

plead guilty, which will be December of next year, they will still not have been tried because of the actions of this administration.

But Khalid Sheikh Mohammed says: We do not possess your military might, not your nuclear weapons; nevertheless, we fight you with the almighty God. So, if our act of jihad and our fighting with you caused fear and terror, then many thanks to God, because it is him that has thrown fear into your hearts, which resulted from your infidelity, paganism, and your statement that God had a son and your Trinity beliefs.

Then he goes on and he says: God stated in his book, verse 151, Al-Umran, Soon shall we cast terror into the hearts of the unbelievers, for that they joined companies with Allah, for which he has sent no authority; their place will be the fire; and evil is the home of the wrongdoers. That is just one part.

He also says: We ask to be near God. We fight you, destroy you, terrorize. You'll be greatly defeated in Afghanistan and Iraq, and America will fall politically, militarily, economically. Your end is very near, and your fall will be like the fall of the towers on the blessed 9/11 day.

But this gentleman references that one of the reasons that it's okay to kill Americans is because many Americans believe there is a Holy trinity, a Father, Son and Holy Ghost. They believe that God had a son that Christians call the Messiah.

My time is running out, so let me direct you to the Treaty of Paris, 1783, such a historic document. The most powerful country in the world at that time, 1783, was Great Britain. They had the most powerful Navy, the most powerful military; and yet a ragtag bunch of people who believed so firmly in the ideas of freedom and being able to practice most of them—in fact, a third of the signers of the Declaration, they weren't just Christians; they, as Martin Luther King, Jr., were ordained Christian ministers, and they believed in freedom and that God was giving us a chance to govern ourselves.

So after this ragtag bunch defeated the strongest country in the world, Great Britain, and they sat down in 1783 in Paris, and we had there on our behalf John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and John Jay, three of our brightest minds, they had to set about figuring out: What can we put on paper to have Great Britain sign that will be so important that they would not want to risk violating an oath? What kind of oath could we put on this treaty that Great Britain would be scared to violate?

□ 1540

This treaty will want them to recognize the United States of America. What can we do to make it serious enough that they would not turn around the next month and say we had no right to be independent despite what they signed? There is an original

copy of the Treaty of Paris in the State Department. Tours can be taken, I've taken tons of tours around Washington, D.C. Until my pastor and his wife, David and Cindy Dykes, were in town years back, I had not seen that. But I was taken aback, and I've got a copy of—this is a duplicate—of the Treaty of Paris, two pages, well, it's the first and last page here. There are 10 articles, so we've got the first and last pages here.

So how would you start a treaty in such a way that it would scare the strongest country in the world from violating their oath? Well, they figured it out, and they put it on the document. The biggest letters anywhere in the treaty are those in the first two lines, and they began "In the Name of the most Holy and undivided Trinity." Starting the Treaty of Paris with "In the Name of the most Holy and undivided Trinity," they knew would be strong enough to scare Great Britain into not violating the oath that they signed on that document.

Then you tie it in with Khalid Sheikh Mohammed's pleading, the very fact that they would sign such a document recognizing the Holy Trinity, according to Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and his interpretation of the Koran, that's justification for killing and terrorizing people that believe in the Holy undivided Trinity.

There's a war going on, and in Libya, apparently we fought for people who want to destroy us. The al Qaeda flag now flies proudly over this federal building in Benghazi, Libya. Congratulations to this administration for making that happen.

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

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS WILL RESTORE FAITH IN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BUERKLE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, tonight I want to speak on the subject jobs, jobs, jobs. Jobs will restore faith in government. Invest, build and grow.

