transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund that increase public indebtedness.
Sec. 209. Separate allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.
Sec. 210. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—POLICY

Sec. 301. Policy statement on health care law repeal.
Sec. 302. Policy statement on means-tested welfare programs.
Sec. 303. Policy statement on block granting Medicaid.
Sec. 304. Policy statement on a carbon tax.
Sec. 305. Policy statement on the use of official time by Federal employees for union activities.
Sec. 306. Policy statement on creation of a Committee to Eliminate Duplication and Waste.
Sec. 307. Policy statement on Federal funding of abortion.
Sec. 308. Policy statement on readable legislation.
Sec. 309. Policy statement on work requirements.
Sec. 310. Policy statement on energy production.
Sec. 311. Policy statement on regulation of greenhouse gases by the Environmental Protection Agency.
Sec. 312. Policy statement on reforming the Federal budget process.
Sec. 313. Policy statement on economic growth and putting Americans back to work.
Sec. 314. Policy statement on tax reform.
Sec. 315. Policy statement on replacing the President's health care law.
Sec. 316. Policy statement on Medicare.
Sec. 317. Policy statement on Social Security.

Sec. 318. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.
Sec. 319. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
Sec. 320. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
Sec. 321. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the reduction of unnecessary and wasteful spending.
Sec. 322. Policy statement on unauthorized spending.
Sec. 323. Policy statement on Federal regulatory policy.
Sec. 324. Policy statement on trade.
Sec. 325. No Budget, no Pay.
Sec. 326. Policy statement on reform of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.
Sec. 327. Policy statement on transportation reform.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 401. Reserve fund for the repeal of the 2010 health care laws.

- Sec. 402. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the replacement of Obamacare.
- Sec. 403. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the 2010 health care laws.
- Sec. 404. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the sustainable growth rate of the Medicare program.
- Sec. 405. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.
- Sec. 406. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.
- Sec. 407. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.
- Sec. 408. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for rural counties and schools.
- Sec. 409. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation reform.
- Sec. 410. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.
- Sec. 411. Implementation of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement.
- Sec. 412. Deficit-neutral reserve account for reforming SNAP.
- Sec. 413. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Social Security Disability Insurance Reform.

TITLE V—EARMARK MORATORIUM

- Sec. 501. Earmark moratorium.
- Sec. 502. Limitation of authority of the House Committee on Rules.

TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

- Sec. 601. Direct spending.

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: \$2,533,142,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$2,675,941,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,789,406,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,890,066,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,014,538,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,148,143,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,294,465,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,456,164,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,626,464,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,807,341,000,000.

(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: \$2,743,504,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$2,778,548,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,848,957,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,925,554,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,033,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,162,619,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,898,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,361,147,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,414,031,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,434,808,000,000.

(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: \$2,818,544,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$2,808,954,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,840,958,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,901,664,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,009,073,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,124,872,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,215,785,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,351,489,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,387,409,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,405,674,000,000.

(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: -\$285,402,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: -\$133,013,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: -\$51,552,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$11,598,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$5,465,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$23,271,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$78,680,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$104,675,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$239,055,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$401,667,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: \$18,204,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$18,414,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$19,013,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$19,267,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$19,603,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$20,055,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$20,311,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$20,701,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$20,976,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$21,220,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: \$13,112,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2016: \$13,206,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2017: \$13,640,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$13,716,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$13,909,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$14,255,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$14,440,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$14,818,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$15,074,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$15,307,000,000.

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, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(A) New budget authority, \$2,047,525,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,046,652,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,070,320,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,058,169,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,067,830,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,059,117,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
 Fiscal year 2015:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2016:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
 (B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

TITLE II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 201. 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. 202. 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. 203. 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 allo-

cation 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. 204. 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. 205. 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. 206. 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. 207. 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. 208. 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. 209. 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/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. 210. 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 III—POLICY

SEC. 301. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE LAW REPEAL.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152) should be repealed.

