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.

It will only get harder if we put those decisions off until tomorrow. We say, do it today.

I urge my colleagues to support the Republican Study Committee budget, as has been key voted out of organizations across this town.

I will end as I began. I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland recognizing the support of those outside organizations, and those are organizations committed to balancing this budget.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it would be great if we could all believe in magic.

The gentleman says that their budget closes all the tax loopholes. No tax loopholes. In fact, he says theirs is the only budget that terminates the Tax Code all together, gets rid of it.

That is interesting because, if you look at the revenue levels coming in under his budget, it is identical to the current Tax Code, every year, exactly as the Congressional Budget Office says, dollar for dollar.

In fact, I think he said he got rid of it in fiscal year 2017 or so. But, gee, the dollars keep rolling in just as they would be if you didn't get rid of the Tax Code.

And you know why?

Because they don't close any of the special interest tax breaks. It is the status quo in terms of the revenue coming in.

If we were, in fact, going to close some of those special interest tax breaks, so that we could reduce our deficits, then you wouldn't have those numbers that they have got in their budget resolution.

Now, look, we all agree that we need to impose fiscal discipline. The question all along has been, how do we do it?

Do we do it in a way where we share responsibility as Americans, or do we do it in a way where some people don't have to pay anything, which means everybody else has to get hit that much harder?

Under the Republican budget, and under this Republican study group budget even more, they protect the very wealthy. You are doing great. But at the expense of everybody else.

So the gentleman talks about more funds for the National Institutes of Health; they more than double the cuts to the National Institutes of Health from the earlier budget we saw, which, again, I would just remind our colleagues, it was the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee who said that the House Republican budget is draconian, that one. That is from Mr. ROGERS. All right?

So now this one is doubling down on draconian. And the question for us, as a country is, what are the consequences?

What does that mean in people's lives?

Well, it means real things. It means less funds for Head Start and early Head Start. It means a big cut to K–12 education.

We have a bipartisan piece of legislation saying that Congress is already failing to meet our commitments to special ed. We asked local school jurisdictions to take on the responsibility, it was the right thing to do, to make sure every kid got a good education. That was the right thing to do.

But these guys would cut that program. So this is the wrong choice for America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee's budget proposal.

Not only does the RSC budget balance in four years, reduce spending, and repeal Obamacare, the RSC budget proposal also recommends the House enact H.R. 352, the Tax Code Termination Act. This legislation, which I introduced at the beginning of the 113th Congress, would force Congress to debate comprehensive tax reform by sunsetting our current tax code in December 2017 and forcing Congress to enact a new tax system by July of that same year. This bipartisan legislation has the support of over 100 Members of Congress who support a variety of tax proposals. I am pleased that the authors of the RSC budget have a desire to see these proposals debated and our complicated tax code addressed by setting a date certain for scrapping our tax code. I look forward to voting in support of the Republican Study Committee's budget and working with my fellow members of the Republican Study Committee to see that happen.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DENHAM). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 291, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

AYES—133

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barton
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Camp
Campbell
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Culberson
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOES—291

Amodei
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurt
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond

Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Jackson Lee
Lewis
McAllister
Miller, George
Perlmutter
Runyan
Schwartz

□ 1020

Messrs. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, MARINO, GARAMENDI, AMODEI, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. SHIMKUS, MILLER of Florida, and SESSIONS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–405.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

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

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2015 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2014 and for fiscal years 2016 through 2024.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 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: $2,592,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,759,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,883,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,000,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,126,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,264,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,420,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,654,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,942,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,138,354,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $58,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $83,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $93,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $109,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $111,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $116,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $125,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $198,126,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $316,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $330,901,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $3,077,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,233,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,405,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,570,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,772,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,966,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,137,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,369,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,520,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,668,170,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $3,070,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,323,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,387,284,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,438,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,754,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,932,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,112,683,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,357,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,484,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,617,936,000,000.

(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: $-477,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $-494,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $-503,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $-538,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $-628,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $-667,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $-692,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $-683,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $-542,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $-479,582,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $18,350,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: $19,001,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,716,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,484,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,322,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,191,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $23,076,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,943,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,691,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $25,411,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015: $13,259,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,792,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,344,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,932,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,628,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,390,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $17,206,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $18,060,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $18,789,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $19,498,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $529,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $569,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $577,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $586,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $595,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $586,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $604,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $613,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $604,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $624,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $619,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $639,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $627,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $656,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $637,835,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $43,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $46,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,601,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $47,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $48,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $49,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $51,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $51,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $54,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $55,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,486,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $29,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $30,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,138,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $31,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $32,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $33,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $34,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $35,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $36,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,603,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $7,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $6,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $5,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,902,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $5,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,291,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $40,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $45,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $45,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $46,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $48,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $49,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,545,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $16,492,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $21,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $21,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $21,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $21,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $21,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $22,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $22,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $22,957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,443,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $9,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-1,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-1,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $11,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-4,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $11,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-5,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $11,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-10,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,715,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-8,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-4,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $14,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-4,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $14,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-5,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $14,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-6,172,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $103,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $105,625,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $106,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $107,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $90,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $91,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $92,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $94,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $95,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $96,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,003,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $18,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $13,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $13,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $13,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $13,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $13,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,601,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $14,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,725,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $95,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $101,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $111,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $116,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $119,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $122,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $124,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $125,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $126,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $126,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,011,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $490,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $492,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $554,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $557,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $611,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $609,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $635,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $669,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $668,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $714,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $703,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $743,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $741,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $782,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $780,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $823,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $821,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $866,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $864,887,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $524,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,974,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $562,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $562,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $573,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $597,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $596,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $659,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $659,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $706,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $706,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $755,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $755,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $836,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $836,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $858,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $858,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $887,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $887,326,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $532,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $543,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $544,651,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $548,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $544,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $552,957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $544,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $572,706,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $568,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $585,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $600,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $594,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $618,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $627,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $622,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $635,638,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,722,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $31,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,133,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,138,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $57,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $154,027,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $166,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $165,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $164,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $162,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $174,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $179,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $183,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $182,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $195,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $192,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $189,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $188,262,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $54,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $59,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $59,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $60,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $62,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $64,404,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $66,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $69,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $71,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $73,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,916,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $25,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $26,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $27,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $28,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $29,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $30,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $31,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $32,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $33,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,760,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $366,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $366,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $423,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $423,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $500,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $500,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $589,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $589,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $665,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $665,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $731,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $731,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $787,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $787,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $842,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $842,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $893,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $893,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $936,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $936,153,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $2,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $-1,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $2,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $3,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $-912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $312,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $3,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $9,109,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $15,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,770,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $-78,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-78,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $-83,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-83,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $-83,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-83,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $-83,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-83,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $-90,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-90,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $-91,882,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-91,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $-95,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-95,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $-98,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-98,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $-101,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-101,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $-107,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $-107,098,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $85,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $25,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $6,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $2,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $35,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

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

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

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

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

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

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT'S OPPORTUNITY, GROWTH, AND SECURITY INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that increases, by the same amounts for defense and non-defense, the 2015 limits on discretionary spending in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

(b) FUNDING OF ADDITIONAL PRIORITIES.—The increase in the discretionary caps will allow additional funding for key priorities, including—

(1) enhance early childhood and K-12 education;

(2) expand scientific research and innovation funding;

(3) provide jobs and meet infrastructure needs;

(4) expand opportunity and mobility for Americans;

(5) enhance public health, safety, and security;

(6) make the government more efficient and effective; and

(7) promote military readiness.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.

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

(1) enhances the delivery of health care to the Nation's veterans and service members, including the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental illnesses, and increasing the capacity to address health care needs unique to women veterans;

(2) makes improvements to the Post 9/11 GI Bill to ensure that veterans receive the educational benefits they need to maximize their employment opportunities;

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

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

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

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX RELIEF FOR INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides additional tax relief to individuals and families, such as expanding tax relief provided by the refundable child credit, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE EXTENSION OF EXPIRED OR EXPIRING TAX PROVISIONS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends provisions of the tax code that have expired or will expire in the future, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT.

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

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

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

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

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

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

by the amounts provided, together with any savings from ending Overseas Contingency Operations, in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH IMPROVEMENT.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves Medicaid or other children's health programs, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024. Such improvements may include demonstrations around psychiatric care for special populations and helping states improve the provision of long-term care.

SEC. 209. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENSION OF EXPIRING HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends expiring Medicare, Medicaid, or other health provisions, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE HEALTH CARE WORKFORCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the contemporary health care workforce's ability to meet emerging demands, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024. Such improvements may include an expansion of the National Health Service Corps, an extension of the enhanced Medicaid primary care reimbursement rates that bring Medicaid primary care payment rates up to Medicare levels using Federal funds, and an expansion of the enhanced reimbursement rates to mid-level providers who practice independently.

SEC. 211. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INITIATIVES THAT BENEFIT CHILDREN.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of children by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024. Improvements may include:

(1) Extension and expansion of child care assistance.