One does not have to be a Christian to understand or believe what the Bible says about three critical things that are important to living our lives: faith, hope, and love. Today I want to connect the idea of faith to faith in government. Hebrews 11.1 says, "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

What are some of those things that are hoped for and not seen? When we drive a car, we have faith that when our light turns green and we go, the person driving the car in the other direction will obey the light when it turns red and stop. When we stop for a red light, we have faith that the car behind us will also stop and not ram us in the rear. We have faith that the pedes-

trians will obey the yield sign and not run out in front of our moving car. We have faith that if a driver turns on the right hand turn signal, they will not suddenly turn left in front of us. We have faith that other drivers will not recklessly endanger our lives by driving drunk. So whether driving to work or to play, it is faith that allows us to drive. And if another person runs a stop light, doesn't brake behind us, doesn't obey the yield sign, suddenly turns in front of us or drives drunk, they have broken the faith. In other words, when you're driving, the only thing that stands between you and death is faith.

If you fly on airplanes, you have faith. You have faith in a pilot that you've never met—that they're well trained, that they know how to take off and land, can handle a storm in the air, can handle an emergency, are physically fit, psychologically stable, and not drunk or on drugs. You have faith in the flight attendants that they've been trained to handle unruly passengers or an emergency situation. You have faith that the maintenance people have properly serviced the plane before it takes off. You have faith that the TSA employees have done their job and have not made an error that will put your life or the life of passengers in danger. You have a reasonable faith in the regulations of the FAA that the fuel, the engines, the body of the plane, and the runways are safe. A critical error anywhere along this line will damage and destroy your faith in air travel.

Train engineers have faith that drivers and pedestrians will not drive or walk around railroad crossing gates and endanger themselves or the train. Bus passengers have faith that the driver is not intoxicated, on drugs, or experiencing emotional problems that can endanger the public or their riders.

Look, Madam Speaker, how faith operates during medical emergencies. When we're at our weakest and suddenly become ill and need to be rushed to the hospital. We have faith that a well-trained ambulance and emergency medical technician will arrive quickly and provide us with care. We have faith that drivers on the road will pull over when they hear the sirens to allow our ambulance driver to get us quickly and safely to the hospital. We have faith in the doctors, the nurses, and the medical staff that they will provide us with the highest quality of care possible regardless of our perceived ability to pay or whether we have medical insurance.

Without the faith that our judicial system has laws that are rationally and morally sound and faith that our judges will conduct themselves in a respectful and fair way toward prosecutors and defendants, we cannot have a justice system that endures.

Earlier last month, I spent the day with the Johnson-Karlok family outside of Mokena, Illinois, during their family's harvest season. As we were sitting down for lunch, Mr. Johnson led us in a short prayer to thank God for

the successful season's harvest. Through his prayer, I quickly learned how many factors a farmer has to rely on for a good harvest year. When I pray over my family's dinner, it's always "God is good, God is great, thank you for the food that I'm about to receive for the nourishment of my body, for Christ's sake, Amen." And then my family sits down and eats.

But when I heard from Mr. Johnson's prayer, there must have been a dozen unseen factors on his mind that small family farmers depend on for their way of life. He expressed gratitude for the sun, gratitude for the rain, gratitude for the soil, and gratitude for the harvest. He prayed for protection against things that can destroy his crop and support for his equipment. His prayer was a mighty different prayer from the prayer that I normally pray over my food.

But the Johnsons and other small family farmers also believe in the Federal Government. If something bad does happen in a season, the Federal Government is there to provide crop insurance and disaster insurance to get them through tough times. They rely on the Federal Government to provide research that enhances production and yield and genetic engineering of the crop and seed breeding.

□ 1550

They have faith in their government that their government will be there in their time of need.

It doesn't matter whether you're a Christian, a Muslim, a Jew, a Buddhist, a Hindu, agnostic or atheist. It is impossible to live without faith. Our auto industry almost collapsed; so we can only have so much faith in General Motors and Chrysler and Ford. Our financial system did partially collapse; so we can only have so much faith in our banks, lenders, and investors. We can only have limited faith in the private sector because it has \$2 trillion to \$2.5 trillion sitting on the sideline, money that it refuses to invest in jobs and in the American people. And if Congress passed and the States ratified a balanced budget amendment, it would mean that the Federal Government could never meet the American people's needs or correct gaps among our people that need to be corrected, and we would lose faith in our government.