SEC. 302. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:

(1) Too many people are trapped at the bottom rungs of the economic ladder, and every

citizen should have the opportunity to rise, escape from poverty, and achieve their own potential.

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

(3) According to the most recent projections, over the next 10 years we will spend approximately \$9.7 trillion on means-tested welfare programs.

(4) Today, there are approximately 92 Federal programs that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

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

(6) It should be the goal of welfare programs to encourage work and put people on a path to self-reliance.

(b) POLICY ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.—It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the welfare system should be reformed to give states flexibility to implement and improve safety net programs and that to be eligible for benefits, able bodied adults without dependents should be required to work or be preparing for work, including enrolling in educational or job training programs, contributing community service, or participating in a supervised job search; and

(2) the President’s budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

SEC. 303. POLICY STATEMENT ON BLOCK GRANTING MEDICAID.

It is the policy of this resolution that Medicaid and the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) should be block granted to the States in a manner prescribed by the State Health Flexibility Act of 2013 (H.R. 567, 113th Congress).

SEC. 304. POLICY STATEMENT ON A CARBON TAX.

It is the policy of this resolution that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

SEC. 305. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE USE OF OFFICIAL TIME BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR UNION ACTIVITIES.

It is the policy of this resolution that, as called for in H.R. 107, the Federal Employee Accountability Act of 2013, Federal employees shall not use official time to conduct union activities.

SEC. 306. POLICY STATEMENT ON CREATION OF A COMMITTEE TO ELIMINATE DUPLICATION AND WASTE.

It is the policy of this resolution that a new committee, styled after the post-World War II “Byrd Committee” shall be created to act on GAO’s annual waste and duplication reports as well as Oversight and Government Reform Inspector General reports.

SEC. 307. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer dollars shall go to any entity that provides abortion services.

SEC. 308. POLICY STATEMENT ON READABLE LEGISLATION.

It is the policy of this resolution that bills should be made more readable and for Members of Congress and more accessible to the public as called for in H.R. 760, the Readable Legislation Act of 2013.

SEC. 309. POLICY STATEMENT ON WORK REQUIREMENTS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the work requirements in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program should be preserved as called for in H.R. 890, 113th Congress.

SEC. 310. POLICY STATEMENT ON ENERGY PRODUCTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and currently unavailable areas of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) should be open for energy exploration and production. To ensure States' rights, states are given the option to withdrawal from leasing within certain areas of the OCS. Specifically, a State, through enactment of a State statute, may withdrawal from leasing from all or part of any area within 75 miles of that State's coast.

SEC. 311. POLICY STATEMENT ON REGULATION OF GREENHOUSE GASES BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Environmental Protection Agency should be prohibited from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change.

SEC. 312. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING THE FEDERAL BUDGET PROCESS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Federal budget process should be reformed to promote accountability, increase transparency, and make it easier to reduce spending.

SEC. 313. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PUTTING AMERICANS BACK TO WORK.

(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 63.2 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.

(b) POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—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.

(2) JOBS ACT.—It is the policy of this resolution that to create jobs, opportunity, and economic growth, H.R. 4304, the Jumpstarting Opportunities with Bold Solutions (JOBS) Act, should be enacted. This legislation, introduced by the Republican Study Committee, would unleash North American energy production, reform labor laws, reduce the regulatory burden, and increase access to capital.

SEC. 314. 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) 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.

(4) 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.

(5) 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.

(6) 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.

(7) 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.

(8) 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.

(9) 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.

(10) 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.

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

(12) 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.

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

(14) 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.

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

(16) 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 provides for the following:

(1) Aims for revenue neutrality (relative to the CBO baseline revenue projection) based on a dynamic score that takes into account macroeconomic effects.

(2) Simplifies the individual rates from seven brackets to two, with a top rate of 25 percent.

(3) Simplifies the tax code by ensuring that fewer Americans will be required to itemize their deductions.