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

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

(4) Regular increases in funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to put the Federal Government on a 10-year path to fulfill its commitment to America's children and schools by providing 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for special education.

SEC. 212. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY AND COMPLETION.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable and increases college completion, including efforts to: encourage States and higher education institutions to improve educational outcomes and access for low- and moderate-income students; ensure continued full funding for Pell grants; or help borrowers lower and manage their student loan debt through refinancing and expanded repayment options, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 213. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A COMPETITIVE WORKFORCE.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that helps ensure that all Americans have access to good-paying jobs by fully reauthorizing the Trade Adjustment Assistance program or funding other effective job training and employment programs by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 214. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes 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 for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 215. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FULL FUNDING OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 216. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that capitalizes the existing Affordable Housing Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2019 or fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2024.

TITLE III—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 301. 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: The resolution rejects cuts to the social safety net that lifts millions of people out of poverty. It assumes extension of the tax credits from the American Taxpayer Relief Act due to expire at the end of 2017. These credits include an increase in refundability of the child tax credit, relief for married earned income tax credit filers, and a larger earned income tax credit for larger families. It also assumes expansion of the earned income tax credit for childless workers, a group that has seen limited support from safety net programs.

(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: For Medicare, this budget rejects proposals to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance. Such proposals will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks, and they will weaken the traditional Medicare program. Instead, this budget builds on the success of the Affordable Care Act, which made significant strides in health care cost containment and put into place a framework for continuous innovation. This budget supports comprehensive reforms to give physicians and other care providers incentives to provide high-quality, coordinated, efficient care, in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability. It makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare. In other areas, the resolution assumes extension of emergency unemployment compensation, additional funding for surface transportation, a new initiative for early childhood education, and extension of the American Opportunity Tax Credit, which assists with higher education expenses.

TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

(1) for fiscal year 2016 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2017, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for all discretionary programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2015.

SEC. 402. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

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

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2015.

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2015.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that appropriates $9,445,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to $480,000,000, to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2015.

(2) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that appropriates $133,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $25,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2015.

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

SEC. 403. COSTS OF EMERGENCY NEEDS, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND DISASTER RELIEF.

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

(b) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for overseas contingency operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to, but not to exceed, the total amount of budget authority the President requests for overseas contingency operations for 2015 in a detailed, account-level, submission to Congress and the new outlays resulting from that budget authority.

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

(d) WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION OPERATIONS.—

(1) CAP ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for wildfire suppression operations for fiscal year 2015 that appropriates a base amount equal to 70 percent of the average cost of wildfire suppression operations over the previous 10 years and provides an additional appropriation of up to but not to exceed $1.4 billion for wildfire suppression operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the additional amount of budget authority above the base amount and the outlays resulting from that additional budget authority.

(2) DEFICIT-NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENT.—The total allowable discretionary adjustment for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and

Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the sum of allocation increases made pursuant to paragraph (1) in the previous year.

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

SEC. 404. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

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

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

SEC. 405. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

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

SEC. 406. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

In the House, and pursuant to section 301(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the remainder of the 113th Congress, the following shall apply in lieu of ''CUTGO'' rules and principles:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) a bill or joint resolution;

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

(iii) a conference report; or

(iv) an amendment between the Houses.

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

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

SEC. 407. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON JOBS: MAKE IT IN AMERICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the economy entered a deep recession in December 2007 that was worsened by a financial crisis in 2008-by January 2009, the private sector was shedding about 800,000 jobs per month;

(2) actions by the President, Congress, and the Federal Reserve helped stem the crisis, and job creation resumed in 2010, with the economy creating 8.9 million private jobs over the past 49 consecutive months;

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

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

(5) job creation is vital to Nation building at home and to deficit reduction—CBO has noted that if the country were at full employment, the deficit would be about half its current size.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pursue a ''Make it in America'' agenda with a priority to consider and enact legislation to help create jobs, remove incentives to out-source jobs overseas and instead support incentives that bring jobs back to the United States, and help middle class families by increasing the minimum wage.

(2) JOBS.—This resolution—

(A) provides funding to support President Obama's four-year, $302 billion surface transportation reauthorization proposal;

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

(C) establishes a reserve fund that would allow for passage of additional job creation measures, including further infrastructure improvements and support for biomedical research that both creates jobs and advances scientific knowledge and health, or other spending or revenue proposals.

SEC. 502. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

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

(1) Supporting the President's four-year, $302 billion surface transportation reauthorization proposal will sharpen America's global competitive edge in the 21st century by allowing infrastructure expansion and modernization.

(2) Many of our roads, bridges, and transit systems are in disrepair, and fail to move as many goods and people as the economy demands. The American Society of Engineers gives the United States infrastructure an overall grade of D+.

(3) Deep cuts to our transportation funding over the next 10 years will hurt families and businesses at a time when we have major infrastructure needs and workers ready to do the job.

(4) Increasing transportation investments improves our quality of life by building new ladders of opportunity—improving our competitive edge, facilitating American exports, creating new jobs and increasing access to existing ones, and fostering economic growth, while also providing critical safety improvements and reduced commute times.

(5) The highway trust fund provides critical funding for repairing, expanding, and modernizing roads, bridges, and transit systems, and according to recent CBO projections, it is expected to become insolvent this summer. This could force a halt to construction projects, which would put 700,000 jobs at risk.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House to provide funding in support of the President's proposed four-year, $302 billion surface transportation reauthorization that prevents the imminent insolvency of the highway trust fund and increases investment in our highway and transit programs. Such an investment sharpens our competitive edge, increases access to jobs, reduces commute times, makes our highways and transit systems safer, facilitates American exports, creates jobs, and fosters economic growth.

SEC. 503. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM AND FAIRNESS FOR MIDDLE-CLASS AMERICANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) According to the United States Census Bureau, American families lost ground during the 2000s as median income slipped 4.9 percent in real terms between 2000 and 2009.

(2) According to the Congressional Budget Office, between 1979 and 2007, real after-tax incomes for the top 1 percent of income earners grew 278 percent—or a stunning $973,100—per household. In contrast, real after-tax incomes of the middle 20 percent of families

grew just 25 percent, and incomes of the poorest 20 percent increased by 16 percent.

(3) Past Republican tax plans have made reducing taxes for the wealthiest Americans the top priority. The result has been legislation that increased deficits while giving a disproportionate share of any tax cuts to the wealthy.

(4) Recent Republican tax plans, including this year's House Republican Budget, have emphasized reducing the top marginal rates to 25 percent. Analysis by the non-partisan Tax Policy Center has shown that it is impossible to achieve such a reduction and be revenue-neutral without large reductions in tax deductions and credits for middle-income taxpayers that would lead to a net tax increase on those families.

(5) Analyses of proposals to reduce top rates to 25 percent within a revenue-neutral tax reform plan indicate that the plans would raise taxes on middle-class families with children by an average of at least $2,000.

(6) Such a tax increase would—

(A) make it even harder for working families to make ends meet;

(B) cost the economy millions of jobs over the coming years by reducing consumer spending, which will greatly weaken economic growth; and

(C) further widen the income gap between the wealthiest households and the middle class by making the tax code more regressive.

(7) The tax code contains numerous, wasteful tax breaks for special interests.

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

(9) they can distort economic incentives for businesses and consumers and encourage businesses to ship American jobs and capital overseas for tax purposes; in many cases, the revenues lost to various tax expenditures can be put to better use for more targeted initiatives.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) This resolution would accommodate action to simplify the tax code and eliminate special interest tax breaks without increasing the tax burden on middle-class taxpayers.

SEC. 504. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the minimum wage has not been increased since 2009;

(2) the real value of the minimum wage today is less than it was in 1956;

(3) increasing the minimum wage to $10.10 per hour would give a raise to about 28,000,000 workers;

(4) increasing the minimum wage to $10.10 per hour would lift about 1,000,000 Americans out of poverty;

(5) minimum wage workers bring home an average of 50 percent of their family's total income;

(6) a higher minimum wage would put more money in the pockets of individuals who are likely to spend additional income, which would help expand the economy and create jobs;

(7) in part because of this effect, recent studies have indicated that increases in the minimum wage do not adversely impact job creation as much as had been previously thought, and that modest increases in the minimum wage may actually create jobs;

(8) the higher minimum wage is important to victims of wage discrimination, who are more likely to find themselves in low-paying jobs;

(9) a higher minimum wage will reduce government spending to provide assistance to minimum wage workers; and

(10) a higher minimum wage will benefit businesses by increasing productivity, reducing absenteeism, and reducing turnover.

(b) POLICY.—This resolution assumes action by the House of Representatives to raise the minimum wage to $10.10 per hour in three annual steps, as proposed in H.R. 1010, the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013.

SEC. 505. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON IMMIGRATION REFORM.

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

(1) Fixing the country's broken immigration system will mean a stronger economy and lower budget deficits.

(2) The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that enacting H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, will reduce the deficit by $900 billion over the next two decades, boost the economy by 5.4 percent, and increase productivity by 1.0 percent.

