United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2013 *No. 41*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY HULTGREN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

REFORM OUR HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for continued reforms to our health care system. The Affordable Care Act was a huge step in the right direction, but we can do more because the path we are on is unsustainable.

The U.S. spends approximately 18 percent of its GDP on health—close to twice as much as other developed Nations—and yet we don't have better health care outcomes. Health care costs are rising faster than inflation and wages, meaning they are eating a larger portion of Americans' paychecks and the government's budget.

If we continue on our current path, the Medicare trust fund will be insolvent by 2024. And Medicare and Medicaid will grow from 24 percent of the Federal budget to almost 30 percent, crowding out other needed investments.

We have to reduce health care costs in both the private sector and the public sector in order to ensure America remains competitive in the global market. But there is a right way to reform our health care system and there is a wrong way. With all due respect, Mr. RYAN's plan is the wrong way.

Mr. RYAN's plan for Medicare and Medicaid misses the point. His solution simply shifts the costs from the government to patients, rather than reducing health care costs. Under the Ryan budget, seniors would pay as much as $1,200 more each year by 2030, and $6,000 more by 2050. For over half of Medicare beneficiaries with incomes less than $21,000, a $1,200 increase is a huge piece of their budget.

He also proposes block-granting Medicaid, which would cut Medicaid funding by approximately $700 billion over the next decade and result in 14 to 19 million people being kicked off Medicaid, many of them children and seniors.

These steps might make the budget look better, but they do nothing to actually reduce the cost of health care, and they hurt patients. We can reduce health care costs without harming beneficiaries.

Here are five steps we should take to reduce health care costs the right way:

First, and most importantly, we have to change the way we pay providers. Right now, we pay for each individual test and surgery. We pay for quantity rather than quality of care. Providers across the country are adopting payment for quality models, but they need Medicare, the largest payer, to get on board and pay for quality as well.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid, or CMS, just completed a pilot where it bundled payments for 37 procedures and reduced spending by 10 percent. This needs to be replicated across the board, and CMS needs to move the majority of its patients to physicians off fee-for-service over the next 10 years.

Second, CMS needs to restructure and expand competitive bidding. It just completed a competitive bidding pilot for durable medical equipment and was able to reduce prices by double digits. While I have some concerns about the structure of that competitive bidding program, I believe it does need to be restructured to prevent suicide bidding and expanded to include more medical tests and services such as lab tests, CT scanners, and other items.

Third, States need to be empowered and incentivized to reduce their health care costs. States like Arkansas have taken bold steps to reduce their health care costs by requiring their two largest insurers and their Medicaid program to join a shared savings plan. They are expected to save the State's Medicaid program $4.4 million in FY '13 and $9.3 million in FY '14. We should be encouraging other States to follow the path of Arkansas and reduce Medicaid costs and improve care.

Fourth, we have to modernize Medicare cost sharing and ask a bit more from those who can afford it. We should combine Medicare part A and B deductibles and cap them. We should increase means testing for premiums for part B. And we should limit first-dollar coverage for high earners. We have to protect our sickest seniors from high costs while asking a bit more from those with greater means.

Finally, we have to improve price and quality transparency. We should prohibit gag clauses, which currently

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

prevent hospitals from sharing health care pricing information. Without pricing transparency, hospitals can't negotiate for the best price for medical devices and physicians can't make cost-conscious choices for their patients.

We do have to reduce health care costs, but there is a right way to do it and there is a wrong way. Mr. RYAN's plan is the wrong path. It harms seniors and fails to reduce underlying health care costs. By pursuing the five proposals I just outlined, we can reduce costs and improve quality, strengthening both our budget and our citizens.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN SERVICEMEMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 10-year anniversary of the start of combat operations in Iraq. Most of discussion in this town focuses on politicians, pundits, and writers. And while I don't begrudge people the ability to indulge in those types of debates, I do think what has been missing is a tribute to the sacrifices that have been made by American servicemembers.

Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War wrote:

> This extraordinary war in which we are engaged falls heavily upon all classes of people, but most heavily upon the soldier. For it has been said, all that a man hath will he give for his life; and while all contribute of their substance the soldier puts his life at stake, and often yields it up in his country's cause. The highest merit then is due to the soldier.

The Iraq conflict is much different than the Civil War. One of the ways it is different is that the burdens fell perhaps even more directly on our American servicemen and -women. After all, we did not have, and do not have, a military draft.

Most of the folks who were going over there volunteered, and a lot of them knowing that they would be sent to places like Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of our servicemembers did multiple combat tours, not just for 4 months or 6 months, but 12 months and 15 months, in very hazardous duties.

And what did they volunteer for? This was not a piece of cake. These were very difficult fights against an enemy that by and large dared not show its face. The enemy preferred to blend into civilian society and wreak havoc with improvised explosive devices and suicide vests. This was a daily reality for our men and women who were on the ground during this period.

When direct combat operations did occur between U.S. forces and the enemy, they were often fierce fights in urban centers in the streets of cities like Ramadi and Baghdad.

And, of course, being on multiple deployments and being gone for so long provided the opportunity for a lot of stress on families. It is difficult to be in a situation where you are missing a holiday. Some of our troops had to miss multiple holidays over multiple years. That is a sacrifice both for the folks who have to be back home but also for the troops who are on the front lines.

So Lincoln said: ''The highest merit is due to the soldier.'' Indeed.

As we look back on the 10th anniversary of Iraq, what we see are soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who were given the most difficult of tasks and yet they discharged their duties with courage and skill. Henceforth, nobody will be able to recount the great feats of some of our services, such as the Marine Corps, from the shores of Tripoli to Belleau Wood to Guadalcanal, without also mentioning the great feats performed by brave marines in places like Fallujah.

□ 1010

When recounting the unparalleled skill of our Special Operations Forces, credit will have to be given to those Navy SEALs who ruled the night during Iraq's most perilous moments.

So, for braving the storms of war with honor, tenacity and distinction, we thank you, the American servicemember, for the sacrifices you made on behalf of our country; and for those who gave the last full measure of devotion, you have earned a place in the pantheon of America's greatest heroes. We thank you for your service and your sacrifice.

THE CREATION OF A COMMISSION ON HEALING THE PHYSICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WOUNDS OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, after a painful decade of war, the United States needs to take the time to regain its equilibrium and find peace. Without a formal process for acknowledging the physical and psychological costs of war, our collective trauma can undermine our country for decades.

As Ernest Hemingway wrote:

> The killing is necessary, I know, but still the doing of it is very bad for a man, and I think that, after all this is over and we have won the war, there must be a penance of some kind for the cleansing of us all.

War involves staggering amounts of loss and—equally important—of killing. Despite great efforts by our soldiers to protect civilians, an overwhelming majority of casualties in modern war are innocent people. This incurs a deep spiritual and emotional cost to those who witness it and are sometimes responsible for it. Many initiatives exist that provide help for the men and women who have fought, but we must go beyond the policy initiatives. Soldiers returning from war need to share their experiences and unburden their souls.

Our soldiers volunteered to serve their country in war, but they did not volunteer to take over the entire moral burden that comes with it. Our Nation needs to discuss the complicated spiritual and emotional obstacles faced by any society that has waged war. This is not a partisan debate about the rightness or wrongness of war. This is a national effort to take care of our soldiers by publicly sharing some of their burdens. We must be willing to explore the responsibility that comes with asking them to fight.

In preindustrial societies, leaders were intimately involved in war, itself—often with a sword in hand—and religious and spiritual leaders were fully engaged in the aftermath. Rituals and ceremonies decommissioned the fighters and made the entire community conscious of the sacrifice. These processes are missing today, and they remain vitally important. The agony suffered by our veterans is vivid testimony: 22 veterans commit suicide every day while an average of almost one active duty soldier a day took his or her life in 2012. That's higher than in combat. Many other soldiers suffer from posttraumatic stress disorder, become addicted to drugs and alcohol, or fall into violence and prison.

If a society fails to address these emotional and moral issues publicly, soldiers and vets will struggle with them privately. Many of them will lose that struggle and leave us all affected by their loss.

The Nation requires concrete ways to address the wounds of the war. We need a national day of solemn ceremonies that acknowledge the costs in lives, trauma, lost limbs, families, a renewed commitment to the social and health issues of veterans, a discussion about national service for young, nonmilitary Americans, and a systematic interaction between combat veterans and civilians.

I worked with Karl Marlantes, who wrote the book ''What It Is Like to Go to War,'' and with Sebastian Junger, who did the documentary called ''Restrepo,'' which was about Afghanistan, in order to create this bill that would address these issues. We propose a commission to examine and articulate the spiritual challenges and to help heal the psychological wounds faced by a Nation emerging from a decade of war.

We call on the President, on the Senate majority and minority leaders, and on the House Speaker and minority leader to appoint a group of distinguished citizens to explore ways to heal this society. The committee should include veterans, spiritual leaders, psychologists, journalists, maybe even a poet. It should strive to reach beyond the politics of war and into the true moral and emotional consequences that violence always incurs. It may be hard for us, but we must do it if we are to remain a humane society.

Some see things as they are and ask why. I dream of things as they never were. The question we must ask now is: Why can't we do for our soldiers what needs to be done? They need to be taken home and received and understood by the populace for what they went and did for us.

THE RYAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the House budget plan that is on the floor today. I thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership on this positive blueprint for our future.

Much has been said about a balanced budget over the past couple of weeks; and while it is important to point out that the House budget balances in 10 years while the Senate's budget never balances, I believe the more important point is why we believe our budget must balance.

A balanced budget is critically important to all Americans and to the future of our great country.

We must balance our budget for our senior citizens, who deserve to have security in their retirements. A balanced budget will strengthen critical retirement programs so our seniors are assured that Medicare and Social Security will continue to be there for them and for their children.

We must balance our budget for our hardworking mothers and fathers across our country. A balanced budget is fundamental to a healthy and robust economy that creates good jobs that the American people need to support their families.