We need to have faith in the Federal Government—which is supposed to be a government of, by, and for the people—but we can only have such faith if it meets our people's current needs. Without such faith and deliverance by our Federal Government, we cannot survive as a Nation.

What is the greatest need of the American people today that a government of, for, and by the people should respond to? Jobs. The problem with this dysfunctional Congress is that it is not keeping the faith with the American people by providing them with their greatest need—jobs.

Every Member of Congress takes the following oath: "I do solemnly swear or

affirm that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic." When we take that oath but leave 25 million people either unemployed or underemployed, internally we are creating potential domestic enemies.

I think I have demonstrated that all of us have faith. Men cannot live by bread alone, and we couldn't live if we didn't have faith. But to have faith in a government means that a government that is actually of, by, and for the people must be responsive to the people's needs. So when Congress or Members of Congress say—through words or deeds or actions or inaction—that the Federal Government can't help, it destroys the American people's faith in their government.

The greatest material need of the American people today is jobs, jobs, jobs. The greatest need of the American economy today is aggregate demand. The most effective and efficient way to meet the need for jobs and aggregate demand—in the spirit of FDR—is for the Federal Government to directly hire workers to do the work that needs to be done. The result of the Federal Government investing, building and growing the economy and creating full employment will be the restoration of faith in government.

For the last 30 years we've been bombarded with Ronald Reagan's conservative negative government rhetoric: "Government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem." That's an interesting phrase. How can a government of, by, and for the people be the problem? Logically, it says either we don't have a government of, by, and for the people, or that people are the problem. So the first thing we must do to counter this negative Reagan propaganda is to have the Federal Government do positive things to restore the American people's faith in government and in themselves.

Among the many things that the addition of the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to the Constitution did during the First Reconstruction after the American Civil War was to help to restore people's faith in the Federal Government's capacity to solve a problem.

In taking over Herbert Hoover's mess of conservative economics—complacency, limited Federal action and inaction—the first thing that Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal did—by the closing of banks to stop the run on currency and gold; Social Security for the aged; regulation of investment by the SEC; agricultural assistance to needy farmers; the Wagner Act that benefited working men and women; the Civilian Conservation Corps, the CCC; and the Works Progress Administration, the WPA, that put people back to work—was to restore faith in the Federal Government.

Lyndon Johnson's Great Society—whose war on poverty worked and reduced poverty, Medicare for the elderly, Medicaid for the poor, Elementary

and Secondary Education Act for students, the 1964 Public Accommodations Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act for African Americans—for most Americans restored faith in the Federal Government.

Today, in order to restore the American people's faith in government, the Federal Government must jump-start the private economy by "priming the pump" and creating jobs. What do we need to do? Madam Speaker, we should move the money: jobs, not cuts; tax the rich; stop the wars; bring home our troops. What does move the money mean? It means we need to create a second economic stimulus, not because the first one failed—it worked, it stopped us from going into the abyss—but because the hole was deeper than we originally thought, we need a second stimulus.

My conservative colleagues in both parties are like the man whose house caught on fire and he tried to put it out with his garden hose and it didn't work. You know what he concluded? He concluded that water does not put out fires. But that was the wrong conclusion. He should have concluded that he needed more water and a bigger hose.

President Obama's original stimulus has given us 20 months of private jobs growth, but we need more to get us back on track. We need the President's American Jobs Act; we need JAN SCHAKOWSKY's Emergency Jobs to Restore the American Dream Act; and we need the plan that I'm putting together, the Invest, Build, Grow and Full Employment Act.

In March of 2009, Congress passed the first economic stimulus, which included \$757 billion intended to save or create 2 million to 2.5 million jobs over 2 years. It succeeded, but it wasn't enough.