(3) The Social Security Actuary estimates that immigration reform will add up to $300 billion to the Social Security Trust Fund over the next decade and will extend Social Security solvency by up to two years.

(4) The passage of H.R. 15 recognizes that the primary tenets of its success depend on securing the sovereignty of the United States of America and establishing a coherent and just system for integrating those who seek to join American society.

(5) We have a right, and duty, to maintain and secure our borders, and to keep our country safe and prosperous. As a Nation founded, built and sustained by immigrants we also have a responsibility to harness the power of that tradition in a balanced way that secures a more prosperous future for America.

(6) We have always welcomed newcomers to the United States and will continue to do so. But in order to qualify for the honor and privilege of eventual citizenship, our laws must be followed. The world depends on America to be strong—economically, militarily and ethically. The establishment of a stable, just, and efficient immigration system only supports those goals. As a Nation, we have the right and responsibility to make our borders safe, to establish clear and just rules for seeking citizenship, to control the flow of legal immigration, and to eliminate illegal immigration, which in some cases has become a threat to our national security.

(7) All parts of H.R. 15 are premised on the right and need of the United States to achieve these goals, and to protect its borders and maintain its sovereignty.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the full House vote on comprehensive immigration reform—such as H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act—to boost our economy, lower deficits, establish clear and just rules for citizenship, and secure our borders.

SEC. 506. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

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

(1) Since the expiration of emergency unemployment compensation at the end of 2013, over 2,000,000 workers and their families have lost benefits. Thousands more are losing benefits each week.

(2) The long-term unemployment rate at the time of the expiration, and still today, was nearly twice as high as it was at the expiration of any previous extended unemployment benefits program.

(3) Extending unemployment is good for the affected workers and their families, and the economy as a whole. The CBO has estimated that extending emergency unemployment compensation will create 200,000 jobs by the end of the year.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that emergency unemployment compensation be extended for 1 year, retroactive to its expiration. The resolution assumes this would be accomplished in two steps with passage of the bipartisan Senate bill adding 5 months and future legislation completing the task. Over the full year, this will benefit 5,000,000 Americans and their families as well as their communities and the Nation as a whole.

SEC. 507. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.

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

(1) The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) has long been considered one of our most effective anti-poverty programs. It has generally enjoyed strong, bipartisan support from Members of Congress and Presidents of each party.

(2) The EITC rewards work. Benefits are only available to taxpayers with earned income. Encouraging workforce participation among low earners is generally thought to benefit the workers, their families, the community and the overall economy.

(3) Many of our income security programs target their benefits towards children. The EITC is no different; the credit for childless workers is significantly less generous. As a result, low-income childless workers often receive little support from our anti-poverty efforts. Expanding the EITC for childless workers would help close that gap and has been supported by anti-poverty experts with varying ideological perspectives, consistent with the Credit's bipartisan history.

(4) Expansion of the EITC can be viewed as a tax cut. There is significant room to expand the EITC for childless workers that would still leave those workers as net taxpayers, when you include both the employee- and employer-paid portion of their Medicare and Social Security payroll taxes.

(5) A tax cut for these workers is appropriate as very low-income childless workers, because of the limited tax benefits available to them, can, in some circumstances actually fall below the poverty line as a result of their tax burden.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that the House should pass legislation to expand the Earned Income Tax Credit for childless workers. This expansion could take several forms, including larger phase-in and phase-out rates, higher thresholds for beginning the phase-out range, and extension of the credit to older and younger adults.

SEC. 508. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT: WHEN WOMEN SUCCEED, AMERICA SUCCEEDS.

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

(1) Wage inequality still exists in this country. Women make only 77 cents for every dollar earned by men, and the pay gap for African American women and Latinas is even larger.

(2) Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women, and the minimum wage has not kept up with inflation over the last 45 years.

(3) More than 40 million private sector workers in this country—including more than 13 million working women—are not able to take a paid sick day when they are ill. Millions more lack paid sick time to care for a sick child.

(4) Nearly one-quarter of adults in the United States (23 percent) report that they have lost a job or have been threatened with job loss for taking time off due to illness or to care for a sick child or relative.

(5) Fully 89 percent of the United States workforce does not have paid family leave

through their employers, and more than 60 percent of the workforce does not have paid personal medical leave through an employer-provided temporary disability program, which some new mothers use.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should make a positive difference in the lives of women, enacting measures to address economic equality and women's health and safety. To address economic fairness, Congress should enact the Paycheck Fairness Act, increase the minimum wage, support women entrepreneurs and small businesses, and support work and family balance through earned paid sick leave, and earned paid and expanded family and medical leave. To address health and safety concerns, Congress should increase funding for the prevention and treatment of women's health issues such as breast cancer and heart disease, support access to family planning, and enact measures to prevent and protect women from domestic violence.

SEC. 509. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO ERADICATE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY.

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

(1) Access to opportunity should be the right of every American.

(2) Poverty has declined by more than one-third since 1967. More than 40,000,000 Americans are not in poverty today because of programs and tax policies that strengthen economic security and increase opportunity. Continued Federal support is essential to build on these gains.

(3) Antipoverty programs have increasingly been focused on encouraging and rewarding work for those who are able. The programs can empower their beneficiaries to rise to the middle class through job training, educational assistance, adequate nutrition, housing and health care.

(4) Social Security has played a major role in reducing poverty. Without it, the poverty rate in 2012 would have been 8.5 percentage points higher. Its positive impact on older Americans is even starker, lowering the poverty rate among this group by 40 percentage points.

(5) Unemployment insurance benefits provide critical support to millions of workers, who lost their jobs through no fault of their own, and their families. Without these benefits, 2,500,000 more people would have lived in poverty in 2012.

(6) The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program alone lifts nearly 5,000,000 people out of poverty, including over 2,000,000 children. It is particularly effective in keeping children—over 1,000,000—out of deep poverty (below half the poverty line). School breakfast and lunch programs help keep children ready to learn, allowing them to reach their full potential.

(7) Medicaid improves health, access to health care and financial security. Medicaid coverage lowers infant, child, and adult mortality rates. Medicaid coverage virtually eliminates catastrophic out-of-pocket medical expenditures, providing much needed financial security and peace of mind.

(8) The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and Child Tax Credit (CTC) together lift over 9,000,000 people, including 5,000,000 children, out of poverty. President Ronald Reagan proposed the major EITC expansion in the 1986 Tax Reform Act, which he referred to as ''the best antipoverty, the best pro-family, the best job creation measure to come out of Congress''. Studies indicate that children in families that receive the type of income supports EITC and CTC offer do better at school and have higher incomes as adults.

(9) Despite our progress, there is still work to be done. Nearly 50,000,000 Americans still live below the poverty line. Parental income still has a major impact on children's income after they become adults.

(10) The minimum wage has not changed since 2007 and is worth less today than it was in real terms at the beginning of 1950. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that an incremental increase in the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour would lift 900,000 people out of poverty.

(11) In addition, some areas of the country have been left behind. They face persistent high levels of poverty and joblessness. Residents of these areas often lack access to quality schools, affordable health care, and adequate job opportunities.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House to support a goal of developing a national strategy to eliminate poverty, with the initial goal of cutting poverty in half in ten years, and to extend equitable access to economic opportunity to all Americans. The strategy must include a multi-pronged approach that would—

(1) ensure a livable wage for workers, including raising the minimum wage so that a full time worker earns enough to be above the poverty line;

(2) provide education and job training to make sure workers have the skills to succeed;

(3) provide supports for struggling families in difficult economic times and while developing skills;

(4) remove barriers and obstacles that prevent individuals from taking advantage of economic and educational opportunities; and

(5) provide supports for the most vulnerable who are not able to work: seniors, the severely disabled, and children.

As the strategy is developed and implemented, Congress must work to protect low-income and middle-class Americans from the negative impacts of budget cuts on the critical domestic programs that help millions of struggling American families. The strategy should maximize the impact of antipoverty programs across Federal, State, and local governments. Improving the effective coordination and oversight across agencies and implementing a true unity of programs under a ''whole of government'' approach to shared goals and client-based outcomes will help to streamline access, improve service delivery, and strengthen and extend the reach of every Federal dollar to fight poverty. The plan should consider additional targeting of spending toward persistent poverty areas to revitalize these areas of pervasive historical poverty, unemployment, and general distress.

SEC. 510. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND RETIREES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

(2) in January 2013, 58,000,000 people relied on Social Security;

(3) 9 out of 10 individuals 65 and older received Social Security benefits;

(4) Social Security helps keep people out of poverty and has lowered the poverty rate among seniors by nearly 40 percentage points;

(5) Social Security benefits are modest, with an average annual benefit for retirees of about $15,000, which is the majority of total retirement income for more than half of all beneficiaries;

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

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

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

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

SEC. 511. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

(2) in 2013, 52,000,000 people relied on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services;

(3) the Medicare program has lower administrative costs than private insurance, and Medicare program costs per enrollee have grown at a slower rate than private insurance for a given level of benefits;

(4) people with Medicare already have the ability to choose a private insurance plan within Medicare through the Medicare Advantage option, yet 72 percent of Medicare beneficiaries chose the traditional fee-for-service program instead of a private plan in 2013;

(5) rising health care costs are not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, they are endemic to the entire health care system;

(6) converting Medicare into a voucher for the purchase of health insurance will merely force seniors and individuals with disabilities to pay much higher premiums if they want to use their voucher to purchase traditional Medicare coverage;

(7) a voucher system in which the voucher payment fails to keep pace with growth in health costs would expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks;

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

(9) versions of voucher policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely set it up for a death spiral as private plans siphon off healthier and less expensive beneficiaries, leaving the sickest beneficiaries in a program that will wither away.