We must balance our budget for our students. Those who are currently in our universities and in our community colleges should feel confident that an investment in their education will lead them to good-paying jobs when they graduate. A balanced budget gives them that confidence that their futures will not be threatened by staggering debt.

Most importantly, we must balance our budget for our children and our grandchildren, who deserve the same chance at the American Dream that we have been given. Rather than handing them the bill for this generation's irresponsibility, a balanced budget will allow us to hand them a brighter future, an American future.

Our balanced budget represents a departure from the status quo here in Washington, and it represents the House Republicans' commitment to moving our Nation forward in a fiscally responsible way. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

AMERICA AND GREECE—STRENGTH IN SOLIDARITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 192nd anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

Greece and America are history's most storied democracies. Our Founding Fathers borrowed heavily from Greek antiquity to build American democracy. Our relationship with Greece, however, is more than one just of philosophical kinship. America, Greece, and Greek Americans have stood in solidarity since the founding of the United States.

In this year, when we also celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington, and the 100th anniversary of both Harriet Tubman's death and Rosa Parks' birth, it is especially fitting to recall how Hellenes and African Americans have reached out to one another to provide mutual support.

When Hellenes acted to liberate themselves in 1821, James Williams, an African American sailor from my hometown of Baltimore, joined the Greek revolutionary navy and fought at the Battle of Navarino. In turn, John Zachos and Photius Fisk, orphans of the Greek War of Independence, became passionate abolitionists in America. Zachos was a member of the Educational Commission of Boston and New York. Fisk, a U.S. Navy chaplain, helped slaves find freedom by supporting the Underground Railroad.

In 1922, recently arrived Greek immigrants organized the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association in Georgia to defend themselves against the Ku Klux Klan. AHEPA went on to help countless Greek immigrants assimilate into American society, and it weighed in on many of the most significant social issues of our time, including the movement for civil rights. Archbishop Iakovos, leader of the Greek Orthodox Church in America, carried that commitment forward when he marched alongside Martin Luther King, Jr., in Selma, Alabama, in 1965. An iconic photograph of those two great leaders appeared on the cover of Life Magazine.

The historical relationship of these two proud communities embodies the greatness of America. On March 25, when we celebrate Greek Independence Day, we salute all those who have struggled for freedom, and we rededicate ourselves to ensuring that America remains a symbol of fairness and opportunity the world over.

□ 1020

I rise today also to mourn the passing of the legendary Greek American, Andrew A. Athens of Chicago.

Andy lived a life that few could match. He enlisted in the U.S. Army in January of 1942 and fought at the famous Battle of El Alamein in Egypt. He attained the rank of captain, and in 1945 was honored with the Bronze Star and the U.S. Army Commendation Medal for his outstanding military service. Andy went on to become a successful businessman and walked with kings and commoners, spreading the high ideals and values of Hellenism.

Andy was at the forefront of organizing Greek Americans in their pursuit of justice for Cyprus and freedom for the Ecumenical Patriarchate. And in so many of what for him became routine endeavors, he embodied Hellenism in the public service by giving back to the broader American society. Whether it was AHEPA, the Order of St. Andrew, or organizations he founded such as the United Hellenic American Congress and Hellenicare, the scope of Andy's commitment to a myriad of important causes was breathtaking. He combined a gentleness of spirit with a fierce determination to make a difference. Andy's heart was always full as he gave graciously of his time and resources to make this world a better place.

Above all, Andy Athens had a deep commitment to family. His beloved wife of 67 years, Louise, and Andy's entire family are in our thoughts. May his memory be ever eternal.

A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House Republican budget, a balanced budget. Let me be very, very clear about this. A balanced budget means jobs. Again, a balanced budget means jobs.

Think about this for a second. Your family at home, you balance your budget; why can't Washington? Businesses balance their budget; why can't Washington? And House Republicans today, all we're asking is to balance the budget in 10 years. Think about this. If you have a 10-year-old, by the time we balance the budget, your 10-year-old will basically be almost done with college.

So in a bipartisan fashion, I would say look at the 1990s. Let's look at President Bill Clinton who balanced the budget with a Republican-controlled House, opportunity and jobs ran rampant. We need to return to that today. So we're asking this President, Please, work with us, Mr. President. But what is worse in all of this is how Senate Democrats have failed to serve you. The last time that they even passed a budget was before the iPad existed—before the iPad existed.

We're willing to compromise; we're willing to work with people. But how can we work with Senate Democrats when they're not working at all? They're not doing their job at all to serve you, the American people. Their budget right now that they're working on does nothing more than raise taxes. They want more of your money, more money out of your paycheck. Ask yourself, does Washington really need more of your money?

We're $16 trillion in debt. We have deficits that we can't even wrap our arms around, and they want more of your money. If you had a financial adviser that put you a million dollars in debt and then ripped through your savings for your children's college education and all of your checking account and said, ''Yeah, just give me some more money and we'll solve the problem,'' would you do it? Absolutely not.

More than jobs, though, we're also working to save Medicare and Social Security, the commitments that we have made to the American people. So let's take a look here at the big picture. Here's a budget breakdown of where we're at right now. Look, your eyes will glaze over when we start talking about the trillions of dollars that we spend. But let's take a look at what you pay versus what you expect.

This blue part right here is on autopilot. No adults have come to the table to talk about where we're at today and how to actually save your Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid in this big blue part. We're doing that today, House Republicans, in balancing the budget. But this is what you expect from the Federal Government: your education, roads, bridges, a healthy environment, and what's mandated by the Constitution, our Armed Forces to protect us.

But this is where it gets really scary. All of this blue part here for Medicare and Social Security is what we take in. In other words, all of our cash on hand, if you will, the money that you pay the Federal Government every time you get a paycheck or pay your income taxes, this is all devoted to Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security. In other words, everything else—your education, the environment, our roads, bridges, ports, Armed Forces—all of that money to pay for that basically is borrowed. It's borrowed—or worse, just printed.

This is the sad reality that we're facing today. But with Republican House leadership and working with Democrats who are actually willing to come to the table and compromise—and not just work with us, work for you—we can save Social Security and Medicare.

And by the way, when you hear Democrats or you see the videos of them throwing your grandmother off a cliff or telling you that Republicans just want to cut, cut, cut, no; this is about save, save, save. And in the words of a hip-hop band from my generation, Public Enemy: don't believe the hype.

House Republicans are working today for you. We're working to save Social Security and Medicare. We're working to save this economy and, ultimately, this country for you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and commemorate the 192nd anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

Like the American revolutionaries who fought for independence and established this great Republic we call the land of the free and the home of the brave, Greek freedom fighters similarly began an arduous struggle to win independence for Greece and its people 192 years ago on March 25.

The Greeks faced four centuries of Ottoman oppression, a David versus Goliath situation, if you will. Beginning their revolution on March 25 was no coincidence. This was the holy day dedicated to the mother of God, Theotokos; and as such, they had their champion, their savior, and their protector by their side. As Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of revolution over the Monastery of Agia Lavra in the Peloponnese, ''Eleftheria i Thanatos''—Liberty or Death—became their battle cry.

As is true in our own country, the price of freedom was great, with brave men and women fighting for God and country in the hope of a better world for future generations.

Our Greek brothers sacrificed much for their independence, and there are many stories which I could share to demonstrate the heroism they exhibited. Most Greeks will remember that of Athanasios Diakos, legendary hero, priest, patriot, and soldier who led 500 of his men in a notable stand against 8,000 Ottoman Turk soldiers. While Diakos' men were wiped out and he fell to enemy hands which tortured him before his death, he became the image for Greeks to give all for love of faith and homeland. May his memory be eternal, Mr. Speaker.

The revolution brought independence to Greece and emboldened those who still sought freedom across the world. It proved a united people, through sheer will and perseverance, can prevail against tyranny. And it is a sentiment which can still be found among Greeks today.

Greek soldiers served alongside Americans in World War I, World War II, and the Korean War. They've always been our allies, Mr. Speaker, and continue to be today.

This week, the joint naval exercise Noble Dina is expected to conclude. And for the 3rd year, the navies representing the United States, Greece, and Israel have come together to engage in maritime evacuations and search and rescue drills, a symbol of the ongoing and growing friendships between the countries.

□ 1030

The lessons the Greeks taught us in 1821 continue to provide strength to victims of persecution throughout the world today. By honoring the Greek struggle for independence, we reaffirm the values and ideas that make America great.

Each time I perform my constitutional duties, I am doing so in the legacy of our American forefathers and the ancient Greeks. As Thomas Jefferson once said, ''To the ancient Greeks, we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves, American colonists, out of gothic darkness.''

We celebrate Greek Independence Day to reaffirm the common democratic heritage we share. And, as Americans, we must continue to pursue this spirit of freedom and liberty, which characterizes both great nations.

Zito i Ellas. Long live Greece.

TRIBUTE TO THE SERVICE OF CAPTAIN ANDREW S. WHITSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate an exceptional naval officer, Captain Andrew Shepard Whitson, at the completion of 30 years of distinguished naval service, culminating as the Director of the U.S. House of Representatives Liaison Office for the Department of the Navy's Office of Legislative Affairs.

I'm honored to commend Captain Whitson's achievements and recognize his service and devotion to our great country.

A 1983 graduate of the Virginia Military Institute, Captain Whitson earned his wings in 1985 and was designated a naval aviator. He sailed around the world, flying the F–14 Tomcat and F/A–18 Hornets. He's served in five fighter squadrons, participating in multiple combat operations during Desert Storm and Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was also recognized as the ''East Coast Fighter Pilot of the Year'' in 1997.

Captain Whitson served as the executive officer and commanding officer of the Bounty Hunters of Fighter Squadron Two, leading them through two deployments aboard USS *Constellation* (CV–64), including the combat operations in Iraqi Freedom. In 2009 and 2010, he served as the commander of Carrier Air Wing 17.