(4) Gives equal tax treatment to individual and employer health care expenditures modeled on the American Health Care Reform Act (H.R. 3121).

(5) Eliminates the current Earned Income Tax Credit that is given in a yearly lump-sum payment and replaces it with a program that would allow workers to exempt a portion of their payroll taxes every month.

(6) Repeals the death tax or inheritance tax.

(7) Reduces the rate of double taxation by lowering the top corporate rate to 25 percent and setting a maximum long-term capital gains tax rate at 15 percent.

(8) Sets a maximum dividend tax rate at 15 percent.

(9) Encourages (on net) investment and entrepreneurial activity.

(10) Moves to a competitive international system of taxation.

SEC. 315. 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 by enacting H.R. 3121, the American Health Care Reform Act.

SEC. 316. 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 op-

tions 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. 317. 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 these reforms will include the following:

(1) Adoption of a more accurate measure for calculating cost of living adjustments.

(2) Adoption of adjustments to the full retirement age to reflect longevity.

(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. This resolution assumes that reforms to the Disability Insurance program will include—

(1) encouraging work;

(2) updates of the eligibility rules;

(3) reducing fraud and abuse; and

(4) enactment of H.R. 1502, the Social Security Disability Insurance and Unemployment Benefits Double Dip Elimination Act, to prohibit individuals from drawing benefits from both programs at the same time.

SEC. 318. 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 on-line 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. 319. 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 BAL-**

ANCES.—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. 320. 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. 321. 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. 322. 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. 323. 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 \$1,200 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 stat-

utes 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. 324. 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. 325. 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.

SEC. 326. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORM OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) SNAP.—It is the policy of the resolution that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program be reformed so that:

(1) Nutrition assistance funds should be distributed to the states as a block grant with funding subject to the annual discretionary appropriations process.

(2) Funds from the grant must be used by the states to establish and maintain a work activation program for able-bodied adults without dependents.

(3) It is the goal of this proposal to move those in need off of the assistance rolls and back into the workforce and towards self-sufficiency.

(4) In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget is permitted to revise allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels, including discretionary limits, accordingly.

(b) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes that, pending the enactment of reforms described in (a), the conversion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. Additionally, it assumes that more stringent work requirements and time limits apply under the program.

SEC. 327. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRANSPORTATION REFORM.

It is the policy of this resolution that State and local officials are in a much better position to understand the needs of local commuters, not bureaucrats in Washington. Federal funding for transportation should be phased down and limited to core Federal duties, including the interstate highway system, transportation infrastructure on Federal land, responding to emergencies, and research. As the level of Federal responsibility for transportation is reduced, Congress should also concurrently reduce the Federal gas tax.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 401. 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. 402. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF OBAMACARE.

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. 403. 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. 404. 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. 405. 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 when the macroeconomic effects of such reforms are taken into account.

SEC. 406. 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. 407. 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. 408. 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. 409. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION REFORM.

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 the Federal transportation funding system, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2015 through 2024.

SEC. 410. 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.

SEC. 411. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution to accommodate the enactment of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement if it includes permanent spending reductions and reforms to direct spending programs.

SEC. 412. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE ACCOUNT FOR REFORMING SNAP.

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 the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP).

SEC. 413. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE REFORM.

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 the Social Security Disability Insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act.

TITLE V—EARMARK MORATORIUM

SEC. 501. EARMARK MORATORIUM.

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 502. LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives may not report a rule or order that would waive the point of order set forth in section 501(a).

TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 601. 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 resolution applies the lessons of welfare reform to both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid.