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

SEC. 512. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

(2) the Affordable Care Act will expand affordable coverage to 25,000,000 people by the end of the decade, and already, millions of Americans have health insurance under this law—more than 7,000,000 individuals have signed up for private health insurance through new health insurance Marketplaces, 3,000,000 young adults have been able to stay on their parent's health insurance plan, and 3,000,000 people have new Medicaid coverage;

(3) the Affordable Care Act ensures the right to equal treatment for people who have preexisting health conditions and for women;

(4) the Affordable Care Act ensures that health insurance coverage will always include basic necessary services such as prescription drugs, mental health care, and maternity care and that insurance companies cannot impose lifetime or annual limits on these benefits;

(5) the Affordable Care Act increases transparency in health care, helping to reduce health care cost growth by requiring transparency around hospital charges, insurer cost-sharing, and kick-back payments from pharmaceutical companies to physicians;

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

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

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

SEC. 513. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICAID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) Medicaid is a central component of the Nation's health care safety net, providing health coverage to 60,000,000 Americans, including 1 in 3 children;

(2) Medicaid improves health outcomes, access to health services, and financial security;

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

(4) Medicaid is the primary payer for long-term care services in the United States, providing a critical health care safety net for senior citizens and people with disabilities facing significant costs for long-term care; and

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

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

SEC. 514. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

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

(2) those who serve in uniform are our most important security resource and the Administration and Congress shall continue to provide the support they need to successfully carry out the missions the country gives them;

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

(4) the Nation's projected long-term debt could have serious consequences for our economy and security, and that more efficient military spending has to be part of an overall plan that effectively deals with this problem;

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

(6) former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen argued that the permissive budget environment over the last decade, a period when defense spending increased by hundreds of billions of dollars, had allowed the Pentagon to avoid prioritizing;

(7) reining in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies, including the Department of Defense—the last department still unable to pass an audit—such as the elimination of duplicative programs that have been identified by the Government Accountability Office needs to continue as a priority;

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

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

(10) weapons technologies should be proven to work through adequate testing before advancing them to the production phase of the acquisition process;

(11) the Pentagon's operation and maintenance budget has grown for decades between 2.5 percent and 3.0 percent above inflation each year on a per service member basis, and it is imperative that unsustainable cost growth be controlled in this area;

(12) nearly all of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce from 2001 to 2013 is due to increases at security-related agencies—Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Veterans Affairs, and Department of Justice—and the increase, in part, represents a transition to ensure civil servants, as opposed to private contractors, are performing inherently governmental work and an increase to a long-depleted acquisition and auditing workforce at the Pentagon to ensure effective management of weapons systems programs, to eliminate the use of contractors to oversee other contractors, and to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse;

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

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

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

(1) the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 for fiscal years 2016 through 2021 should be rescinded and replaced by a deficit reduction plan that is balanced, that makes smart spending cuts, that requires everyone to pay their fair share, and that takes into account a comprehensive national security strategy that includes careful consideration of international, defense, homeland security, and law enforcement programs; and

(2) savings can be achieved from the national defense budget without compromising our security through greater emphasis on eliminating duplicative and wasteful programs, reforming the acquisition process, identifying and constraining unsustainable operating costs, and through careful analysis of our national security needs.

SEC. 515. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE.

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

(1) The United States Government Accountability Office described climate change as, ''a complex, crosscutting issue that poses risks to many environmental and economic systems—including agriculture, infrastructure, ecosystems, and human health—and presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government''.

(2) The United States Academy of Sciences and the British Royal Society reported, ''It is now more certain than ever, based on many lines of evidence, that humans are changing Earth's climate. The atmosphere and oceans have warmed, accompanied by sea-level rise, a strong decline in Arctic sea ice, and other climate-related changes''.

(3) The United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded the effects of climate change are occurring worldwide, ''Observed impacts of climate change have already affected agriculture, human health, ecosystems on land and in the oceans, water supplies, and some people's livelihoods''.

(4) The United States National Research Council's National Climate Assessment and Development Advisory Committee found climate change affects, ''human health, water supply, agriculture, transportation, energy, and many other aspects of society''.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that climate change presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government. The scientific community has reached a consensus regarding climate change science, which provides critical information to preserve economic and environmental systems throughout the world.

SEC. 516. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON INVESTMENTS IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.

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

(1) Investments in early education are among the best investments we can make for children, families, and the economy.

(2) Investments in early childhood benefit the economy as a whole, generating at least $7 in return for every $1 invested by lowering the need for spending on other services—such as remedial education, grade repetition, and special education—and increasing productivity and earnings for those children as adults.

(3) Children who receive high-quality early education benefit directly in both the short term and the long term. They have better educational outcomes, stronger job earnings, and lower crime and delinquency rates.

(4) Unfortunately, only 3 out of every 10 4-year-olds are enrolled in high-quality early childhood education programs in the United States. This low level of participation ranks the United States 28th out of 38 countries in the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development for the share of 4-year-olds enrolled in early childhood education.

(5) In particular, children from low-income families are less likely to have access to high-quality, affordable preschool programs that will prepare them for kindergarten. By third grade, children from low-income families who are not reading at grade level are six times less likely to graduate from high school than students who are proficient.

(b) POLICY.—This resolution provides for enactment of a $76 billion, 10-year investment to provide access to high-quality early education for all 4-year-olds. Early education programs must meet quality benchmarks that are linked to better outcomes for children, including a rigorous curriculum tied to State-level standards, qualified teachers, small class sizes, and effective evaluation and review of programs.

SEC. 517. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAKING A BALANCED APPROACH TO DEFICIT REDUCTION.

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

(1) Since 2010, the Congress has enacted several major measures to reduce the deficit. Most of the savings come from cuts to spending. Revenues represent less than one-quarter of total savings achieved.

(2) Allowing implementation of the remaining spending sequester will damage our national security, critical infrastructure, and other important investments.

(3) Every bipartisan commission has recommended, and the majority of Americans agree, that we should take a balanced, bipartisan approach to reducing the deficit that addresses both revenue and spending.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should develop a balanced plan to address the Nation's long-term fiscal imbalance. The plan should—

(1) prevent job loss and economic drag in the near term as the economy heals;

(2) increase revenues without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans; and

(3) decrease spending through greater efficiencies within the Government and improving incentives for service providers while maintaining the Medicare guarantee, protecting Social Security and a strong social safety net, and making strategic investments in education, science, research, and critical infrastructure necessary to compete in the global economy.

SEC. 518. 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) The Federal Government spends about $80 billion each year for information technology. GAO has identified opportunities for savings and improved efficiencies in the Government's information technology infrastructure.

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

(5) 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.

(6) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2015, 32 laws will expire. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

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

(b) POLICY STATEMENT 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 changed.

SEC. 519. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE USE OF TAXPAYER FUNDS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House should lead by example and identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration shall review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members of Congress and House Committees, and shall identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, Barbershop, Salon, and the House dining room. Further, it is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reflects the priorities and values of the country. This amendment focuses on growing jobs now, making sure that we have a strong economy and making sure we significantly reduce our deficit and debt as a share of our economy over the longer term and does it in a balanced way. It does it by, for example, closing some of the special interest tax breaks that actually perversely encourage American corporations to ship American jobs overseas. We believe we should be in the business of shipping American products overseas, and this budget does invest in jobs right here at home.

Unlike the House Republican budget, we don't allow the transportation trust fund to go insolvent later this summer. Unlike the House Republic budget, we do not make deep cuts in our kids' education. We think it is important to build that ladder of opportunity. Unlike the Republican budget, we don't reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole and require seniors to pay more if they have high prescription drug costs, and we don't shred the social safety net.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also bring to the attention of the body something else that is in here. We advance fund, 100 percent, the Veterans Administration, because what we saw during the unnecessary and unproductive government shutdown last fall was that the closure began to put at risk the benefits that were being paid to our veterans. Now, we already provide for the advance funding of those health care benefits, but what we don't fund in advance are the people who have to administer them to make sure that they are delivered to our veterans on time.

So we are very pleased to have a letter here from the DAV and other veterans' groups that strongly support this provision in our budget. It is something that they have been requesting. I just want to read one of the paragraphs:

> We would like to commend you for presenting an alternate budget proposal that contains a provision for advance appropriations to all VA discretionary programs and services, a critically needed reform that is universally supported by veterans' organizations and is DAV's number one priority.