Captain Whitson is retiring after 30 years of honorable service to this Nation. His professional success would not have been possible without the support of his wife, Tracy—I've had the privilege of getting to know Captain Whitson and his family—and his lovely daughter, Alexandra. Their shared sacrifice is a credit to their personal character.

I wish Captain Whitson continued success and fulfillment as he transitions to civilian life after three decades of exceptional service to our country. His loyal dedication to duty reflects the highest standards of naval service.

I hold him in high personal regard and consider it a privilege to call Captain Whitson my friend. And I'm delighted that he and his family call Virginia's Second Congressional District their home.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my fellow colleagues this morning join me, all

Members of the House, in saluting this outstanding naval officer and wishing him and his wonderful family fair winds and following seas.

HONORING THE ANNIVERSARY OF GREECE'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. As cochair and cofounder of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, I rise today to celebrate the 192nd anniversary of Greece's declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire.

Against incredibly difficult odds, the Greeks defeated one of the most powerful empires in history to win their independence. Following 400 years of Ottoman rule, in March 1821, Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the traditional Greek flag at the monastery of Agia Lavras, inciting his countrymen to rise up against the Ottoman army.

The bishop timed this act of revolution to coincide with the Greek Orthodox holiday celebrating the Archangel Gabriel's announcement that the Virgin Mary was about to give birth with the divine child. Bishop Germanos' message to his people was clear: A new spirit was about to be born in Greece. The following year, the Treaty of Constantinople established full independence for Greece.

New York City is home to one of the largest Hellenic populations outside Greece and Cyprus. Astoria, Queens, which I have the honor of representing, is often called ''Little Athens'' because of the large Hellenic population in that neighborhood.

New Yorkers celebrate Greek Independence Day with a parade on Fifth Avenue in Manhattan, which I have been honored to participate in year after year. Marching side-by-side with my Greek-American friends, I have always been overwhelmed by the warmth and enthusiasm which the community has brought to New York City. These events remind us of the Hellenic-American community's many contributions to our Nation's history and culture.

The friendship between America and Greece is based on mutual respect, a commitment to common goals, and a sharing of fundamental values, especially ensuring stability in southeastern Europe. I hope permanent solutions can be found for ending the divisions of Cyprus and finding a mutually agreeable name for the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia.

I know that the Greek independence movement was an inspiration to the American independence movement, and we have learned so much from our Greek friends.

I have introduced, in many Congresses, an important resolution with my caucus cochair, Representative GUS BILIRAKIS. This resolution urges Turkey to respect the rights and religious freedoms of the ecumenical patriarch. It was my privilege to meet with the patriarch last year, and I know that he is negotiating with the Turkish government for the return to Halki, the Greek Orthodox seminary, of the right and independence to educate their priests and to restore their lands to them.

I want to say that I ask all of my colleagues to join me and Members of Congress in celebrating Greece's independence. It is also my sincere pleasure to pay tribute to New York's Hellenic-American community for its many contributions to our great country.

Zeto e eleftheria. Long live freedom.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN AND JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again today in support of Yucca Mountain in Nye County, Nevada, which, by law, is designated as the site for a permanent geological repository for our Nation's spent nuclear fuel.

Last year, the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future issued a report, but barred even evaluating the merits of Yucca Mountain, despite the fact that it has been approved on a bipartisan basis by Congress and signed into law by the President, and actually reaffirmed by signing the law in 2002. The initial law was passed in 1982, and the law was amended in 1987, which, in a bipartisan manner, passed through both Chambers, signed by different Presidents, established that Yucca Mountain would be the repository for our nuclear spent fuel.

What the Blue Ribbon Commission did say was any host community should expect incentives. That commitment is no different from Nevada when it comes to Yucca Mountain. And good news: the local county, Nye County, Nevada, is consenting and ready to negotiate with the Department of Energy.

In advance of Yucca Mountain even receiving its first delivery, we will work with the State, Nye County, and surrounding communities to provide incentives to benefit the people of Nevada and their communities. We will address infrastructure needs, provide additional ground water monitoring, and build rail spurs, providing benefits outside of the Yucca Mountain project.

As we look to make nuclear processing viable in the future, we can establish research dollars to universities in the State to be leaders in this field, and we will work to develop these and other ideas from State and local leaders to best fit their needs.

This will mean thousands of direct or indirect jobs across the State of Nevada. Before any of these incentives are even discussed, we know from DOE in the past that the project would yield over 2,500 direct jobs on its own for more than 25 years under the current permit. Even after 50 years, as the project winds down, there would still be more than 500 direct jobs.

□ 1040

Construction of a rail spur could require an additional 1,000 workers and 300 permanent jobs for decades to come. All told, with indirect jobs and the project alone, conservative estimates project 7,000 new jobs in Nevada, not even counting those associated with other incentives we in Congress are prepared to work with the State and local communities to pursue.

Mr. Speaker, we need to move forward on finishing the licensing application on Yucca Mountain, as required by law. Let the science speak for itself that says Yucca Mountain meets a million-year safety standard so it can serve as a national asset that develops thousands of badly needed jobs in Nevada's struggling economy.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Monsignor Robert Kurwicki, Cathedral of Saint Joseph, Jefferson City, Missouri, offered the following prayer:

O gracious and merciful God, so great and everlasting, we come before You today with our hearts filled with sincere love and true devotion. Now grant us, in this, the people's House, a spirit of justice and goodwill in order that the important work of this day may be carried out in truth and charity.

We know that, by our own strength, we will falter and fail. Yet we have a hope that You will never leave us or forget us in Your great shepherd's care. We are serious as we recommit ourselves to You and to Your goals. Show us the way to perfection.

Bless these elected Members, their families, staffs, and constituents in a special way this day, in order that they may continue to reach for the highest, noblest, and greatest benefits for this Nation.

And the House says, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BARROW of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING MONSIGNOR ROBERT KURWICKI

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to introduce Monsignor Robert A. Kurwicki as an esteemed guest to deliver the opening prayer of the United States House of Representatives.

Monsignor Kurwicki is the Reverend Monsignor of the Cathedral of Saint Joseph in Jefferson City, Missouri. The monsignor has served the great State of Missouri as the chaplain of the Missouri House of Representatives since 2011, a position in which he is responsible for leading the members of the State house in prayer and helping to improve the strong tradition of faith in our capitol in Missouri.

In addition to his important role in the Missouri House of Representatives, he is also a member of the Priests Senate and Vice-Chancellor of the Diocese of Jefferson City. Monsignor Kurwicki is and has been a tremendous spiritual influence, not only to myself and my family, but also the Third District, as well as the entire State of Missouri.

It is an honor to welcome him here to Congress and thank him for his invaluable service to our community and our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLSON). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will vote on the House Republican budget resolution. This will be the third straight year that the House will pass a budget. The budget is not just a plan for this coming fiscal year, but it's also a plan to balance our budget in this Nation in 10 years.

The national debt is now $16.7 trillion. That works out to about a $147,000 of debt per taxpayer. Our Nation cannot continue to spend and borrow at this rate. The House Republican budget tackles our spending problems head-on, while protecting our military from indiscriminate cuts.

It also outlines a plan to reform our burdensome Tax Code. By getting spending under control and reforming our Tax Code, this budget would help create jobs, and that's exactly what our economy needs right now.

Congress has a responsibility to future generations to get the budget balanced, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this effort.

FALSE CHOICES

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the budget proposals on both sides of the aisle that are before the House this week.

Folks in Washington are good at giving the American people false choices. Today, we're forced to choose between budgets that cut Medicare benefits and budgets that unnecessarily raise taxes.

Folks in my district in Georgia have had enough of these false choices. We need to cut spending on things we don't need and can't afford, balance the budget, and lower taxes on all families; but there are no proposals to do that.

Each time we come to the House floor to deal with a budget, both sides are focused on messaging, not solutions. The people in my district deserve better. It's time for Congress to develop a responsible budget that cuts the deficit, protects Medicare and Social Security, and lowers taxes by fully reforming our outdated Tax Code.

PATH TO PROSPERITY

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will consider the Path to Prosperity budget, reaffirming, once again, that the House Republicans are the only ones in Washington offering serious solutions to government's spending-driven debt crisis.

Americans at home must prepare a balanced budget for themselves and their families. Our plan would bring the same common sense to Washington once the budget is balanced over the next decade.

Our budget is not balanced by raising taxes on hardworking Americans, but by responsibly reducing spending on government waste and reforming mandatory spending to ensure that programs on which Americans rely remain strong for decades to come.

Our budget saves taxpayers $4.6 trillion over the next decade. The Senate Democrat budget, however, calls for $1.5 trillion in new taxes and $7.3 trillion in new debt.

America, Mr. Speaker, deserves better. That's why the House Republicans have proposed the Path to Prosperity to get our economy back on track and create more jobs and opportunities for more Americans.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the ocean levels are rising. The ice cap is melting. Severe storms, more intense and more frequent. Climate change is real, not that you'd know it in this body. We're still having a debate about the reality. This is a fact-free zone in Congress when it comes to climate change. But we can still make progress, even if we debate the science.

We should do things that allow all of us to use less energy. Energy efficiency is good, regardless of what fuel source you use. It creates jobs for the folks who are out of work in the home construction industry, doing retrofits for commercial and residential buildings. It saves families money, and it saves businesses money.

There's an enormous amount of advocacy on both sides of the aisle to do this practical, commonsense step. It will have an incidental benefit, as well, of reducing carbon emissions.

So even as we have an unresolved debate about the science of climate change, let's take practical steps that are good for jobs, good for the economy, and good for saving taxpayers money.

THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE START OF THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 10th anniversary for the war in Iraq that began with the United States-led invasion on March 20, 2003.

In 2005, I resigned from public office in the State of Colorado to return to Active Duty in the United States Marine Corps for assignment in Iraq. I did this, not because I believed that the invasion of Iraq was the right decision for our country, but because I strongly believed that, once the decision had been made to go into Iraq, that we had a responsibility to bring this war to a just conclusion.