In December 2010, Congress passed an \$858 billion bill extending the Bush-era tax cuts, which is expected to create 3 million jobs over the next 2 years. It may, but it's not enough. That's \$1.6 trillion over 4 years that we've invested in create 5 million to 5.5 million jobs and will probably succeed, but it's not enough. We need a plan that fits the size of the problem. We need something more and something more efficient and effective to put 15 million Americans back to work.

Tax cuts are the worst and most inefficient way to create jobs. By congressional standards, \$900 billion is not a lot of money, especially when it's used to jump-start the \$15 trillion gross domestic product that is the American economy. If we can afford \$712 billion to fight a war abroad in Iraq, we can afford \$900 billion to put Americans back to work right here at home. We can move the money from those who can afford to give more to those who need it, and not hurt anyone. That's how we keep the faith.

We need to do what FDR did during the Great Depression—have the Federal Government directly hire workers. "In times of economic crisis, government has a crucial important role to

play. People matter and results count. And we don't need to go too far back in our history to find examples," said Michael Hilzik, the Pulitzer prize-winning author and L.A. Times reporter who explored this issue in his latest book, "The New Deal: A Modern History."

For those of my conservative colleagues in both parties who say the government can't and doesn't create jobs, he writes: "The WPA produced 1,000 miles of new and rebuilt airport runways, 651,000 miles of highway, 124,000 bridges, 8,000 parks, 18,000 playgrounds and athletic fields, some 84,000 miles of drainage pipes, 69,000 highway light standards, and 125,000 public buildings built, rebuilt or expanded. Among the latter were 41,300 schools. The transformative power of this effort is inestimable."

FDR, using the Federal Government, directly created jobs because it took jobs to do all of that. FDR invested in and built up an entire region with the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Public Works Administration built the Grand Coulee Dam in the State of Washington and put 8,000 men to work, starting in 1933, using materials from 46 States.

□ 1600

In southern California, the PWA helped repair or replace 536 school buildings damaged or destroyed by the great Long Beach earthquake March 10, 1933.

In Florida, the PWA built the Overseas Highway, 127 miles of causeways and bridges connecting the mainland and Key West, and transformed the island into one of America's premiere tourist attractions.

In New York City, the PWA built the Triborough Bridge that connected three of the City's five boroughs, and it funded the building of LaGuardia Airport.

Hoover Dam, once known as Boulder Dam, is located in the Black Canyon of Colorado River on the border between Arizona and Nevada. It was constructed between 1931 and 1936 during the Great Depression, and in July 1934, it employed over 5,000 workers building the dam.

And in my home city of Chicago, the Lake Shore Drive Bridge was started in 1929, but the Great Depression prevented its completion until the WPA delivered funds in the mid-1930s. When completed in 1937, the bridge was 356 feet long and 100 feet wide, making it the world's longest and widest bascule bridge, a movable or draw bridge, a type of bridge that was developed and perfected in Chicago and used for many of its river crossings.

So we already have an economic model. The CCC, the WPA, the PWA, and FDR's New Deal. If we just had, Madam Speaker, the political will. The first phase of an overall 6-year \$2.2 trillion proposal, we can take \$600 billion, jump-start this economy by hiring 15 million workers at an average annual salary of \$40,000. Some will make

\$20,000, some \$60,000, depending on the job, to invest in America.

This project will rebuild our infrastructure, put Americans back to work, and create aggregate demand, the greatest need of this economy. And the aggregate demand will bring the \$2 trillion to \$2.5 trillion in private money sitting on the sidelines back into the game. The investment of private money will create even more jobs, and all of these workers will be paying taxes.

The number of Americans dependent on the Federal Government for unemployment compensation and food stamps will be reduced, which will help lower the deficit and debt faster than any current proposal.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has proposed a similar 5-year, \$2.2 trillion plan to build and rebuild America's infrastructure for the future.

In 2011, according to the National Association of State Budget Officers, States have a combined debt of almost \$200 billion. The Federal Government should bail them out and give Democratic and Republican governors and State legislatures a clean economic slate.