(B) For Medicaid, this resolution recommends conversion from direct spending to a discretionary program subject to appropriation. Pending this reform, this resolution assumes the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. 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 resolution 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, recommends conversion from direct spending to a discretionary program subject to appropriation. Pending this reform, this resolution 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 resolution advances policies to put seniors, not the Federal Government, in control of their health care deci-

sions. 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 resolution calls for Federal employees—including Members of Congress and congressional staff—to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 544, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I rise today on behalf of the Republican Study Committee. As so many Members of this Chamber know, the Republican Study Committee is made up of those most conservative Republicans here in the House; and while I serve on the Budget Committee, I have great respect for our Budget chairman, PAUL RYAN, and I have a great belief in the budget that came out of that Budget Committee.

The Republican Study Committee's role is to try to do even better; and, Madam Chair, we have brought just such a budget today. We call it the Back to Basics Budget, and it is the budget that balances the fastest of any budget that we are going to be debating here on the House floor.

In just 4 years, it will bring us to balance, but I am not here about the numbers. I am here about why the numbers matter because, for every year that we are not in balance, we are not just borrowing that money from our children, we are paying interest on that money that could have gone to other priorities.

You will hear in this debate today about priorities that my friends on the other side of the aisle wish we would invest more money in that they don't believe our budget invests enough in.

That may be true, yet what our budget does do is begin to pay back the debt in ways that we can take all of that money that we are dedicating to interest today and dedicate it to American families tomorrow.

Of all of the things we disagree on in this Chamber, I think we can agree that the best use of our dollars is not in their going to pay creditors, but in their going to serve constituents, and

that is what the Back to Basics Budget will do for us today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, what we have got here with this particular amendment is more than a doubling down on what was already a bad idea.

We heard, actually, from Mr. ROGERS, who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and a Republican Member of Congress, that the Republican version of the budget offered by Mr. RYAN was "draconian"—draconian because of the impact it has on important investments that have historically helped make our economy grow, make us a world leader, make sure that we can keep our competitive edge in a global economy. The Republican budget coming out of the Budget Committee devastated those important investments.

Of course, they didn't close one single special interest tax loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit, but they decided to cut deeply into investments in our kids' education, everything from early education, to K-12, to college ed. They make no secret about it.

They want to charge college students higher interest rates and, at the same time, protect special interest tax breaks. What we have here in the Republican Study Committee's amendment is simply a doubling down on what the chairman of the Republican Appropriations Committee already called draconian.

The interesting thing to me, Madam Chairman, is that I would have thought that the Republican Study Committee would have taken a different approach. I would have thought they would have taken an approach that didn't require, as part of their budget, the revenues from the Affordable Care Act, but if you look at their revenue line, it is identical to the revenue line in the House Republican budget, which is identical to the Congressional Budget Office's revenue line, which The Heritage Foundation—no left-leaning group—has said means that these budgets incorporate the tax revenues from the Affordable Care Act.

Again, here is what The Heritage Foundation said:

Perhaps the biggest shortcoming of this budget is that it keeps the tax increases associated with ObamaCare.

It is what they have said about the House Republican budget's revenue line. This one has the same thing.

If they are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act, as they say they will, that revenue line should go down; yet no matter how you cut it, Madam Chairman, the choices remain choices that we do not believe reflect the values and priorities of this country,

which are of protecting those special interest tax breaks for very powerful interests while gutting important investments in our future, investments that have been proven historically to make the United States the leading economic power in the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to thank my friend for his fealty for The Heritage Foundation. I share that and would remind him that the Heritage action is key voting a “yes” vote on the budget before us today.

If he would like to be in line with Heritage, he can vote “yes” with me today. I would welcome that support.

With that, Madam Chairman, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman SCALISE, who is the chairman of the Republican Study Committee and a gentleman who has provided huge leadership for us in this Conference.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding and for his leadership in bringing forth this budget. As the chairman of the Republican Study Committee’s Budget and Spending Task Force, Mr. WOODALL has brought this budget called Back to Basics, and that is really what we are here to talk about right now.

Madam Chair, what are those basics we should get back to?

I think they are the basic fundamentals that our Founding Fathers laid out when they created this great Nation. It is still the greatest nation in the history of the world, but it is a nation with serious challenges.