I can't say enough about the young men and women of our military whom I met in Iraq when I served there and observed their courage, their determination to succeed under very challenging conditions, and their extraordinary sacrifices.

However, now that I'm a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I will do everything I can to make sure that our country never goes down this path again. Nation-building operations, where we invade, pacify and administer whole countries, is the wrong direction for America and must never be repeated again.

□ 1210

REPEAL THE SEQUESTER

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee will hold a hearing on sequestration's effect on implementing safety regulations at the Federal Aviation Administration. This is an important reminder that critical deadlines for the release of rules regarding pilot qualifications and training are fast approaching.

Just over 4 years ago, dozens of lives were lost as Continental Flight 3407 crashed in my western New York community. Since then, the families and friends of these victims have made countless visits to Washington, D.C., and advocated to ensure that what happened to their loved ones will never be repeated.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot lose focus and allow further delays to the completion of these already long-overdue rules. I urge Congress to repeal the sequester for the safety of our flying public.

THREE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week marks an anniversary that doesn't warrant celebration. Three years ago, President Obama's takeover of health care was signed into law.

This mountain of stacked paper represents the 20,000 pages of new regulations in President Obama's new health care law. Each regulation represents another shackle on America's small businesses—our job creators. But don't take my word for it. Just ask the folks at two of Ohio's home health care employers, Interim Health Care in Bridgeport, who employs 300 hardworking Ohioans, or Comfort Keepers in East Liverpool, who employs another 230. Both companies tell me that President Obama's takeover of health care is causing them to seriously reconsider the ability to expand and hire more employees. In fact, they may not survive.

These are just two companies in eastern Ohio. What about the thousands of small businesses across America?

President Obama's health care law is a government red tape tower that's raising health care costs, limiting access to health care, and it's hurting job creation at a time when we need real economic growth.

VETERAN EXCELLENCE THROUGH EDUCATION ACT

(Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. This week marks the 10th anniversary of the onset of the Iraq war. As our troops return home, many still face a high unemployment rate. The statistic is higher for women veterans.

One remedy to this abysmal unemployment rate is education. However, for many veterans, the opportunity to pursue the necessary education is difficult because of economic constraints, family responsibilities, or lack of information about available Federal resources. Similarly, many college campuses struggle to provide veterans with these resources.

That is why I introduced my first bill this week, called the Veteran Excellence Through Education Act. This bill creates a competitive grant program aimed at helping college campuses that serve underrepresented populations and provides academic and related support services for all enrolled veterans in these schools. My district has many nearby schools with a growing veteran student population that would benefit from this bill, such as Cal Poly Pomona, Cal State San Bernardino, San Bernardino Valley Community College, and UC Riverside.

Education is a future investment. It is our obligation to assist veterans with job training and economic opportunity in return for their service to our country. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Every American family and small business knows that budgets have to be balanced to be sustainable. For years, though, Washington hasn't been balancing its budget. The Senate hasn't even be passing them. House Republicans have had enough of this ''Washington exceptionalism.'' We've introduced a budget for the Federal Government that will balance in just 10 years.

Budgets reveal priorities, and House Republicans have revealed ours. We want to build a stronger, more prosperous future for this generation and the next. We want to protect the promise of Medicare, guarantee accountability for the use of taxpayer dollars, preserve personal freedoms, and pursue commonsense governance. The American people deserve this, and so we've offered a balanced budget that encourages growth and opportunity for all while paving the way for the country to get out of debt.

Will the President follow our lead and submit a budget that balances?

RYAN BUDGET

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, more than 4 months have passed since our country reelected President Obama and embraced his plans to keep moving our country forward. But right now, Republicans are offering a budget proposal that includes many of the same ideas that voters rejected this fall. The Republican budget would end the Medicare guarantee as we know it and repeal the Affordable Care Act that's already providing benefits to so many families in my home State of Rhode Island and across this country.

Rhode Islanders don't want another Republican budget proposal that jeopardizes our economic recovery, gives away billions of dollars in tax subsidies to Big Oil, and protects tax breaks to companies that ship jobs overseas. They want a budget that reflects our values and priorities as a Nation, a budget that honors the promises we made to our seniors, puts our country back to work, invests in rebuilding our national infrastructure, protects our investments in education, and reduces our deficit by making smart cuts in spending and reforming our Tax Code.

The Republican budget fails to meet any of these standards, and I hope my colleagues will join me in opposing it this week.

PRESIDENT OBAMA GOES TO ISRAEL

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce that over 100 colleagues have joined together on both sides of the aisle to send a letter to President Obama commending his trip to Israel and also asking him to use it as an opportunity to continue to put the imprimatur of the administration on a strong U.S.-Israeli relationship. We also urge the President to continue to make sure that all options are on the table as it relates to Iran and their nuclear ambitions and that we should continue to adopt a policy of prevention and not containment.

Similarly, we said that we need to protect Israel's Qualitative Military Edge and Israel's inherent right to defend itself, and also recognize that the Israeli-Palestinian peace process can only be achieved and advanced through direct negotiations without preconditions.

Finally, we said that the President must maintain foreign aid to Israel, as well as funding for Iron Dome and other Israeli-made antimissile defense systems.

In a nutshell, we've urged the President to use this as a time to highlight our relationship with the Nation of Israel because it makes all the sense in the world, and it's a foundation upon which prosperity can happen.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I stood here a few days before the sequester deadline and urged this House to take action. The sequester is a set of random, arbitrary, temporary cuts that put thousands of jobs in jeopardy and harm our national security readiness and our economy. Some have yet to see the immediate effects. But this problem is like a pipeline being shut off 10 miles down the road. We may not notice it right away, but soon it'll start to turn into a trickle.

In central New York, we are seeing the effects at our airports, our schools, our hospitals, and throughout our community:

280 employees are slated to be furloughed at the 174th Attack Wing at Hancock Field, a unit currently in operations in Afghanistan;

The air traffic control tower at Hancock Airport may close for overnight flights;

The Syracuse City Schools could lose more than a million dollars in aid. They have already lost nearly a thousand positions in the last 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to slam our schools and expect to have an educated workforce for the 21st century. We need to address our debt and balance the budget. But we can't do it on the backs of our middle class and seniors, and we shouldn't do it at the expense of thousands of hardworking men and women: our teachers, public health workers, law enforcement officers, prison guards, FDA inspectors, Social Security workers, and civilian Defense Department workers. They're just trying to make a living and keep their jobs.

Just as my constituents have asked me to do, I'm going to keep urging this House to take action. We need to work together to protect our middle class, protect jobs, and get our economy moving again. We cannot continue this policy of random cuts time and again, putting our economy at risk. We have to stop punishing our constituents because Washington doesn't work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Members are reminded to heed the gavel at the expiration of the time for which they are recognized.

□ 1220

GET THE FACTS BEFORE BLAMING RENEWABLE FUEL SECTOR

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of media coverage on RINs. A RIN is a renewable identification number which is given to refiners upon the purchase of renewable fuels. It is then used by refiners every February to establish that they have met their previous year's obligation under the Renewable Fuels Standard.

These recent stories raise a question as to why RINs are being blamed in the increase in gasoline prices. RINs are given away for free by ethanol and other renewable fuel producers to the refiners and only have value in the submission of the reports in February. We are currently in the month of March and soon to be in April. There are questions that need to be asked on why such swift dramatic price shifts are being reported in the market? Are speculators at work?

There is an excess of over 2 billion RINs. Why is that not proving and providing stability? I encourage the media to ask these types of questions, but to simply jump on and blame the renewable fuel sector is incorrect.

RECOGNIZING DR. HOPE MICHELSEN AND ALICE DENG FOR INDUCTION INTO WOMEN'S HALL OF FAME

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize Dr. Hope Michelsen of Livermore and Alice Deng of Pleasanton for their recent induction into the Alameda County Women's Hall of Fame.

The Hall of Fame recognizes outstanding women in our area and their contributions to our community and Nation. Dr. Michelsen is being honored in the category of science, and she is a leader and trailblazer at Sandia National Laboratory in my district. She is a combustion and atmospheric chemist at Sandia National Lab and a lead researcher on several projects related to energy and climate change.

Alice is being inducted to the Hall of Fame in the youth category. A student at Amador Valley High School in Pleasanton, Alice demonstrates leadership well beyond her years. She is the cofounder of an organization that helps young people overcome their fear of public speaking and an active volunteer with the Tri-Valley Eden Township Youth Community Court.

It's fitting that these extraordinary women are being honored in March, which is Women's History Month. I'm very proud to have both Alice and Dr. Michelsen in my district. Their hard work continues to move our district forward.

CONGRATULATING SOUTHWEST AIRLINES AND DALLAS LOVE FIELD AIRPORT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Southwest Airlines and Dallas Love Field Airport as they celebrate the unveiling of the new terminal and long-overdue repeal of the Wright Amendment. This long-awaited milestone goes to show that freedom and free enterprise go hand in hand.

You know, when we first introduced legislation to repeal the Wright Amendment back in 2005, people said it couldn't be done. When government gets out of the way and allows free enterprise to unleash its full potential, businesses expand, create jobs—and in this case soon will offer the people of Dallas and visitors a world-class airport. Passengers pay lower fares and fly nonstop to more destinations across the country. Clearly, when you've got freedom on your side, you're bound to win.

Thank you for your commitment to our community, and congratulations Southwest Airlines and Dallas Love Field.

God bless you, and God bless America.

RYAN BUDGET

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Yesterday, I discussed the American Society of Civil Engineers' scorecard. Our infrastructure is failing—it got a D-plus—costing us lost productivity and wasted fuel. Now, we need to deal with that problem, but there is an even bigger problem looming, which is the already inadequate levels of investment in our infrastructure are about to end.

The Ryan budget takes us from a $40 billion investment in our crumbling roads, bridges, and highways to $100 million—$40 billion, $100 million. Transit: $10 billion to zero. That's right. The Ryan budget cuts our investment—that's already inadequate—in infrastructure from $50 billion a year to $100 million. That's about 1 million jobs lost in addition to the accelerated deterioration of the system.