Our cities and counties are in debt. Set aside another \$100 billion to bail out most, if not all of them, and give Democratic and Republican county presidents and commissioners, mayors, and city councils a clean economic slate: \$700 million in Chicago; \$48 million in the District of Columbia, for example.

So for a mere \$900 billion, which is slightly more than each of the last two stimulus packages, we can bail out all States, most, if not all of the counties and cities, and put 15 million Americans back to work. The only thing that we lack in this Congress is the political will.

So I, again, say we need to restore people's faith. Move the money. Jobs, not cuts. Tax the rich. Stop the wars. And bring our troops home.

Robert Reich, in his latest book, "Aftershock," argues that the central challenge at the heart of America's ongoing economic predicament is, and I quote, "not to rebalance the global economy so that Americans save more and borrow less from the rest of the world, it is to rebalance the American economy so that its benefits are shared more widely within America." In other words, America's jobs and aggregate demand problems cannot be solved with the current maldistribution of income and wealth which is at the heart of our economic problems.

What am I talking about?

According to the most recent non-partisan CBO report, and again, I quote directly, "The top 1 percent of earners more than doubled their share of the Nation's income over the last three decades. In addition, government policy has become less redistributive since the late 1970s, doing less to reduce the concentration of income. The equal-

izing effect of Federal taxes was smaller in 2007 than in 1979, as the composition of Federal revenues shifted away from progressive income taxes to less-progressive payroll taxes.

"Also, Federal benefit payments are doing less to even out the distribution of income as a growing share of benefits, like Social Security, goes to the older Americans and regardless of their income.

"From 1979 to 2007, the average inflation-adjusted after-tax income grew by 275 percent for the 1 percent of the population with the highest income. For others in the top 20 percent of the population, average real estate tax household income grew by 65 percent.

"By contrast, for the poorest fifth of the population, average real after-tax household income rose only 18 percent. And for the three-fifths of the people in the middle of the income scale, the growth in such household income was just under 40 percent."

In other words, the "class warfare" that Republicans have been reacting to and complaining about is exactly the opposite of what they say it is. It hasn't been class warfare by the poor and the middle class against the rich. The middle class and the poor are not jealous of the rich, and they're especially not jealous of those who are part of the "greedy rich."

The middle class and the poor have not been attacking the real job creators. Yes, they're opposed to giving more tax breaks, as Republicans want to do to the so-called job creators who already have \$2 trillion to \$2.5 trillion sitting idle on the sideline and who've not used that money to create jobs.

But make no mistake about it. There is class warfare going on. The non-partisan CBO just documented that it's been class warfare by the rich against the middle class and the poor. That's what's really happening.

We live, Madam Speaker, in a representative democracy. Democracy is a government of, by, and for the people. A government of, by, and for the people will be responsive and meet the material needs of its people and its people's economy.

We don't really have an economic problem, at least one that we can't solve. Again, we have a political problem with my conservative colleagues in both parties in this Congress.

We have a problem of the American people not demanding that their Federal Government meet their need for jobs and the resulting economic aggregate demand.

The people of Occupy Wall Street, Occupy LaSalle Street, Occupy Oakland, and the other 99 percent movements that are springing up and becoming active around this country and around the world are beginning to demand that democratic governments everywhere address the existing economic inequality and be responsive to their need for meaningful jobs at meaningful wages.

In 2010, the Tea Party movement became politically active and moved Congress in a more conservative direction.

If the “Occupy” movements are to bring about real change, they must become politically active in 2012 and beyond. They need to move Congress in a more progressive direction, a direction that fits their needs.

Just like the ultra-conservative Tea Party movement pressured moderate Republicans to stiffen their backs on conservative things Republicans say they believe in, so too the Occupy movements must pressure Democrats to stiffen their backs on the liberal things that Democrats say they believe in.

Madam Speaker, we already know that my conservative colleagues in both parties believe in States’ rights and deregulation, which will allow the private economy and market forces to wreak havoc on the economy and most Americans like it did in the first decade of the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, we already know conservatives in both parties believe in trickle down economics that never trickle down but always flood up.