If you look at our economy, our economy is struggling in many ways because of policies coming out of Washington, because of Washington’s failure to confront those challenges.

People across this country are ready to confront those challenges. They are looking to us to finally start laying out a vision that says we are going to start living within our means, that we are going to do the things that families across this Nation do every single year, and that is finally getting back to fiscal discipline.

When my friend on the other side—I guess the person who is tasked with coming and opposing budgets that balance—uses terms like “draconian”—Madam Chair, I will tell you what is draconian. What is draconian is to deny the opportunity to our children and grandchildren that we enjoy today, something that every single generation in the history of our country has.

One of the pure definitions of the American Dream is that every generation in our Nation’s history, since George Washington led us through that Revolution, has had better opportunities than those that we enjoy today; yet most people in this country recognize, if we don’t get our fiscal house in order, our children—my 7- and 4-year-olds, whom my wife drove to school this morning—won’t have those same

opportunities, and they all deserve the opportunities that we enjoy.

So how do we do it? How do we get back to basics?

We do it by having really good, strong, bold policy—bold policy that says we ought to live within our means.

Our budget balances by year 4. In 2018, we have a balanced Federal budget. If you compare that with President Obama’s budget, he has got a budget that has over \$1 trillion in new taxes.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: oh, you need to stick more taxes on all of these businesses.

If anybody is making a profit in America, it seems like they want to put a bull’s-eye on him. If one happens to be successful and make a profit and create jobs in this country, that is somehow a bad thing.

If you take their approach in their budgets—in all of their budgets—they have over \$1 trillion in new taxes. President Obama has nearly \$2 trillion in new taxes, so you would think: okay, all of those new taxes must be what get you to balance.

In fact, Madam Chair, all of those new taxes just get you more despair. This President’s budget never, ever gets to balance, but he has all of those tax increases that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about.

In our budget, we don’t have any new tax increases. What we have is good, smart fiscal discipline policy that says let’s get our economy moving again and let’s believe in the American people.

By not raising taxes and by getting our economy moving, you actually get to balance in 4 short years and start creating surpluses, so we can pay back that debt, as my friend from Georgia talked about, so that we don’t have to send all of those interest payments to other countries and to other priorities. Let’s set those priorities in America.

How do we do this? How do we actually get back to balance in such a short period of time?

Number one, we save Medicare from bankruptcy, just as PAUL RYAN does in the House Republican budget that came out of the Budget Committee. We share many of those same principles that get us to fiscal responsibility by saving Medicare, by not letting it go bankrupt, as our colleagues on the other side do and as the President’s own budget does.

The President’s own budget allows Medicare to go bankrupt. We don’t think that is responsible, so we take care of those who paid into a system over their lifetimes.

We also invoke smart policy. If you start with health care, in our bill, we actually repeal the President’s health care law and replace it with the American Health Care Reform Act, a bill that actually puts patients back in charge of their health care and that allows us to, again, have families be in charge of those decisions and to lower costs.

It is good, smart policy. We will talk more about it, but this is the right path to getting our economy back on track.

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

The gentleman speaks about the importance of fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility, and we agree.

The question we have is: Why do they exempt from the whole practice of fiscal discipline all of these what are called tax expenditures and tax preferences that have been put into the Tax Code many times by very powerful special interests?

What does a tax preference mean? It means in many cases that, because somebody has well-heeled lobbyists, he is able to escape having to pay taxes on something that everybody else has to pay for.

□ 0930

What our Republican colleagues are saying is they don’t want to take away any of those special interest preferences for the purpose of reducing the deficit. They would rather cut deeply into our kids’ education. They would rather charge college students more interest on their loans. They would rather increase class sizes in K–12, which is what happens when you cut Title I and special education.