That can't be a serious proposal. This isn't a serious budget. It's balanced on phony premises. Anybody believe we're going to go to zero spending and abandon Federal investment in our roads, bridges, highways, and transit systems? And if they believe that, that's even crazier than the numbers in this budget.

The Democratic budget continues those investments and makes certain we will invest in the future of America.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET A BLUEPRINT FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, currently we are experiencing one of the worst economic recoveries in the history of our Nation. It's a stagnant economy, and this should not be the new normal. Our budget is a blueprint for economic growth and job creation.

I can't stress the differences between our budget and the Senate Democrat budget. Their budget raises taxes by over $1 trillion and never balances. This is totally irresponsible.

We cannot continue to borrow nearly $4 billion every day. Current policies and the Senate Democrats' plan is suffocating our economy and job growth.

Our budget brings us to a balanced budget using tax dollars in a fiscally responsible manner, commonsense regulatory tax reforms, and an energy policy that results in economic growth and job creation.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PLAN

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Good day, Mr. Speaker. Good day, my colleagues—or as my Republican colleagues would say, bonjour.

Today, we're considering the Republican budget, which is a plan modeled after European-style austerity measures. In plain English, it is bad.

The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office makes clear this budget will slow economic growth and kill over 2.5 million American jobs. It requires further sacrifices from our veterans, our seniors, students, small businesses, and hardworking middle class families. It ends Medicare as we know it. And it has no vision for how we're going to create jobs. It doesn't even include the phrase ''job creation.''

The American people rejected this budget in November 2012. The Congress should reject it today. It's time to say au revoir—good-bye—to this Republican budget and move forward with a plan focused on jobs and creating a better future for this country.

SENATE COMMENTS ON MARINE TRAGEDY

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was stunned to watch the senior Democrat leader of the other body implying that the blame for Monday's tragic deaths of seven marines is the result of the recent automatic cuts to defense spending, also known as sequestration—''the sequester.'' His outrageous comments referring to the dead marines' training with explosives implied that the sequester which the President insisted upon was ''going to cut back this stuff''—their training.

I'm appalled because this senior Democrat should know that the sequester cuts have not even been fully implemented. They could not have played a role in these marines' deaths.

As an American who has proudly worn the uniform of a naval officer, I am furious that a Member of Congress would play politics with such a tragedy. The families of these seven marines deserve an apology. I pray that they will get it.

Semper fi, Marines. Semper fi.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act.

In 2008, with strong bipartisan support, Congressman SIMPSON and I introduced the original bill that was signed into law that year. For the first time in history, a scientific method for adding newborn screenings to State programs was established.

Prior to enactment of this law, only 10 States and the District of Columbia required infants to be screened for all the recommended disorders. Today, 44 States and the District of Columbia require screening of at least 29 of the 31 core treatable conditions. Unfortunately, critical gaps and challenges remain.

The reauthorization bill establishes a grant program to assist States in developing followup and tracking programs and renews the Secretary's Advisory Committee for Heritable Disorders.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this vital legislation. No child should die or suffer from preventable disabilities which could have been detected at birth.

□ 1230

HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to voice my strong support for the House Republican fiscal year 2014 budget. And I want to commend my colleague, chairman of the Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN, for his ongoing leadership on this issue.

There is simply no denying it: the Federal Government has a spending problem, a problem that has led to nearly $17 trillion of debt. For too long, Washington has shirked its responsibility in addressing this issue and punted the problem to future generations. As a father, I cannot in good conscience let this generational theft continue.

It is critical that we pass a budget that puts our country back on track through responsible cuts and reforms. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee, of which I am a member, has already identified numerous duplicative government programs. Yet rather than eliminating these programs, the government continues to pour more money into them.

Congressman RYAN's budget prioritizes our spending so that we protect important programs in the long-term by trimming the waste in government.

BAN ON KNIVES

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago our Nation experienced unimaginable loss caused by the terrorist attacks on September 11. Let us not forget that the terrorists overtook planes using simple box cutters, which were allowed on board at the time.

TSA's recent decision to now lift the ban on knives on aircraft is shockingly irresponsible and reckless. Why make this potentially deadly decision when this policy has been keeping our Nation safer for years? This is dangerous for passengers, flight attendants, and pilots. The airlines, flight attendants, pilots, and Federal air marshals have all expressed their strong opposition to this TSA policy that will compromise their safety and the safety of their passengers.

Americans can plainly see that it is commonsense to keep potential weapons off our airplanes. We have already witnessed the harm knives can cause. Knives took down four planes. Knives took down the World Trade Center. Knives struck at the heart of our Nation's defense. Knives took thousands of innocent lives.

This is a huge step backwards in protecting American security. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand with the American people and urge TSA to not implement this reckless strategy.

RYAN BUDGET

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House budget proposal for the 2014 fiscal year. This proposal sets real practical goals that will stop spending money we don't have by cutting wasteful spending, fix our broken Tax Code to create jobs and increase wages, protect and strengthen important priorities like Medicare and national security, reform welfare programs like Medicaid so that we can deliver on the promises that we have made for those who truly need it, and repeal the President's health care bill so that we can finally replace it with meaningful patient-centered health care.

Most importantly, it reduces the deficit and the debt that we have, and it becomes balanced in 10 years. I am continuously amazed by those on the other side of the aisle who say that this is just crazy talk that we would balance the Federal budget in 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, this addresses the issues and the goals that will create a pro-growth economy and which will affect every American family across this country.

REMEMBERING GOVERNOR HUGH L. CAREY OF NEW YORK

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a distinguished New Yorker and former Member of this body, who will be honored in a special ceremony in New York's 20th Congressional District on April 8. Hugh L. Carey was born in Brooklyn in 1919, enlisted in the Army in World War II, served in Europe where he helped liberate prisoners at a concentration camp, and eventually reached the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Upon returning home, Mr. Carey received a law degree from St. John's University. In 1960, he was elected to this Chamber and went on to serve seven terms before being elected Governor of New York in 1974, a position he held until 1981.

Governor Carey is widely remembered for his steady hand during New York City's economic crisis, during which he brought many competing interests together to forge compromise on difficult issues. He also instituted improvements for the mental health community of New York State. A born storyteller with a quick wit and boundless charm, Hugh Carey was a New Yorker to the core.

I am honored to have this opportunity to remember a former Member of this body, as well as New York's 51st Governor, who throughout his career led with distinction and compassion. I look forward to next month's ceremony recognizing his service in World War II.

PATH TO PROSPERITY

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the Path to Prosperity budget on the floor this week reaffirms once again that House Republicans are the only ones in Washington providing genuine, serious solutions to our country's spending-driven debt crisis.

We have released a budget that cuts government spending responsibly, enacts commonsense reforms, and, most importantly, balances the government's books within 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, what have we heard from the President? Well, nothing. The President hasn't even submitted his budget to Congress yet, and it is on track to be one of the latest budget submissions in history. And the Democratic-controlled Senate's budget, of course, raises taxes and never, ever breaks even.

That is not what America needs, Mr. Speaker. With our budget, House Republicans have provided a genuine blueprint for creating more jobs and opportunity in America today.

RESTORE THE TUITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 1265, bipartisan legislation which would restore tuition assistance for men and women serving in the military.

Earlier this month, the Department of Defense announced that the Army, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard would all be suspending their tuition assistance programs due to sequestration.

I represent Fort Bliss and the 36,000 men and women in uniform who currently serve there. Many of them served in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the tuition assistance programs are critical to help them transition into civilian life and to find good-paying jobs.

This program represents 0.1 percent of the Pentagon's budget. As Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General Martin Dempsey has said, ''There's nothing more important in a democracy than education.''

Let's stand up to ensure that those who have given so much for our Nation have access to education. Please join me in supporting H.R. 1265.

DEMOCRATIC BUDGETS

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, we are going to start taking up debate on several budgets. I want to point out one important consistent thing about the budgets that my esteemed colleagues will be offering. Not a single one of them ever balances. I will say that again, Mr. Speaker: not a single Democrat budget that is being offered will ever balance.

If we do not have surpluses, we cannot pay down the debt. We will never be able to pay down the debt until we have surpluses. If you offer a budget that never offers any surpluses, there is never any way to repay the debt.

And I respectfully suggest that if I come to you and ask you to lend me money and I have the intention of giving it back to you, that that is truly debt. But if I come to you and ask you to give me money and I have no intention of ever giving it back to you, that is theft. That is exactly what the opponents' budgets will offer us today. There is no way to ever repay any of this debt. It is wrong, and the American public deserve better.

WORLD WATER DAY

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

Mr. COSTA. As a third-generation family farmer, I know firsthand that water is the lifeblood of not only San Joaquin Valley, but our entire world. For decades, generations have had to fight tooth and nail for a reliable water supply. It grows our crops, drives our economic activity, and, more importantly, sustains human life. As the global population continues to grow, the demand on the world's water supply will continue to increase and create greater opportunities for conflict.

Friday is World Water Day when we focus on how we can meet the water needs of all people, regardless of where they live on this planet.

In our valley, we have learned much about ways to conserve water, convey it over long distances, and put it to use efficiently. Nonetheless, in California this year, we will have to deal with another partially caused regulatory drought that was unnecessary.

Water has and will continue to present both challenges and opportunities. We must choose the side of cooperation and collaboration if we are about to solve our world's long-term water needs.

□ 1240

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a proud member of the Congressional Hellenic Caucus to recognize Greek Independence Day.

Let us honor this date in memory of the beloved Andy Athens.

This holiday celebrates the 1821 victory in the Greek people's struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire.

My grandfather, Arthur Costandinos Cathones, for whom I am named, instilled in me a great love for Greece and Greek culture. The Hellenic values he taught me have served me well as guiding principles throughout my career in public service.