So whether it is veterans, whether it is our kids' education, or whether it is making our commitment to our seniors, we choose to make sure that we fund the priorities of the country and we don't keep off-limits tax preferences for the powerful and the privileged.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Chairman RYAN.

As a businessowner of 42 years, I know what it means to meet the bottom line and live within my means, both in my business and in my family. Unfortunately, America hasn't lived within its means for years, and we are nearing the tipping point. But President Obama and the Democrats in Congress want to push us nearer to the edge rather than rein us back in by spending money we just don't have and growing government with massive, government-run programs like ObamaCare.

The government already takes enough money from the hands of hardworking Americans—and that is not the problem. The problem is spending. Mr. VAN HOLLEN's plan does nothing to address the real problem. It makes it worse. We need a budget that shrinks the size of government, reins in out-of-control spending, and prevents tax dollars from being subject to waste, fraud, and abuse.

The Van Hollen plan raises taxes by $1.8 trillion, and when compared to the Republican budget authored by Chairman RYAN, it spends nearly $6 trillion more, adds more than $4 trillion to the national debt, and it never, never balances. The budget is a disaster that doesn't reflect the direction this Nation needs to go, nor does it reflect what the American people want or need.

We need a responsible plan. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this substitute.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is right that we do close some special interest tax breaks, but we also have about $400 billion in revenue from pro-growth immigration reform which is in this budget, which at least some of our colleagues on the Republican side recognize as a good thing.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office has told us that one thing we could do right now to get the economy moving faster would be to pass comprehensive, bipartisan immigration reform. In fact, they say it will help reduce the deficit by close to $1 trillion over the next 20 years and generate some economic activity. So $400 billion in that revenue is from more economic activity, the kind of pro-growth activity we thought our Republican colleagues liked.

I am now very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, who has been focused on trying to make sure everybody in America gets a fair shake.

□ 1030

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the ranking member for yielding and for your tireless leadership of our committee. I rise in very strong support of the Democratic alternative to the disastrous Republican budget. Our Democratic alternative closes tax loopholes and makes smart investments in policies and programs that create jobs, cuts poverty and grows the economy for all.

The Democratic alternative raises the minimum wage to $10.10 which lifts nearly 1 million Americans out of poverty. It also expands the earned income tax credit, and for the millions of Americans still struggling to find a job, it extends the lifeline of unemployment compensation which House Republicans have refused to consider. Nearly 3 million people are living on the edge because Republicans refuse to extend emergency unemployment compensation.

Our alternative protects Medicare, eliminates the sequester, and includes, as our ranking member said, comprehensive immigration reform which lowers our deficit by $900 billion.

Finally, I appreciate some of my Republican colleagues have shown an interest in cutting poverty in our country. However, we have starkly different opinions of how we achieve that goal.

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

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

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the ranking member.

As I was saying, we must attack poverty, not the poor, as evidenced through the draconian cuts to the safety net in the Ryan budget. Gutting SNAP is not a path out of poverty.

The American people deserve a fighting chance to enter the middle class. They deserve better than the Ryan budget. Let me tell you, the better budget for our country is the Democratic alternative, which provides pathways out of poverty, creates jobs, protects the safety net, and grows the economy for all.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is noteworthy that once again—once again—and this is the fourth budget cycle that I have been through, the fourth Democratic budget offered here, that never balances. It never balances. How do you ever, ever pay back money that you have already borrowed if you never have a surplus and never get to balance? I have said it before and I will say it again: if you borrow money from me and intend to pay it back, that is debt. If you borrow money from me and never intend to pay it back, that is theft. That is what the Democrats are offering here today, Mr. Chairman. They are encouraging us to borrow more and borrow more and borrow more and never lay out any plan whatsoever for paying that money back to the children and grandchildren from whom we are borrowing.

The only plan that will be offered later today that does that is the Republican budget. I strongly encourage a ''no'' vote on the Democratic plan, a ''no'' vote on continued generational theft, and a ''yes'' vote on the Republican plan.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I find this newfound ideology of having to hit a particular target at a particular time interesting since 3 years ago the Republican budget balanced maybe around the year 2040. And this year, it doesn't balance if you also claim to be getting rid of the Affordable Care Act, because you have $2 trillion in revenue in savings in this Republican budget from the Affordable Care Act, the same Affordable Care Act you say you are getting rid of. You just can't have both things true at the same time.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), someone who knows a little bit about logic, a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, a budget is a statement of a society's moral principles. The Democratic budget is an investment plan that creates a job for a marine who comes back from Afghanistan. It guarantees health security for a single mom and her asthmatic daughter. It expands the opportunity for a bright-eyed son of immigrant parents to go to college.

On the other hand, the Ryan manifesto doesn't create a job for that marine. The Ryan budget fires 3 million Americans over the next 2 years, and it protects tax breaks for companies shipping those jobs overseas. The Ryan budget repeals the Affordable Care Act, forcing that single mother and baby daughter back into the intolerable days when families could not afford health care.

In summary, the Republican budget asks not what you can do for your country, but proclaims your country refuses to do a thing for you.

The Democratic budget invests in our greatest resource, the American people, the key to our Nation's continued greatness in the years to come. Vote ''yes'' on the Democratic alternative.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), the vice chairman of the House Budget Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the committee for the great work he has done in bringing forward a positive, solutions-oriented budget.

What we are hearing here is the same song, different verse. You would think that they would get tired of singing this song because it is so out of key: spends more, taxes more, borrows more, adds $4.3 trillion to the debt and never, ever comes to balance. Ever.

The American people watching this and reading their newspapers about what the plan is in Washington, what the budget is in Washington, they recognize that the Democrats' plan is never, ever to balance; not something they can do in their homes. People have to balance their budgets. Not something they can do in their businesses; people have to balance budgets. So we hope that at some point in the future our friends on the other side of the aisle recognize that fiscal responsibility has something to do with the American dream.

When we don't balance as a Nation, when our Federal budget doesn't balance, when we continue to add $4.3 trillion more to the debt than the Republican budget, what that means is we are robbing from future generations. We are telling them you are going to have to pay this; we are not responsible enough to pay it. You get to pay it. How does that sound to the young person out there who, by the way, is graduating from college and can't find a job in their sphere of interest because of this faltering economy.

So what is the alternative? That is the good news, Mr. Chairman. There are positive solutions that we are offering. That is the Republican budget we are going to have a vote on just this morning, a positive budget that actually balances the budget over a period of 10 years. And it not only balances the budget, it gets us on a path to pay off the entire debt of the United States.

Think about the wonderful dreams that can be realized by young people and others across this great land when we don't have any debt. Think of what happens when you finally pay off that car. What a great relief that is. When you are finally able to pay off your home, when you are finally able to pay off those debts, you remember, you wake the next morning and you feel freer and more excited. There is a greater opportunity to realize your dreams.

Our budget recognizes that health care is indeed important, and that Medicare and Medicaid, not according to me or the Republican side but according to the actuaries in those programs, is going broke. Bankrupt. What does that mean? That means that seniors and individuals in the Medicaid program will no longer be able to receive the benefits, the services, the health care that we have promised them as a country. That is what that means. That is what this program does on the other side of the aisle. That is why in our budget we save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid. We do so by making certain that patients are in charge of health care, not the Federal Government. The Republican budget is the premier budget that is being offered today. I urge my colleagues to vote down the Democrat budget and vote for the Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, look, our Republican colleagues are going to have to choose and tell the American people, either they claim to have a budget that balances in 10 years or they are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act. But right now because they get rid of the entire Affordable Care Act, including the revenues and savings, they don't come close to balancing. I keep hearing balance, and the reality is that it has all that revenue from the Affordable Care Act.

The one thing we know is that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says the Republican budget will slow down the economy in the next couple years. Ours won't, in part because we make investments in our infrastructure.

At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), who is focused on making sure that this country has the modern infrastructure it needs, the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if this budget balances, it balances in an alternate reality, perhaps on Planet Reagan. But it does take a very dyspeptic view of investments because they prioritize tax cuts for billionaires over investments. They purport or pretend or actually will cut out all Federal investment in roads, bridges, highways, and transit. That is a $52 billion cut. That is a couple of million jobs, and a lot more crumbling bridges.

We have something called the Land Water Conservation Fund. It is funded by taxes collected from offshore oil drilling. It is suppose to buy conservation lands. They will not allow a single acre of land to be purchased by the Federal Government, but they will still collect the tax from the oil industry.

And what about the looming crisis in wildfires in the West? Well, they are closing their eyes and are pretending we are not going to have drastic wildfires across the West, and they put zero budget in there in anticipation of drastic wildfires.

This is the most unbelievably unrealistic, and I would have to go almost to the word, and I can't attribute it to people's motivations, but hypocritical budget I have ever seen.

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

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a fascinating debate that is taking place today, laying out truly the two versions and visions for America. My friends on the other side of the aisle have no interest in putting America on a pathway to sustainability. They advocate for $2 trillion of more taxes, but more taxes and more spending in their proposal never leads us to a balanced budget. They lead us to a debt crisis.