They talk about opportunity, but the opportunities that they are protecting are those for the special interests who had their lobbyists do very well for them in Washington. Hey, hands off all of that. We don’t want to touch that. But we are coming after everybody else, including, by the way, seniors on Medicare who will immediately see the reopening of the doughnut hole.

So if you are a senior with high prescription drug costs, that is going to cost you \$1,200 more per year, on average, immediately. And then they begin to phase in in their budget their Medicare voucher program, which will end the Medicare guarantee.

This is all about priorities. The interesting thing here is that, despite all the talk about fiscal discipline from our Republican colleagues, it is hands off imposing any fiscal discipline on powerful special interests who have succeeded in getting themselves special deals in the Tax Code.

I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), chairman of the Democratic Caucus and a member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has spent a lot of time focusing on these issues.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the ranking member on the Budget Committee for, first, all the work he has done over the years in trying to get America back on track when it comes to what it should do with its budgets.

Budgets are a testament to our values and our priorities, and I believe Mr. VAN HOLLEN has made it very clear what the values and priorities of Members of this side of the aisle are. It is

about making sure that we invest the taxpayer dollars to help our economy grow, help grow jobs, and help our kids grow up and get to college.

But let me remind everyone here of something. Remember those brainless, autopilot sequester cuts which had been scheduled for last year that led to the Republican shutdown of our government? Well, the Republican budget of 2015 is sequester on steroids.

Remember last year's autopilot sequester cuts that would have kicked over 50,000 children out of Head Start classes? Well, the 2015 Republican budget kicks 170,000 kids out of Head Start classes.

This Republican budget would kill jobs, with 1.1 million Americans likely to lose their job as a result of this budget and probably 3 million more the following year are the estimates.

This budget would cut seniors' Social Security benefits by changing the way we calculate their cost-of-living increases so that they would get less each year, even though we know the cost of living for seniors keeps going up.

They would continue to reduce our investments in very important projects that include Medicare, because this Republican budget would voucherize Medicare. It would turn it into a privatized version of what we have now, without the guarantees, so that seniors will be paying more for their prescription drugs.

This Republican budget would close not one single wasteful corporate tax loophole and, instead, it actually offers billionaires a \$200,000 tax cut at the same time that it is increasing taxes for the middle class by about \$2,000.

It should surprise no one that, while we are not closing any tax loopholes in the Republican budget and while we are increasing the taxes for middle class Americans, this Republican budget excludes things that we should do.

Through this budget we could, right now, move to increase the economy's capacity, increase the number of jobs, and decrease our deficits by finally fixing our broken immigration system.

Our Democratic budget does that; the Republican budget doesn't. And as a result, we give up, through the Republican budget, an opportunity to reduce our deficits by close to a trillion dollars over the next couple of decades. We give up the opportunity to create close to 3.5 million jobs over the next 10 to 20 years by doing immigration reform, and we give up the chance to strengthen Social Security by doing immigration reform. The Democratic budget makes those investments.

The Democratic budget actually invests in early childhood education. The Democratic budget makes it possible for more middle class families to afford to send their kids to college.

The Democratic budget makes those investments because we do close corporate tax loopholes. We do go after those who are evading paying their fair share of taxes. And we can make those

investments in early childhood education, in fixing our broken immigration system, in investing in our roads and bridges because we go after those who are evading paying their taxes. We could do that.

But, again, I remind you, this is a budget being presented on this floor from our colleagues on the other side that actually put the brainless cuts under the sequester on autopilot. And we need to defeat that.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to just say: Nonsense. Nonsense. This is the only budget that is being presented that includes the Tax Code Termination Act that terminates every single special interest loophole in the entire Tax Code. Both gentlemen know that. Every single special interest exemption, exception in the Tax Code is gone under this budget.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a fantastic member of the Republican Study Committee and a member of my class of 2010.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, over the past 3 years, I have conducted over 220 townhall meetings in my district. When we discuss Federal spending, my constituents do not want to hear about debt-to-GDP ratios or CBO scoring rules when it comes to the budget. What they want to know is why Congress has not balanced the budget yet and when we plan to do so. They want to know when Washington will stop spending money we don't have. They want to know when we will stop piling trillions of dollars of debt on the backs of our children and grandchildren.