I have enjoyed visiting Greece a number of times to learn firsthand about the birthplace of democracy. These trips have given me a deep understanding of the country's history, its food, its culture, its music and especially its people. I encourage my colleagues to visit Greece to experience all it has to offer.

The U.S. and Greece have always shared a special bond that we should recognize and strengthen instead of repeatedly using Greece as the whipping boy for Europe's economic woes as some have done in speeches on this floor.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ELLMERS). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. SHIMKUS, Illinois
Mr. WOMACK, Arkansas
Mr. ISRAEL, New York
Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. DAVID SCOTT, Georgia
Mr. SCHNEIDER, Illinois
Ms. FRANKEL, Florida
Mr. CONNOLLY, Virginia

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 25, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25.

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

□ 1243

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, March 19, 2013, time for general debate had expired.

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

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 25

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2014 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

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

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023:

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

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

Fiscal year 2014: $2,270,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,606,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,778,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,903,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,028,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,149,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,284,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,457,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,650,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,832,145,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $0.
Fiscal year 2015: $0.
Fiscal year 2016: $0.
Fiscal year 2017: $0.
Fiscal year 2018: $0.
Fiscal year 2019: $0.
Fiscal year 2020: $0.
Fiscal year 2021: $0.
Fiscal year 2022: $0.
Fiscal year 2023: $0.

(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 2014: $2,769,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,681,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,857,258,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: $2,988,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,104,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,281,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,414,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,540,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,681,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,768,151,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $2,815,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,736,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,850,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,958,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,079,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,231,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,374,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,495,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,667,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,722,071,000,000.

(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 2014: -$544,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$130,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$71,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$54,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$50,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$82,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$89,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$38,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$16,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $110,073,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $17,776,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,086,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,343,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $18,635,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $18,938,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,267,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $19,608,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $19,900,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $20,162,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $20,319,503,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $12,849,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,069,788,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,225,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,362,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,485,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $13,648,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,836,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $13,992,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $14,154,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $14,210,984,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2014 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $579,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $574,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $563,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $585,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $598,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $612,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $582,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $625,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $639,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $654,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $628,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $671,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $649,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $688,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,461,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $41,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $39,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $40,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $41,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $44,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $44,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $46,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $47,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,030,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $28,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $28,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $29,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $30,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $31,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $31,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $32,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $33,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $33,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,344,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $2,121,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $2,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$12,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$147,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $38,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $37,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $36,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $38,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $38,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $39,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $39,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $40,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $39,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,382,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $16,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $18,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,380,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $19,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $19,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $20,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,859,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$9,000,000,000..
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,398,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -$21,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$6,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$2,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$20,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$23,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$1,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$20,654,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $87,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $40,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $81,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $91,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $68,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $92,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $72,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $92,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $74,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $99,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,906,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $8,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $8,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $8,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $8,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $8,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $8,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $8,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $9,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $9,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $9,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,271,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $56,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $73,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $85,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $95,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $100,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $95,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $97,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $98,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $99,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $101,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,780,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $363,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $378,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $358,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $353,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $359,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $362,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $375,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $375,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $387,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $393,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $422,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $410,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $420,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $441,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $456,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $455,134,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $515,944,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $515,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $534,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $534,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $581,788,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $597,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $597,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $621,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $621,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $679,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $679,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $723,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $723,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $770,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $771,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $845,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $843,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $875,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $874,988,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $509,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $508,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $480,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $476,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $487,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $487,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $484,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $479,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $484,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $475,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $495,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $490,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $501,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $496,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $505,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $501,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $515,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $510,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,354,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $145,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $149,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $162,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $160,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $159,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $175,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, $179,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $191,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $187,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $186,882,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $51,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $53,116,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $56,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $56,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $58,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $60,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $62,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $64,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $70,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,561,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $72,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,195,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $24,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,158,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $25,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $26,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $27,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $27,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,219,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $28,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,116,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $341,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $341,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $367,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $405,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $405,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $476,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $476,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $555,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $555,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $613,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $661,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $661,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $694,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $694,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $723,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $723,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $745,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $745,963,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$59,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$44,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$58,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$53,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$65,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$59,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$71,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$65,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$77,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$71,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$82,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$76,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$81,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$89,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$88,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$92,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$89,323,000,000.
(20) Government-wide savings (930):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$9,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$21,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$9,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$17,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$8,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$13,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$11,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$9,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$8,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$7,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$21,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$35,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$13,555,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$91,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$91,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$99,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$99,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$101,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$101,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$106,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$106,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$109,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$109,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$115,049,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$115,049,000,000.
(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $93,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,694,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF SPENDING REDUCTION.—The House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit, not later than __________, 2013, recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations, such committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(2) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(4) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(5) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit

changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(6) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(7) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

TITLE III—RECOMMENDED LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2030, 2040, AND 2050

SEC. 301. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

The following are the recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels for each of fiscal years 2030, 2040, and 2050 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—The appropriate levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 19.1 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 19.1 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: 19.1 percent.

(2) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 19.1 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 19.1 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: 19.1 percent.

(3) DEFICITS.—The appropriate levels of deficits are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 0 percent.
Fiscal year 2040: 0 percent.
Fiscal year 2050: 0 percent.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

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

SEC. 402. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REFORM OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms or replaces the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 403. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 404. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 405. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 406. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that implements a trade agreement, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 407. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 408. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under P.L. 106–393 in the future and would not increase the deficit or direct spending for fiscal year 2014, the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, or the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 409. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

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

TITLE V—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 501. 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 2014 is 6.7 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 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law.

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

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

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

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

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 5.9 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 2014 is 5.3 percent under current law.

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

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

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

TITLE VI—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 601. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

(1) The Veterans Health Care Budget and Reform Transparency Act of 2009 provides advance appropriations for the following veteran medical care accounts: Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities.

(2) The President has yet to submit a budget request as required under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, including the request for the Department of Veterans Affairs, for fiscal year 2014, hence the request for veteran medical care advance appropriations for fiscal year 2015 is unavailable as of the writing of this concurrent resolution.

(3) This concurrent resolution reflects the most up-to-date estimate on veterans' health care needs included in the President's fiscal year 2013 request for fiscal year 2015.

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

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

(d) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2015, the aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) $55,483,000,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(A) Medical Services;

(B) Medical Support and Compliance; and

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

(2) $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (c).

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 602. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

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

SEC. 603. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—If a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2014 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO IMPLEMENT DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS AND TO FUND VETERANS' PROGRAMS AND OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—

(1) FINDINGS.—(A) The President has not submitted a budget for fiscal year 2014 as required pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, by the date set forth in that section.

(B) In missing the statutory date by which the budget must be submitted, this will be the fourth time in five years the President has not complied with that deadline.

(C) This concurrent resolution reflects the levels of funding for veterans' medical programs as set forth in the President's fiscal year 2013 budget request.

(2) PRESIDENT'S BUDGET SUBMISSION.—In order to take into account any new information included in the budget submission by the President for fiscal year 2014, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels for veterans' programs, Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, or the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations set forth in the report of this concurrent resolution to conform with section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as adjusted by section 251A of such Act).

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

(c) DETERMINATIONS.—For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution on the budget in the House, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2014 and the period of fiscal years 2014 through fiscal year 2023 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust such applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 604. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

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

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning with fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 605. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

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

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, if such adjustments do not cause a net increase in the deficit for fiscal year 2014 and the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 606. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

(c) BUDGET COMPLIANCE.—(1) The consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 604.

(2) Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution, if—

(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report;

would not cause the appropriate allocation of new budget authority made pursuant to section 302(a) of such Act for that fiscal year to be exceeded or the sum of the limits on the security and non-security category in section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act as reduced pursuant to such section.

SEC. 607. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

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

(1) Costs of Federal housing loans and loan guarantees are treated unequally in the

budget. The Congressional Budget Office uses fair-value accounting to measure the costs of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, but determines the cost of other Federal housing programs on the basis of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (''FCRA'').

(2) The fair-value accounting method uses discount rates which incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length. In contrast, cash-basis accounting solely uses the discount rates of the Treasury, failing to incorporate risks such as prepayment and default risk.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the $635 billion of loans and loan guarantees issued in 2013 alone would generate budgetary savings of $45 billion over their lifetime using FCRA accounting. However, these same loans and loan guarantees would have a lifetime cost of $11 billion under fair-value methodology.

(4) The majority of loans and guarantees issued in 2013 would show deficit reduction of $9.1 billion under FCRA methodology, but would increase the deficit by $4.7 billion using fair-value accounting.

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

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

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

SEC. 608. TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND THAT INCREASE PUBLIC INDEBTEDNESS.

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

SEC. 609. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the ''first fiscal year'' and the ''total of fiscal years'' shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2014. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism under section 302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation. The Committee on Appropriations may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under section 302(b) of such Act. Spending that counts toward the allocation established by this section shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, for purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2014, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 610. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

TITLE VII—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 701. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

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

(1) Although the U.S. economy technically emerged from recession roughly four years ago, the recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound with the unemployment rate still elevated and real economic growth essentially flat in the final quarter of 2012.

(2) The enormous build-up of Government debt in the past four years has worsened the already unsustainable course of Federal finances and is an increasing drag on the U.S. economy.

(3) During the recession and early stages of recovery, the Government took a variety of measures to try to boost economic activity. Despite the fact that these stimulus measures added over $1 trillion to the debt, the economy continues to perform at a sub-par trend.

(4) Investors and businesses make decisions on a forward-looking basis. They know that today's large debt levels are simply tomorrow's tax hikes, interest rate increases, or inflation – and they act accordingly. It is this debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, that is weighing on U.S. growth, investment, and job creation.

(5) Economists have found that the key to jump-starting U.S. economic growth and job creation is tangible action to rein in the growth of Government spending with the aim of getting debt under control.

(6) Stanford economist John Taylor has concluded that reducing Government spending now would ''reduce the threats of higher taxes, higher interest rates and a fiscal crisis'', and would therefore provide an immediate stimulus to the economy.