Madam Speaker, we already know the consequences to the economy, workers, and society of laissez faire policies, bank crises that threaten and bring about even great depressions, failed corporations, disastrous home foreclosure crises, high unemployment, and corrupt politics.

Madam Speaker, we already know what conservatives on both sides of the aisle bring us. But will progressive Democrats advocate for bringing the American people anything better?

□ 1610

So I want to challenge myself and my progressive Democratic colleagues to do more. We say we care about the poor. Well, let’s give the poor some bootstraps so they can lift themselves up. We say we care about the working class. Well, let’s advocate for a solution that fits the size of the problem and create enough jobs to employ the American people who are unemployed and put all Americans to work—not by 2017, not by 2018, but by the end of the month.

Try missing a bill for 4 or 5 or 6 years. Only Washington could conclude that an unemployed or underemployed person has until 2018 to worry about bringing down unemployment numbers.

We say we want more home ownership. Well, let’s propose meaningful solutions to address the housing foreclosure crisis. We say we’re for the middle class. Let’s advocate for policies that will restore the middle class’s previous standard of living. We say we support students. Well, let’s help them reduce their college debts. We say we support small businesses. Let’s advocate for policies that will help small businesses grow and enable them to hire more workers.

We need to stand with family farmers like the Johnsons in my new congressional district and against agribusiness when they threaten to drive the Johnsons out of business.

So I say, Madam Speaker, in conclusion, let’s put America back to work. Enough of the games. Invest in America. Rebuild America. Grow the American economy, end the housing foreclosure crisis and restore the American Dream. Enable college students to go back to school. Retrain our workers. Save our children. Save our family farms. Rebuild our bridges, our ports, our sewers, and our water systems. Build high-speed rail, public transportation, ports, levees, and new airports. Invest in alternative energy sources—wind, solar, biomass, and geothermal.

We can do better. Register and vote for politicians who will better represent the real economic interests of the American people. We can act. We can change things. We can restore faith in government and the private sector for the American people.

We must invest, build, and grow to accomplish full employment.

We must do better, Madam Speaker. We must put the American people to work. And most importantly, we must honor our highest obligation as Members of this institution, and that is to restore the American people’s faith in the capacity of their government to bring about change positively in their lives.

I thank the Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 11:30 a.m. on account of personal reasons.

Mr. HEINRICH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2012 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2012 THROUGH FY 2021

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2012 and for the 10-year period fiscal year 2012 through fiscal year 2021. This status report is current through October 4, 2012.

The term ‘current level’ refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President’s signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the overall limits set in H. Con. Res. 34, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution’s aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays

for years after fiscal year 2012 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for action completed by each authorizing committee with the “section 302(a)” allocations made under H. Con. Res. 34 for fiscal year 2012 and fiscal years 2012 through 2021. “Action” refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2012 with the “section 302(b)” suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for fiscal year 2013 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 402 of H. Con. Res. 34. This list is needed to enforce section 402 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 34

[Reflecting action completed as of October 4, 2011—(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)]

	Fiscal year	
	2012 ¹	2012–2021
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	2,858,545	(1)
Outlays	2,947,916	(1)
Revenues	1,891,411	30,296,017
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	2,966,294	(1)
Outlays	3,025,428	(1)
Revenues	1,890,917	30,279,647
Current Level over (+) / under (-) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	+107,749	(1)
Outlays	+77,512	(1)
Revenues	-494	-16,370

¹ = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

Notes for 2012: The appropriate level for FY2012 was established in H. Con. Res 34, which was subsequently deemed to be in force in the House of Representatives pursuant to H. Res. 287. The current level for FY2012 starts with the baseline estimates contained in An Analysis of the President’s Budgetary Proposals for Fiscal Year 2012, published by the Congressional Budget Office, and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Budget authority for FY2012 are above the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 34.