This RSC budget would balance the budget the soonest of any of the alternatives before us, Mr. Chairman, and it would begin to pay down our debt the fastest. It is the type of results the American people demand out of Washington.

I am pleased this budget includes some innovative and responsible reforms like Medicaid block grants, food stamp block grants, and a real timetable to save and secure Medicare.

I am also pleased it would repeal ObamaCare. It would call for the passage of a real health care reform act like the American Health Care Reform Act, the JOBS Act, the REINS Act, throwing out our entire Tax Code and starting over, and it would restore work requirements for those on welfare and prohibit funding abortion providers.

In short, this RSC budget is full of the right ideas to get our Nation back on track, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting for the RSC budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. BROWN), a distinguished member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and someone who is focused on investing in America.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. The documents that we are debating today are more than just the Republican budget. It is who they are.

They constantly quote scripture, yet the Bible says the poor will always be with us. Our job is to help raise the standard.

They remind me of "The Wizard of Oz." The Republicans have no heart.

This is another example of reverse Robin Hood—robbing from the working people and the middle class to give huge tax cuts to the rich.

The latest House Republican goals are to dismantle Medicare by ending the guarantee and replacing it with a voucher program and block grant and cut Medicaid by \$732 billion.

I was so upset last year when the SNAP program—programs like Meals on Wheels and assistance to children—was cut by \$40 billion. Now they cut it by \$125 billion.

They want to repeal the Affordable Care Act. But let me just mention that everybody that talks about repealing it has health care. Every single one of them have health care.

They reject the President's proposal for veterans and Job Corps while aiming to reduce the high unemployment rate among veterans. A cut of 24 percent to nondefense appropriations would mean \$146 billion cut from veterans' health care.

They cut transportation and infrastructure projects by \$173 billion, phasing out the Essential Air Service programs to 160 small communities.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DENHAM). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. It eliminates Amtrak operational funds, resulting in 36 States and more than 20 million people losing Amtrak service. The transportation budget assumes no highway or transit investment in 2015.

And while everyone knows that education is critical, they cut billions from programs like Head Start.

To whom God has given much, much is expected. I certainly think more is expected from the Republican leadership in this House.

As I said from the beginning, they remind me of "The Wizard of Oz." This Republican House has no heart.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), my good friend.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, the RSC budget balances in 4 years. For most Americans, 4 years seems like a very long time. When they see budgets that balance in even 10 years, let alone 26 years, or not at all, they wonder what we are thinking.

In the real world, folks can't spend money they don't have. Families have to balance their own budgets. They expect Washington to do the same. That is why I applaud this budget. It is full of tough choices, but it demonstrates

that House Republicans aren't afraid to make the difficult decisions necessary to secure America's future and preserve the American Dream.

It is called leadership. That means proposing simple answers—even when they are not easy ones.

I commend Chairman SCALISE and Mr. WOODALL for crafting a plan that will balance the budget and create a healthy economy sooner than any other budget alternative. The RSC budget proposes a path that embraces the responsibility we have to future generations to leave America better than we found her.

The unwillingness of Congress to make tough choices is putting our country on a road to ruin. Let's take the road less traveled. It may make all the difference.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution celebrating the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Smith-Lever Act, which established the nationwide Cooperative Extension System.

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105-292, as amended by Public Law 106-55, and as further amended by Public Law 107-228, and Public Law 112-75, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, reappoints the following individual to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom:

Katrina Lantos Swett of New Hampshire.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Republican Study Committee's Back to Basics Budget for 2015.

The RSC's budget solves a problem that threatens the future well-being of this country, and that is the increasing size of the Federal Government's debt.