(7) Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has stated that putting in place a credible plan to reduce future deficits ''would not only enhance economic performance in the long run, but could also yield near-term benefits by leading to lower long-term interest rates and increased consumer and business confidence.''

(8) Lowering spending would boost market confidence and lessen uncertainty, leading to a spark in economic expansion, job creation, and higher wages and income.

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

SEC. 702. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

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

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

(2) Since 2001 alone, there have been more than 3,250 changes to the code. Many of the major changes over the years have involved carving out special preferences, exclusions, or deductions for various activities or groups. These loopholes add up to more than $1 trillion per year and make the code unfair, inefficient, and very complex.

(3) These tax preferences are disproportionately used by upper-income individuals. For instance, the top 1 percent of taxpayers reap about 3 times as much benefit from special tax credits and deductions (excluding refundable credits) than the middle class and 13 times as much benefit than the lowest income quintile.

(4) The large amount of tax preferences that pervade the code end up narrowing the tax base by as much as 50 percent. A narrow tax base, in turn, requires much higher tax rates to raise a given amount of revenue.

(5) The National Taxpayer Advocate reports that taxpayers spent 6.1 billion hours in 2012 complying with tax requirements.

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

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

(8) The U.S. corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) sums to just over 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. The total Federal marginal tax rate on corporate income now reaches 55 percent, when including the shareholder-level tax on dividends and capital

gains. Tax rates this high suppress wages and discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

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

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

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

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

(13) Revenues have averaged 18 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 19.1 percent of the economy, and – if the spending restraints in this budget are enacted – this level is sufficient to fund Government operations over time.

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

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

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

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation during fiscal year 2014 that provides for a comprehensive reform of the U.S. tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through revenue-neutral fundamental tax reform, which should be reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House not later than December 31, 2013, that—

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

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

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

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

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

SEC. 703. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

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

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

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

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2023 and unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.2 percent per year, and under the Congressional Budget Office's alternative fiscal scenario, direct spending on Medicare is projected to exceed 7 percent of GDP by 2040 and reach 13 percent of GDP by 2085.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 704. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent CBO projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of $1.319 trillion over the next 10 years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the Majority Leader of the House shall introduce the President's legislation upon receipt.

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

(4) Legislation submitted by the President shall—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

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

(C) improve fairness for participants;

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

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

SEC. 705. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.

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

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

(2) More than 21 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the last decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2001-2002 Academic Year and the 2011-2012 Academic Year:

(A) Published tuition and fees for in-State students at public four-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 5.6 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation.

(B) Published tuition and fees for in-State students at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.8 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation.

(C) Published tuition and fees for in-State students at private four-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.6 percent per year beyond the rate of general inflation.

(4) Over that same period, Federal financial aid has increased 140 percent beyond the rate of general inflation.

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

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

(7) American students are chasing ever-increasing tuition with ever-increasing debt. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, student debt nearly tripled between 2004 and 2012, and now stands at nearly $1 trillion. Student debt now has the second largest balance after mortgage debt.

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

(9) Based on estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, the Pell Grant Program will face a fiscal shortfall beginning in fiscal year 2015 and continuing in each subsequent year in the current budget window.

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

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

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

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

(3) maintaining the maximum Pell grant award level at $5,645 in each year of the budget window; and

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

SEC. 706. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

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

(1) According to the last available estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold $698 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2013.

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 707. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

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

(1) The House of Representatives cut budgets for Members of Congress, House committees, and leadership offices by 5 percent in 2011 and an additional 6.4 percent in 2012.

(2) The House of Representatives achieved savings of $36.5 million over three years by consolidating House operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that:

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

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

SEC. 708. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(E) 13 programs, 3 tax benefits, and one loan program to reduce diesel emissions; and

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

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

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

(6) 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.

(7) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2014, 42 laws will expire, possibly resulting in $685 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

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

(b) POLICY 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 reduced or eliminated.

SEC. 709. POLICY STATEMENT ON UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.

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

TITLE VIII—SENSE OF THE HOUSE PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) additional legislative action is needed 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; and

(2) when 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

The CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–21.

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

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

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

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–21.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SEC. 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 and 2015 through 2023.

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

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2023:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,038,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,290,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,646,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,833,891,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,973,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,111,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,245,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,400,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,592,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,800,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,991,775,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $0,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $20,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $40,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $55,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $70,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $82,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $95,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $115,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $135,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $149,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $159,630,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $3,054,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,963,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,046,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,211,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,386,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,568,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,779,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,973,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,136,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,350,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,492,138,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,956,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,997,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,082,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,240,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,382,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,542,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,749,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,926,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,103,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,323,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,451,446,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $917,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $706,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $435,783,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $406,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $409,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $431,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $504,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $526,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $511,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $522,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $459,672,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $17,113,638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,008,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,626,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,222,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,871,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,558,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,312,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,094,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,863,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,634,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,364,925,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $12,274,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $13,059,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,588,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,081,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,574,683,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,081,187,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: $15,669,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,297,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,929,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,600,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $18,229,414,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $669,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $731,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $766,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $812,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $861,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $908,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $951,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $994,855,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,038,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,083,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,129,163,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013: $634,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $711,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $756,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $805,969,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $856,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $907,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $962,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $1,022,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,086,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,154,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,227,009,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $5,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $5,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $5,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $6,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $6,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $7,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $7,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $7,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,505,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $7,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,751,000,000.

SEC. 103. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,000,000.

SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:
(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $648,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $658,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $567,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $575,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $582,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $590,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $574,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $598,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $607,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $616,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $603,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $625,569,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $636,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $621,603,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $58,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $47,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $46,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $48,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $49,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $51,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $52,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $52,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $55,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,212,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $29,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $31,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $36,396,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,643,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $6,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $4,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,913,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $44,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $42,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $42,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $44,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $45,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $48,036,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $49,596,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $51,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $52,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,703,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $20,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,301,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $20,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,116,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,959,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $−30,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−24,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $10,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−2,394,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−4,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $11,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−5,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−6,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $16,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−6,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $17,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−2,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $17,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−3,032,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $100,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $88,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $88,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $89,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,855,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $90,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $91,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $91,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $93,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $94,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $95,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $96,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,364,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $51,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $24,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,362,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $25,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,233,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $26,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $26,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $26,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $27,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $27,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $28,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $29,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,953,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $77,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $78,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $89,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $106,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $117,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $123,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $119,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $120,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $122,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $124,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $126,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,845,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $365,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $420,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $415,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $500,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $493,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $554,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $611,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $648,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $648,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $685,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $684,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $732,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $721,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $764,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $763,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $808,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $806,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $852,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $851,028,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $511,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $535,596,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $535,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $540,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $540,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $586,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $586,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $602,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $602,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $626,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $687,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $686,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $734,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $734,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $782,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $782,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $855,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $855,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $883,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $883,062,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $544,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $542,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $530,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $528,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $524,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $537,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $536,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $531,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $538,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $565,188,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $578,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $592,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $611,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $612,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $619,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $614,921,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,441,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $140,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $145,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $150,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $162,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $161,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $159,902,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $159,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $176,188,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $175,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $180,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $191,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $188,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $187,433,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $53,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $66,526,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $56,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $59,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $59,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $61,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $63,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $65,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $67,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $70,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $76,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,564,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $24,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $24,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $25,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $26,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $27,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $28,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $29,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $29,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $30,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,304,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $331,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $331,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $342,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $370,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $419,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $506,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $608,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $608,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $683,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $683,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $752,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $752,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $806,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $806,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $859,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $859,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $905,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $905,971,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $−35,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $−42,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−20,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $−51,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−36,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $−61,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−48,906,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $−68,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−61,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $−76,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−70,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $−84,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−80,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $−92,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−89,556,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $−76,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−76,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $−75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $−80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $−86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $−90,137,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $-90,137,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, $-90,503,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $-90,503,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, $-97,574,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $-97,574,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $-98,916,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $-98,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, $-103,177,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $-103,177,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $-105,117,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $-105,117,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, $-108,885,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $-108,885,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

Not later than October 1, 2013, the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws, bills, or resolutions within its jurisdiction to increase the total level of revenues by $975,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPLACE SEQUESTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that amend section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a) or section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240) to repeal or revise the enforcement procedures established under those sections, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. For purposes of determining deficit-neutrality under this section, the Chairman may include the estimated effects of any amendment or amendments to the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)).

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS TO PROMOTE EMPLOYMENT AND JOB GROWTH.

(a) EMPLOYMENT AND JOB GROWTH.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to employment and job growth, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance to small businesses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance to the unemployed, or improve the unemployment compensation program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(d) TRADE AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to trade, including Trade Adjustment Assistance programs or international agreements for economic assistance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS TO ASSIST WORKING FAMILIES AND CHILDREN.

(a) INCOME SUPPORT.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, child support enforcement programs, or other assistance to working families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) HOUSING ASSISTANCE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to housing assistance, which may include working family rental assistance, or assistance provided through the Housing Trust Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) CHILD WELFARE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to child welfare programs, which may include the Federal foster care payment system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.