It is one thing to come into this House, into this Chamber, and tell the American people, ''I want to raise taxes; and with those tax increases which are going to kill jobs, at one point I will balance the budget.'' But they don't even do that. They tax and they spend, and spend and they tax, and they never balance.

Mr. Chairman, I know this is Mr. RYAN's last budget that he has introduced. I have somewhat of a disagreement on this, and there is some good news and bad news in what the Democrats propose. The good news is that they actually pay for all of their spending. The bad news is the money they pay it with is still in the pockets of our hardworking middle class families. It is going to be an attack on middle class families if we are going to pay for an irresponsible budget and an irresponsible spending path. And in the end, they will have a lower standard of living. I think that is unacceptable. I think we should reject this budget and actually be responsible to the American people, sustainable for the American people, and truly get the job done for the next generation.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguish member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget flies in the face of the reality of their own budget. It does nothing to deal with the very real, looming crisis of Social Security. They are afraid to inflict their Medicare solution on the seniors that vote today; instead, it will bite long after the people arguing for it will have moved on.

It repeals the Affordable Care Act, but keeps the taxes and fees they railed against. But there is nothing sadder than yesterday's Ryan soliloquy on how America cannot afford to invest in its future.

Well, we don't think having billionaire hedge fund managers pay the same tax rate as hardworking Americans would be a blow to prosperity. Our budget invests in America's future—in infrastructure, education, innovation—while the Republicans would sentence this rich, great country to perpetual decline. Mercifully, this won't happen. Their budget will not become law.

Someday, America will invest in our future again, close tax loopholes, and work together to solve our problems. Our budget shows how.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 minute, Mr. Chairman.

We have had a good three days of debate here. I plan on saying more in a few moments, but I find it really interesting, I don't see much of a defense of the budget that the gentleman is offering, and more of the continually what I would call discredited attacks against ours. Our budget increases spending on average by 3.5 percent over the next 10 years instead of 5.2 percent.

□ 1045

We are proposing to spend $43 trillion over the next 10 years instead of the $48 trillion. This is draconian, awful, evil, terrible, hurting people.

We have seen this movie so many times over and over again. All the other side is offering is just keep doing more of the same; the same economics that we have had for the same 5 years, just keep doing more of that.

If taxing, borrowing, and spending was working, we would know by now. It is not.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

That is why we need a different direction. That is why we owe the country an alternative; one that actually grows the economy, one that balances the budget and pays off the debt, one that secures retirement not with empty promises but real reforms, one that goes after waste and cronyism, one that respects people and does not offer more and more and more and more control in Washington.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, what we know is old and stale and doesn't work is trickle down economics. The idea you just give the folks at the very top a little bit bigger tax break and somehow it is going to benefit everybody else didn't work and made the deficit go up.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), a member of the Finance Committee.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

We do live in a great country. Thank God people before this Congress, before Mr. RYAN's budget, understood that investing in our Nation's infrastructure was critical to achieving that greatness.

The budget being offered by the Democrats invests in America, we invest in infrastructure. The Ryan budget does not do that. In fact, we go back.

Our country has never been made great. We have never built railroads, never built great dams, never built great things to make this country the wonderful place that it is based on cutting and slashing and redistributing money up toward the wealthiest.

Vote against the Ryan budget. Vote for the Democratic alternative.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman I am now pleased to yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I think we can agree at least on the rhetoric that the best thing we can do to balance our budget in the long-term is to grow the economy, but it is pretty clear we have a different vision as to how that will actually happen.

We believe that a Tax Code that is fair, that equally distributes the obligation to all Americans, is one of the ways we get there. We don't believe that simply cutting taxes for the wealthiest Americans and passing the obligation on to working people is the way to do it.

We believe that we grow the economy by investing in infrastructure so that we can grow jobs and deliver products across the country and across the planet. We don't think we get there by cutting infrastructure and continuing to challenge our businesses.

We believe we grow the economy by investing in the skills of our workforce so that they can become more productive, not by cutting those necessary programs.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

It has been a good debate on the floor of the House over the last couple of days.

The question boils down to, what are our country's priorities, what are our country's values? We believe we should be focused right now on growing opportunity and growing jobs. That is what our budget does.

The Congressional Budget Office tells us that the House Republican budget will actually slow down job growth and slow down economic activity over the next couple of years.

We invest in our infrastructure to keep America going. Their budget actually has the transportation trust fund go insolvent later this year.

We continue to build ladders of opportunity so more people can prosper in this country. The Republican budget protects tax breaks for folks at the very, very top; in fact, provides millionaires with a one-third cut in their tax rate—they do that—but they cut our investment in early education, in K through 12. We actually increase, we increase our early investment education. We think our kids' future is the most important thing for the future growth of this country.

We protect our commitments to seniors. We don't reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, we do not end the Medicare guarantee, and yes, we significantly bring down the deficits and stabilize the debt-to-GDP ratio in the out years. We don't do it by playing games. We don't say we are going to get rid of the Affordable Care Act and then rely on all the revenue and all the savings from the Affordable Care Act to pretend to hit balance in the out years.

As I said earlier, we make sure we learn from our mistakes. In the 16-day shutdown, which was totally unproductive and totally unnecessary and all part of an effort to get rid of the entire Affordable Care Act, a lot of Americans got hurt, including our veterans who are on the edge. So we do in this budget what every veteran organization asked this Congress to do: we made sure we advance-fund those appropriations so that next time, God forbid, someone in this House thinks it is a good idea to shut down the government, at least those who served our country are not put at risk in terms of getting the medical and other support they need.

So yes, we invest in our veterans, we invest in our kids' future, we maintain our commitments to seniors, and we do that by asking the most powerful and the most privileged special interests to contribute a little bit more as we grow our economy through commonsense bipartisan immigration reform.

If you want an America that is going to grow and prosper as one country, where we respect our individual freedoms and liberty and entrepreneurship but also recognize that there are some things that history has taught us we do better by working together, which is what has made us a world economic power, then support the Democratic budget. If you want to continue to support and protect the special interests at the very top on some trickle down theory, that that will help everybody else, then vote for the Republican budget, because that is what they do at the expense of the rest of the country and at the expense of economic growth and prosperity for every American.

Vote "yes" for jobs, opportunity, and security. Vote for the Democratic budget.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First off, let me start off by saying to my friend from Maryland: I am glad we are having this debate, and this is the last time the two of us are doing this, and it has been a pleasure.

I also want to thank the staff. All of our staffs have put so much hard work into this. I want to thank our staff, led by our great staff director, Austin Smythe, for all that he has done. I want to thank the people over at the CBO who work really long hours producing all of these estimates so that we can write these budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD these names to show our thanks.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE MAJORITY STAFF

Austin Smythe
Andy Morton
Tim Flynn
Conor Sweeney
Vanessa Day
William Allison
Brian Bolduc
Dennis Teti
Paul Restuccia
Nicole Foltz
Jon Romito
Mary Popadiuk
Jon Burks
Jim Herz
Matt Hoffmann
Ted McCann
Stephanie Parks
Justin Bogie
Shane Skelton
Gene Emmans
Kara McKee
Jenna Spealman
Donald Schneider
Alex Stoddard
Jose Guillen
Richard "Dick" Magee
Eric Davis

Interns: Boyd Garriott, Gabriel Krimm, and Alyssa Wootton

PERSONAL STAFF (REPRESENTATIVE PAUL RYAN, WISCONSIN, 1ST DISTRICT)

Cameron Clark
Chad Herbert
Casey Higgins
Susie Liston
Joyce Meyer
Teresa Mora
Sarah Peer
Lauren Schroeder
Kevin Seifert

Andy Speth
Allison Steil
Tricia Stoneking
Robert Swift
Danyell Tremmel
Megan Wagner
Tory Wickiser
Interns: Harrison Balistreri, Sarah Holtz, Gretchen Wade, and Brittney Weiland

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the differences between our budgets and our approaches could not be more clear. Let me take them one by one.

We have had a number of substitutes on the floor. There is one consistent theme from the substitutes offered by our friends on the other side of the aisle. While we are offering a budget that balances the budget and pays off the debt, they are offering a budget that never, ever balances.

They are starting with a $1.8 trillion tax increase. That is on top of the $1.7 trillion tax increase that has already occurred. They go as high as offering in the Progressive Caucus budget a $6.6 trillion tax increase.

They are offering not only a spending on autopilot going out of control today, they want to raise it higher, $791 billion in this budget to as much as $3.3 trillion in more spending. They are offering a budget to add trillions to the debt.

Now, when they say they want to raise taxes, and that is what their proposal is, again, they like to say it is just on the rich: Anybody listening, don't worry, it is not on you, it is on just these few rich people.

Here is the problem. They have a funny way of defining the rich. They have a funny way of defining it as small business. Most of our jobs come from small businesses. Those are the people who are going to get hit with this tax increase. That is where our jobs come from.

Second, we have seen this movie before, and we know what it looks like. They have already raised taxes $1.7 trillion. Look at the taxes on ObamaCare. They were supposed to be taxes on the rich. It taxes everybody. It doesn't matter how much you make. You are going to get hit with a tax: a mandate tax, a sell-your-house tax, taxes, taxes, taxes.