The solution provided by the budget is simple. It requires the Federal Government to balance its budget in 4 years.

Similar to the Ryan budget, the RSC proposal reduces discretionary spending, reforms Social Security, simplifies the Tax Code, and cuts wasteful spending, among other things.

□ 0945

I am particularly pleased with the RSC's inclusion of two of my bills that seek to eliminate some wasteful spending. We eliminate the Commission to Nowhere, and we eliminate the MAP Act, and we save \$10 million by doing that.

Time and again, the Denali Commission has been found to perform duplicative work that should be carried out by State and local governments. This view is supported across the board, from Citizens Against Government Waste, to the Heritage Foundation, to even President Obama.

In fact, the inspector general of the Denali Commission recently called it "a congressional experiment that hasn't worked out" and suggested that "Congress put its money elsewhere."

The waste within the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Market Access Program is also disturbing. The MAP program, though intended to increase international consumption of American products, has financed lavish international travel and marketing expenses for some of our already most successful companies.

Under this program, taxpayer dollars have paid for international educational wine tastings from London to Mexico, and financed an animated series in Spain chronicling the adventures of a squirrel named Super Twiggy and his nemesis, the Colesterator.

Our national debt stands at over \$17 trillion. Such debt puts our country's security, economy, and everything else at risk.

Let's pass this today.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my friend from Maryland if he has any speakers remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. No, I do not.

Mr. WOODALL. I would ask the gentleman if he would like to give me the opportunity to close?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The gentleman is free to lead off.

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

We have talked about tax breaks for the rich here. There are no such tax breaks in this budget. We have talked about the preservation of corporate loopholes. There are no such preservation of corporate loopholes in this budget.

I will say it again. This is the only budget that we will vote on that includes the Tax Code Termination Act, which admits to one another that the tax system we have today is broken. Republicans and Democrats alike have

riddled it beyond repair with special interest loopholes, exemptions, breaks, and special carve-outs.

I, Mr. Chairman, am the cosponsor, the lead sponsor of the Fair Tax, the only proposal on Capitol Hill that abolishes every single deduction, exemption, exception in the Tax Code. So nonsense, if folks will suggest that this is a budget for special interests.

Let me tell you what this is a budget for. This is a budget for working Americans, because, Mr. Chairman—you saw it earlier when the chairman of the Republican Study Committee held up this chart. The red line represents a pathway of economic ruin contained in the President's budget.

The President talks about a balanced approach, and yet his approach never balances. The Republican Study Committee budget balances more quickly than any other budget proposal that we will discuss.

Does it have to make tough choices to do it?

Yes, it does. What is the benefit of those tough choices, Mr. Chairman?

The benefit is in interest savings alone. If you support NIH, as I do, with just the interest savings between our budget and the President's budget, we couldn't just double NIH funding, we could triple it, not just this year but every year in the budget window.

Mr. Chairman, on our current path, by 2017 we are going to be spending more on interest on the national debt than we spend on the entire Medicaid program to care for our children and our elderly.

By 2020 we will spend more on interest on the national debt under the President's proposal than we will on all national security concerns combined.

There is not a family in America, Mr. Chairman, that believes they can borrow their way into prosperity.

The interest that we pay on the debt that the President proposes that this Nation borrow steals opportunities from our children. It is immoral to advance our generation today at the expense of generations tomorrow.

Does this budget make tough choices?

It does. There is only one budget that we will be considering today, Mr. Chairman, that takes steps to protect and preserve Social Security. That is the RSC budget.

There are only two budgets that we will be considering today that take steps to ensure the solvency of Medicare for generations to come. That is the RSC budget and the Budget Committee budget.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot talk about a balanced approach that does not balance. You cannot talk about making tough decisions if you are willing to do nothing to save those programs, Medicare and Social Security, that so many of our families back home rely on.

We know those programs are headed towards destruction, which is why the RSC has made the very difficult choice to begin saving them today.