

outsource jobs overseas, the lack of any investment in infrastructure or education, or research and development, when you listen to the stories that I've talked about from people from my district, from the very same county that Chairman RYAN and I share, who talk about devastating impacts of these cuts, we have a budget that is misplaced and will affect real people in the middle class.

I would just like to talk about one final part of the budget that really makes it really hard to, on top of all these cuts, think that a lot of serious thought went into it, and that's the fact that the Republican version of the budget repeals the Affordable Care Act, all of the benefits to the public, the millions of people who will gain access to health care, but it still takes the revenues brought in by the program. And we were told that when we asked questions in committee.

So, on one hand, to take away the program and say you're going to get rid of it, and on the other hand, to still take the revenues that are brought in by the program makes the budget not a very credible budget. And as I've said in committee, and I'll say again, if you're going to take those sort of false assumptions and put a budget together, you might as well say that we're going to hire leprechauns to take the pots of gold at the end of rainbows and count that as revenue, because it's about as realistic.

In the end, the Progressive Caucus is very proud of our Back to Work Budget. We are going to invest in infrastructure, we're going to invest in public workers, we're going to make sure that we're getting our fair share of resources that we need so that government can function to take care of the middle class and the people who need it the most. It will create 7 million American jobs, reduce unemployment to 5 percent, and yet still reduce our deficit by \$4.4 trillion.

□ 1840

It will strengthen Medicare and Medicaid and provide high-quality, low-cost medical coverage to millions of Americans. That's what the people of the country voted for in November. That's the budget we should be putting forward in this country, and that's the budget the Progressive Caucus puts out today.

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

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE ADVENT CHRISTIAN VILLAGE AT DOWLING PARK, FLORIDA

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a wonderful and unique community in my district, the Advent Christian Village at Dowling Park, Florida, which is now in its 100th year.

Scripture advises us that, to whom much has been given, much is returned. Thomas Dowling of Suwannee County, Florida, had this in mind a century ago when he set out to turn his thriving lumber business into a vision for the community. Mr. Dowling set aside some of his property that he was developing around Live Oak for the Advent Christian Church to use for ministry. Before long, a family of five orphaned siblings had come to live at Dowling Park. The Setzer children became the first residents of Advent Christian Church's Home and Orphanage, which also opened its doors to the elderly.

Today, Advent Christian Village is a leading-edge retirement community of more than 800 dynamic, welcoming members of America's Greatest Generation. While children no longer live at Advent Christian Village, they are an integral part of the ministry carried out by today's residents who, a century later, still take Thomas Dowling's vision to heart.

The story of the Advent Christian Village is one of Americans coming together, expressing generosity and kindness to one another and helping those in need. Dowling Park is one of the brightest spots in Suwannee County and the Third District, and I congratulate them on 100 years of ministry.

FORT REPORT: SEQUESTRATION, THE WASHINGTON WORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak today about the sequestration and fiscal affairs facing our country.

Earlier this month, I was back home in Lincoln, and I went to one of the local diners and saw my friend Norm, and Norm asked me a question. He said: JEFF, what are they doing about that word they keep using in Washington?

Well, Norm was referring to "sequestration," which took effect March 1. "Sequestration" is that inside-the-Beltway term for automatic spending reductions to the Federal budget. These reductions will be \$85 billion in the first year, with roughly half applied to military programs and half applied basically to everything else the government does, with the exception of retirement, health care, and other income support programs.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might help everyone if we had a little bit of history to clarify how we got to this moment.

A year-and-a-half ago, there were negotiations in Washington over what we call the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling must be lifted by us in Congress if the Federal Government cannot pay its bills and we must borrow more. We give that authority to the administra-

tion. The negotiation ended with three outcomes:

First, Congress would cut spending by an amount greater than the rise in the debt ceiling;

Second, a supercommittee would be formed to negotiate the right type of tax reform and the right type of spending reductions;

Third, automatic spending cuts, now known as the sequester, would take place—this was proposed by the President and agreed upon by us in Congress—if this supercommittee failed.

These automatic cuts to the budget, the sequestration, were supposed to be so distasteful to everyone that it was going to motivate us all to find creative and reasonable solutions to fix the budget crisis. But the supercommittee failed; now the sequester has kicked in.

Mr. Speaker, 70 percent of Americans want this deficit reduced. I imagine those numbers are probably higher in Nebraska, where I live, where fiscal responsibility is a core characteristic of family life, business ethics, as well as good governance. People know economically, mathematically, or intuitively that you can't spend more than you have. Citizens also want to see their government act in a reasonable fashion.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget deficit has been running more than \$1 trillion in the last few years, and our cumulative debt will top \$17 trillion this year, the size of our overall economic output in the country. The overspending and debt are serious impediments to economic recovery, and they also create national security problems.

Some in Washington want to halt any spending reductions at all. I don't believe this is an option. Washington must begin living in the real world. Something must be done. Two principles should be at work here: there must be reasonable budgetary reductions, while at the same time there must be deliberate delivery of smart and effective government services. While the sequester serves as a trigger for the first principle, it does not balance it with the second. Automatic cuts do not allow for discretion in determining which programs should stay or expand and which should be revised or eliminated due to ineffectiveness.

The sequestration also hits our military in a disproportionate manner and disrupts procurement and planning decisions that cannot operate on a short-term budgetary horizon. Mr. Speaker, we should keep the spirit of the sequestration—and preserve the fullness of these reductions—but continue to revise its implementation with the flexibility to make more precise cutbacks. The House recently passed a funding bill for the remainder of the fiscal year which gives the military this needed flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, as well, the Appropriations Committee recently held a hearing with the head of the Government Accountability Office, known as the