Are they raising all these taxes so they can pay off the debt? No—to fuel more spending.

Here is what we are proposing. Here is what the gentleman doesn't want to say. We are saying have revenue-neutral tax reform, meaning take the amount of revenues we bring into the government today, keep that same revenue, but clean up this awful Tax Code. Plug the loopholes, cancel loopholes so that we can lower tax rates for families and businesses across the board to create more jobs, more economic growth. We have already gotten the studies that tell us doing this helps a lot.

We are taxing American businesses at much higher tax rates than our foreign competitors are taxing theirs, and they are winning and we are losing. So we are saying, fundamental comprehensive tax reform, stop picking winners and losers in Washington, lower tax rates.

Second, this House Democrat budget increases spending by $740 billion above what would happen if we did nothing. That is $5.9 trillion more than our budget. They used to call this stimulus. I remember just a few short years ago all these ideas were called stimulating and stimulus. Remember, Mr. Chairman, we have done this. And guess what? Stimulus didn't work.

So now they call it investment. If you disinvest, that means you are not spending enough. An investment, just remember every time you hear the word investment, it means: tax, borrow, spend in Washington. Take money from hardworking taxpayers, borrow from the next generation, and spend more money in Washington. That means take money from businesses, take money from small businesses, take money from people creating jobs, borrow more money from China, leverage it against the next generation, spend more in Washington.

We will spend $3.5 trillion this year. Spending is slated to go above about 5.2 percent on average. We are basically saying let's get this under control; 3.5 percent is enough.

What they will also say is look at what we are doing on Medicare, all these awful things that we are doing on Medicare. We are saving it for the current generation by preserving it as is, and then we are making sure that it is there for the next generation.

Here is the dirty little secret. Look at what they have already done to Medicare. It was ObamaCare that ended Medicare as we know it, it was ObamaCare that raided $700 billion from Medicare to spend on ObamaCare, it was ObamaCare that set up this new rationing board of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats to put price controls on Medicare, which will lead to denied care for seniors.

It is the House Democrats' budget that is complicit with the Medicare trust fund going bankrupt in 2026. Our budget strengthens Medicare, saves it for this generation, and puts reforms in place so that the next generation can count on it without having 15 bureaucrats running the program.

Look at what they are proposing on national security. They track right along with the President's budget. They are proposing to cut compensation for our men and women in uniform, to hollow out our force, to cut training and readiness and structure, not to lower the deficit, but to fuel more domestic spending. So we will have an Army lower than anything we have seen before World War II, we will have a Navy smaller than what we haven't seen since before World War I, we will have an Air Force smaller than we have ever had before, not for deficit reduction, but for more domestic spending. We reject that approach.

Finally, their budget adds $4.3 trillion to our national debt. That is despite this massive tax increase. Their budget never balances, ever.

Under their plan, in 2024, the deficit will be $637 billion. At the end of the day it is just not credible.

We trust the American people to have more control over their lives. We reject this budget. Let's balance the budget, grow the economy, create jobs, and pay off our debt, and pass the House Republican budget.

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 261, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

AYES—163

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—261

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)

Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

Jackson Lee
Lewis
McAllister
Miller, George
Perlmutter
Runyan
Schwartz

□ 1126

Messrs. CASSIDY, SOUTHERLAND, and STEWART changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RUSH and CUELLAR changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Pro-Growth Budget Act.

Right now, America is not working for too many people. For years, our economy has remained stagnant and job growth weak.

□ 1130

At the current time, three out of four Americans report that they are living paycheck to paycheck. The ability to climb the economic ladder of success and live the American Dream is becoming much more difficult for millions of people.

Mr. Chairman, this is the status quo in America, but it is a status quo that we must not accept. Our constituents deserve better. Our constituents deserve a government that is focused on turning this economy around and making America work again, and work again for everybody.

In the House, there are some very clear differences on how to solve America's problems. My Democratic colleagues believe the best way to move the country forward is with $1.8 trillion in new tax hikes so that this government can even spend more. That is not right, and it is not fair. Working Americans deserve a chance to put more of their hard-earned paychecks into their personal savings accounts, to invest that or spend it on their families before they are forced to send it to Washington.

We House Republicans have a better plan, a balanced budget that will begin to provide working families, many of whom are struggling to make ends meet, with just a little relief. The budget before us will create jobs. It will cut wasteful spending. It will reform our Tax Code and hold Washington more accountable. Plain and simple, this budget is pro-growth. This budget is about making America work again.

Today, Members of the House have a very simple choice. We can continue the status quo, stand in the way of economic progress and new opportunities for working middle class families, or we can choose to lead the American people down a path to prosperity where all Americans have a chance at success.

Mr. Chairman, passing a budget is not only an important step to restoring trust in government and faith in our economy, it is our legal obligation to do so. The House passes a budget even when our paychecks aren't on the line. The House Republicans choose to lead on this issue. We have passed a budget every year since taking the majority. So let's now stand together and fulfill one of the most important duties that we were elected to do and pass a budget that the American people that sent us here can be proud of.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the chairman of the Budget Committee, for his continued dedication to reining in wasteful spending and restoring fiscal responsibility and in balancing the budget.

I also want to thank the other members of the Budget Committee for their hard work continuously on this issue.

I urge my colleagues to pass this budget on behalf of the American people.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to start by joining the chairman of the committee and thanking both the Democratic and Republican staff of the Budget Committee for their hard work and submit, for the RECORD, their names.

BUDGET COMMITTEE MINORITY STAFF LIST

Sarah Abernathy
Ellen Balis
Kathleen Capstick
Zachary Cuff (Intern)
Ken Cummings
Bridgett Frey
Jocelyn M. Griffin
Tom Kahn
Najy Kamal
Andrea Leung
Sheila McDowell
Diana Meredith
Erin Miller
Kimberly Overbeek
Karen Robb
Scott Russell
Beth Stephenson
Andy Van Wye (Intern)
Ted Zegers

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I would also, Mr. Chairman, like to take this opportunity, it is Chairman RYAN's last year as head of the Budget Committee, and I do want to thank him for the professional way in which he has conducted the committee.

Lest he think I am getting carried away, this is an example where process did not lead to a better product, and that is why we are here today because, unfortunately, I have to report that this House Republican budget is the worst of the Republican budgets I have seen in the last 3 years for the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, budgets reflect the choices we make for our country. They tell the American people what we care about and what we care less about. At every juncture in this House Republican budget, they choose to protect very powerful special interests and the most wealthy in our country at the expense of everyone else and at the expense of all the other priorities. For example, they have tax cuts that actually encourage companies to ship

American jobs, not products, overseas, while our budget invests right here in the United States of America.

Now, we heard the Republican leader say we want a better economy for everybody. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that this Republican budget will slow down economic growth right now for the next couple of years, that it will reduce job growth in the next couple of years, all while doing what? Providing another windfall tax break to millionaires.

Yes, look at their budget. They want to drop the top tax rate, 39 percent to 25 percent, full 30 percent. What does that mean? $200,000 average tax break for millionaires. Who finances it in their budget? Well, math tells you middle-income taxpayers pay more. They pay $2,000 more per, average, in order to finance trickle-down economics, even though we know from experience that that was a dead end for this country.

While our Republican colleagues talk about fiscal responsibility, apparently they don't care enough about it to close one single special interest tax loophole to help reduce the deficit—not one, not a hedge fund owner, not a big oil company, not one.

And because they say hands off the most powerful and the most privileged, their budget has to come after everybody else, and it does. So it hits our kids' education, early education, K–12. College students are asked to pay more interest. In fact, they got $45 billion savings by charging college kids more interest while they are still in college and not working, again, while hands off the powerful special interests.

Seniors, seniors on Medicare see the prescription drug doughnut hole open, the safety net, again, shredded. And all for what purpose?

Now, they claim that they are going to somehow balance the budget at the end of the 10-year window. But you know what? They can't have it both ways. We have had over 50 votes here in the House of Representatives from our colleagues to repeal the Affordable Care Act. But guess what. They have got $2 trillion in this budget from revenues and savings from the Affordable Care Act.

We use some of those savings. We use those Medicare savings to strengthen Medicare.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield the final minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader who has been a fighter for America's priorities.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I congratulate the Budget Committee for the hard work that you have done.

I wish we had more than 10 minutes on each side to discuss the House Democratic budget, but so it is.

Here we are, about to leave for the holy season of Easter and Passover. It reminds me of the Gospel of Matthew, in which Matthew says: ''For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.''

This budget is a statement as to where our treasure is and where our hearts are for the American people. A budget, as our distinguished ranking member said, must be a statement of our national values. What is important to us as a nation should be reflected in our spending priorities, in our treasure.

But you be the judge, I want to say to the American people, but the Speaker will not allow me to address the American people, so their representatives here. Is it a statement of your national values, of our country, to give a $200,000 tax break to people making over $1 million a year at the expense of increasing taxes $2,000 for the middle class? Is that a statement of our values? I didn't think so.

Is it a statement of our values, in order to finance the special interest privilege that is in the Republican budget, is it a statement of your values to cut over 170,000 children from Head Start? Is that a statement of our values? Children learning, parents earning, opportunity, fairness.

Is it a statement of your values to support a budget that says, 3.5 million children in our country, disadvantaged children in economically disadvantaged areas, will have cuts in the budget of Title I? Is that a statement of our values in order to give tax breaks to Big Oil?

Is it a statement of our values to say to aspiring families, some the first in their families to be able to go to college, that we are going to cut over half a million, maybe over 600,000 kids from Head Start? Is that a statement of values to say to over half a million young people you will not have opportunity to have higher education? Instead, we are going to give that same amount of money to Big Oil for tax incentives for them to drill. Is that a statement of our values? I don't think so. I don't think so.

So where is their treasure and where is their heart?

The treasure in this Republican budget is just as what our ranking member said; it is with the special interests and the wealthiest people in our country. It is a trickle-down approach that has never worked. It has worked for the rich. It has worked for the special interests and their supporters, but it has not worked for the great middle class.

Do we need any more evidence of it not working, that these same warmed-over policies that existed in the Bush era that took us to the Great Recession, a great recession where we met right before the election in September of 2008, where the Chairman of the Fed said to us, if we do not act immediately, we will not have an economy by Monday? This was a Thursday night. That is where these policies took us at the end of the Bush years, and we are still digging out of that recession.

Instead of having a budget that lifts us up to create jobs, to create growth, to invest in science and education, to keep America number one, they call their budget a path to prosperity. It is a road to recession and always has been, and that is what it is now.

So at least we have a few minutes to discuss our value system, where our treasure is, with the richest and the special interests or with the great middle class and those who aspire to it, and, therefore, where our heart is in terms of budget priorities in this budget.

This is an important budget. Some people want to dismiss it as a joke because it is so outrageous. It is deadly serious. It isn't funny at all because of the impact that it has in the lives of America's families, our children, our seniors, voucherizing Medicare, removing the guarantee of Medicare for our seniors.

□ 1145

Is that a statement of our values, to say to our seniors: you are on your own, you are on your own?

I don't think so. So if our heart is with the middle class, we will put our treasure there and make investments in education and job creation, investments in science.

I will just close. Again, I started with the Bible. Scientific research gives us an almost biblical power to cure. Where there is scientific opportunity, we almost have a moral responsibility—certainly a moral imperative to invest in it, to improve health, to improve the quality of health in our country, and to make sure that everybody has access to it.

But don't worry about the access to it because our investments in basic scientific research are seriously impaired by this budget. It does violence to any concept of science that promotes innovation and keeps making America number one, advancing innovation with investments in science and technology.

It undermines investments in how we protect our environment, so that our children can breathe clean air and drink clean water, about how we protect our America by investments in science and technology to do so, and the intelligence to avoid conflict and the investments in job creation that science will enable us to do.

So if you believe in knowledge, if you would believe in fact, if you believe in the middle class, you must reject the Republican budget. You must reject the Republican budget.

What the Republican leadership is asking Members to do is something that I don't know that they share that value. Certainly, Republicans across the country do not. Republicans across the country support education, investments in science, and the rest. Any poll will show you that.

Just one other thing: if you really want to reduce the deficit, one of the fastest ways you can do it is to have a budget that does as ours does, to include comprehensive immigration reform, which reduces the deficit by $900 billion with a b, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

So by reason of treasure, by reason of heart, by reason of value, by reason of ethic, by reason of honoring our responsibilities to the American people, vote a good, strong ''no'' on the Ryan Republican budget. It is a path to ruin. It is not a path to prosperity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN's budget is a budget about growth, about investment, about keeping America number one, about strengthening the middle class, which is the backbone of our democracy.

Vote ''no'' on the Ryan budget.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Let me first start off by saying, Mr. Chairman, you have presided over this budget for many years. You have set a great example for the rest of us. This is your last year serving, and I want to thank you for what you have done for this institution. Thank you for setting a great example.

Mr. Chairman, what this debate comes down to is a question of trust. We have offered a budget because we trust the American people. Unlike the Senate Democrats who, once again, have punted, have chosen not even to offer a budget this year, we trust the people to make an honest assessment. We trust them to make the right choice for their future.

Now, to their credit, the House Democrats have offered budgets as well. The problem is they put their trust in Washington. Every time you hear this word ''investment,'' just know what that means: take from hard-working taxpayers, borrow more money from our next generation, from other countries, and spend it in Washington.

Time and again, they are proposing to put government in the driver's seat. They have already engineered a takeover of our entire health care sector. They are overregulating our energy sector. They are depriving us of jobs. They won't even give us the Keystone pipeline.

They are proposing yet new taxes, another $1.8 trillion increase. They are proposing more cronyism. They are proposing more control for Washington, less control of our communities, less control over our businesses, less control over our lives, less control over our futures. In my respectful opinion, it is a vision that is both paternalistic, arrogant, and downright condescending.

You know, Big Government, in theory, it sounds compelling. In practice, it is totally different. Remember, if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Remember, if you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan. Remember, if government just takes over this sector, it will lower your costs.

Big Government in practice is so different than in the theory. The results have nothing to do with the rhetoric.

We, on the other hand, trust the people. We are offering a balanced budget that pays down the debt. We are offering patient-centered solutions, so patients are the nucleus of the health care system, not the government.

We are offering a plan to save Medicare now and for future generations. We are offering a stronger safety net with State flexibility to help meet people's needs and to help people get from welfare to work, to make the most of their lives. We are offering a progrowth Tax Code. We are offering more energy jobs.

You can boil the differences down to one question: Who knows better, the people or Washington? We have made our choice with this budget. I trust the American people to make theirs.

Mr. Chairman, let's call the votes.

The CHAIR. All time for debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2015 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2016 through 2024, and, pursuant to House Resolution 544, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 205, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—219

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—205

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kingston
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)

Payne	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)
Pelosi	Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)
Peters (CA)	Schakowsky	Tierney
Peters (MI)	Schiff	Titus
Peterson	Schneider	Tonko
Pingree (ME)	Schrader	Tsongas
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Van Hollen
Polis	Scott, Austin	Vargas
Price (NC)	Scott, David	Veasey
Quigley	Serrano	Vela
Rahall	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Rangel	Shea-Porter	Visclosky
Richmond	Sherman	Walz
Roybal-Allard	Sinema	Wasserman Schultz
Ruiz	Sires	Waters
Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Waxman
Rush	Smith (WA)	Welch
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Sánchez, Linda T.	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth
	Takano	

NOT VOTING—8

Carson (IN)	McAllister	Runyan
Jackson Lee	Miller, George	Schwartz
Lewis	Perlmutter	

□ 1201

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 177 I was unable to attend. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 2014, I missed rollcall vote 177. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today and missed roll Nos. 175 through 177. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on roll No. 176. I would have voted "nay" on roll Nos. 175 and 177.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2377

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as cosponsor of H.R. 2377.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

VISA LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2195) to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity against the United States and poses a threat to United States national security interests, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2195

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. VISA LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

Section 407(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (8 U.S.C. 1102 note) is amended—

(1) by striking "such individual has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities" and inserting the following: "such individual—

"(1) has been found to have been engaged in espionage activities or a terrorist activity (as defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(iii)))"; and

(2) by striking "allies and may pose" and inserting the following: "allies; and

"(2) may pose".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution:

S. CON. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, April 10, 2014, through Thursday, April 24, 2014, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12:00 noon on Monday, April 28, 2014, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, April 10, 2014, through Thursday, April 24, 2014, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, April 28, 2014, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. (a) The Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at such place and time he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the Senate adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the Senate shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The Speaker of his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENYING AN IRANIAN TERRORIST DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, last week, we learned something shocking and appalling. The Iranian Government wants to appoint a terrorist as their Ambassador to the United Nations, a man who participated in the 1979 terrorist attack on our Embassy in Tehran. This is unconscionable and unacceptable.

Last week, Senator TED CRUZ and I introduced legislation to fix this problem. This bill gives the President the authority he needs to deny this individual a visa. Senator CRUZ pushed the bill through the Senate unanimously on Monday.

I have been working with House leadership this week to quickly move this bill forward here in the House so that we do not have an Iranian terrorist walking the streets of New York City and having diplomatic immunity. I am proud to report that we just passed this bill unanimously.

I thank my colleagues and House leadership for passing the Cruz-Lamborn legislation.

THE RYAN REPUBLICAN BUDGET THROWS SENIORS OFF A CLIFF

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, they cradled us in our arms when we were babies, picked us off the ground when we scraped our knees, worked long hours to send us to college, and embraced us with unconditional love. I am talking about our parents and our grandparents. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am distraught with tears in my heart because of the Republican budget—slashing Medicaid by billions and cutting critical funding for our neediest seniors in nursing homes.

When our grannies and gramps are at their weakest, their oldest, their loneliest, the Republican Ryan budget puts them in a wheelchair and throws