(a) PRE-KINDERGARTEN.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to a pre-kindergarten program or programs to serve low-income children, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) CHILD CARE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to child care assistance for working families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) HOME VISITING.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to a home visiting program or programs serving low-income mothers-to-be and low-income families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TAX RELIEF.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide tax relief, including extensions of expiring tax relief or refundable tax relief, relief that supports innovation by United States enterprises, or relief that expands the ability of startup companies to benefit from the credit for research and experimentation expenses, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure a sustainable revenue base that leads to a fairer, more progressive, and more efficient tax system than currently exists, and to a more competitive business environment for United States enterprises, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INVEST IN CLEAN ENERGY AND PRESERVE THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to—

(1) the reduction of our Nation's dependence on imported energy and the investment of receipts from domestic energy production;

(2) energy conservation and renewable energy development, or new or existing approaches to clean energy financing;

(3) the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program;

(4) Federal programs for land and water conservation and acquisition;

(5) greenhouse gas emissions levels;

(6) the preservation, restoration, or protection of the Nation's public lands, oceans, coastal areas, or aquatic ecosystems;

(7) agreements between the United States and jurisdictions of the former Trust Territory;

(8) wildland fire management activities; or

(9) the restructure of the nuclear waste program;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN AMERICA'S INFRASTRUCTURE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for Federal investment in the infrastructure of the United States, which may include projects for transportation, housing, energy, water, telecommunications, or financing through tax credit bonds, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to—

(1) eligibility for both military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation (concurrent receipt);

(2) the reduction or elimination of the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and Veterans' Dependency and Indemnity Compensation;

(3) the improvement of disability benefits or the process of evaluating and adjudicating benefit claims for members of the Armed Forces or veterans; or

(4) the infrastructure needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including constructing or leasing space and maintenance of Department facilities;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make higher education more accessible and affordable, which may include legislation to increase college enrollment and completion rates for low-income students, or promote college savings, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS FOR HEALTH CARE.

(a) PHYSICIAN REIMBURSEMENT.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that increase payments made under, or permanently reform or replace, the Medicare Sustainable Growth Rate (SGR) formula, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that the provisions in such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(b) EXTENSION OF EXPIRING HEALTH CARE POLICIES.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that extend expiring Medicare, Medicaid, or other health provisions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(c) HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that promote improvements to health care delivery systems, which may include changes that increase care quality, encourage efficiency, or improve care coordination, and that improve the fiscal sustainability of health care spending over the long term, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(d) THERAPY CAPS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that protect access to outpatient therapy services (including physical therapy, occupational therapy, and speech-language pathology services) through measures such as repealing or increasing the current outpatient therapy caps, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(e) DRUG SAFETY.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to drug safety, which may include legislation that permits the safe importation of prescription drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration from a specified list of countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN OUR NATION'S COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) or make changes to chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976''), or both, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 313. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A FARM BILL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for the reauthorization of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 1651) or prior Acts, authorize similar or related programs, provide for revenue changes, or any combination of the purposes under this section, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 314. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN WATER INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to water infrastructure programs or make changes to the collection and expenditure of the Harbor Maintenance Tax (subchapter A of chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 315. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PENSION REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports to strengthen and reform the pension system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 316. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HOUSING FINANCE REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that promote appropriate access to mortgage credit for individuals and families or examine the role of government in the secondary mortgage market, which may include legislation to restructure government-sponsored enterprises, or provide for mortgage refinance opportunities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 317. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that support Department of Defense auditability and acquisition reform efforts, which may include legislation that limits the use of incremental funding, or that promotes affordability or appropriate contract choice, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 318. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the support of Overseas Contingency Operations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 319. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that make changes to or provide for the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (Public Law 107–297; 116 Stat. 2322), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 320. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR POSTAL REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports to strengthen and reform the United States Postal Service, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SEC. 321. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR GOVERNMENT REFORM AND EFFICIENCY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings through the elimination, consolidation, or reform of Federal programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives, or the sale of Federal property, or reduce improper payments, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 401. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014, PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this resolution, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on that bill or joint resolution) that would cause the discretionary spending limits in this section to be exceeded.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—This subsection may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) for fiscal year 2013—

(A) for the security category, $684,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(B) for the nonsecurity category, $359,000,000,000 in budget authority; and

(2) for fiscal year 2014—

(A) for the revised security category, $497,352,000,000 in budget authority; and

(B) for the revised nonsecurity category, $469,023,000,000 in budget authority;

as adjusted in conformance with the adjustment procedures in this resolution.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After a bill or joint resolution relating to any matter described in paragraph (2) or (3) is placed on the calendar, or upon the offering of an amendment or motion thereto, or the laying down of an amendment between the Houses or a conference report thereon—

(A) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, budgetary aggregates, and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, by the amount of new budget authority in that measure for that purpose and the outlays flowing therefrom; and

(B) following any adjustment under subparagraph (A), the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this subsection.

(2) MATTERS DESCRIBED.—Matters referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) EMERGENCY REQUIREMENTS.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for emergency requirements (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(B) DISABILITY REVIEWS AND REDETERMINATIONS.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for continuing disability reviews and redeterminations (consistent with section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(C) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE.—Measures making appropriations in a fiscal year for health care fraud and abuse control (consistent with section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(D) DISASTER RELIEF.—Measures making appropriations for disaster relief (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985).

(3) ADJUSTMENTS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—

(A) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the discretionary spending limits, allocations to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and aggregates for one or more—

(i) bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or passed by the House of Representatives;

(ii) joint resolutions or amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(iii) amendments between the Houses received from the House of Representatives or Senate amendments offered by the authority of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; or

(iv) conference reports;

making appropriations for overseas contingency operations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes (and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985), up to the amounts specified in subparagraph (B).

(B) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED.—The amounts specified are—

(i) for fiscal year 2013, $99,670,000,000 in budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom); and

(ii) for fiscal year 2014, $50,000,000,000 in budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''nonsecurity category'' means all discretionary appropriations not included in the security category;

(2) the term ''revised nonsecurity category'' means all discretionary appropriations other than in budget function 050;

(3) the term ''revised security category'' means discretionary appropriations in budget function 050; and

(4) the term ''security category'' means discretionary appropriations associated with agency budgets for the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the National Nuclear Security Administration, the

intelligence community management account (95–0401–0–1–054), and all budget accounts in budget function 150 (international affairs).

SEC. 402. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2014 or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2015 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2015.

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

(1) for fiscal years 2015 and 2016 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying 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 in each year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 402 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress) shall no longer apply.

SEC. 403. ADJUSTMENTS FOR SEQUESTRATION OR SEQUESTRATION REPLACEMENT.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS UNDER CURRENT LAW.—If the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 go into, or remain in effect, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such enforcement.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS IF AMENDED.—If a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the adjustments to discretionary spending limits under section 251(b) of that Act, or the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of that Act or section 901(e) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

SEC. 411. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse, or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on the Budget.

SEC. 412. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

SEC. 413. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—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 contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 414. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 415. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

TITLE V—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 501. 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 2014 is 6.7 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 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law

(3) No significant reforms to means-tested direct spending are proposed.

(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 2014 is 5.9 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 2014 is 5.3 percent.

(3) No significant reforms to nonmeans-tested direct spending are proposed.

Amend the title so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and fiscal years 2015 through 2023.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

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

Mr. Chairman, last year at this time I came before this body and I offered as an amendment, as a possible replacement, the budget offered by the President of the United States. It failed overwhelmingly. In fact, I think it failed to receive a single vote.

I did that in order to promote a debate, and I think we had that debate. I think that was healthy.

Remember, a budget is more than just a spending document. It is also a vision document. I had hoped to be able to do the exact same thing this year, to bring forth the President's budget to discuss not only the spending levels in that budget, but also the vision contained in that particular budget. Imagine my surprise then when this week came around and we waited for the President's budget and it was not offered.

It was not offered for the first time in modern history. This is the first time in modern history that a President has failed to offer a budget before the United States House of Representatives took up the topic. It's the very first time since the Budget Act of 1921. I don't know how we're supposed to discuss the President's vision for the Nation as contained in the budget when it's not here. I think that's wrong.

It's required by law, Mr. Chairman. The law requires the President to submit a budget before today. I believe this is now the third or fourth time he's been late during his Presidency. It's inexcusable. It's inexcusable, regardless of the party of the President, not to follow the law and not to offer a budget.

So it's with great regret, Mr. Chairman, I'm not able to offer to you today for discussion before this body the vision for this Nation contained in the President's budget because no such documents exist. I actually tried, by the way. I offered a 34-page document full of question marks, but appropriately that was ruled out of order as not being able to be brought forward to the House. Again, it is with great reluctance I'm not able to offer the President's budget.

Why am I here? I'm here instead to offer as a substitute the budget that passed the Senate Budget Committee last week. It's the first budget to be taken up by the Senate, I believe, in 4 years. I would like to think it's a direct result of the bipartisan action that this body took several weeks ago in passing No Budget, No Pay. The Senate assures us, Mr. Chairman, they were going to do a budget anyway. I took them at their word. And I'm glad that this body was able to pass out No Budget, No Pay in order to give them the additional incentive to do that.

What have they done? What has the Senate offered us? What did the Senate pass out of committee last week on entirely partisan lines? They offered us a budget that increases taxes by $900 billion over the tax window. In fact, that's the smallest amount. That's the amount they admit to. If you take the Senate committee at their word, they also want to undo the sequester and add an additional $100 billion worth of stimulus money, and they want to do that without impacting the deficit. You can safely assume, I believe, that it's $1.5 trillion, not $900 billion, but $1.5 trillion in new taxes out of our colleagues in the Senate on the Democratic committee.

They increased spending by $265 billion over the baseline over the next decade, and they also spend $4.9 trillion more than does the Republican budget that we'll offer later today. Their spending, as offered in their budget, grows by 4.7 percent annually, one of the highest rates of growth other than the last several years in the history of the Nation.

The deficit, according to their budget, in the year 2023, will be $566 billion. In contrast, the budget that we will be offering will be surplus in 2023. It will finally allow us to start paying down the debt; and there are no significant reforms at all in Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security.

How you can have a vision for this country going forward and not at least discuss possible and reasonable reforms to those programs is beyond me, but somehow it passed out of the Senate committee.

□ 1250

Defense is cut by an additional quarter of a trillion dollars over the sequester cuts that we've already had and over the reductions that the Defense Department voluntarily took upon itself during the last budget process.

Now, I've come before this body before, Mr. Chairman, and encouraged this body, in a bipartisan fashion, to look to the Defense Department as possible ways to save money, under the belief that there must be some money in the Defense Department that can be saved in a responsible fashion. What the Senate has done goes so far beyond that that it's hard to fathom—an additional quarter of a trillion dollars in defense spending reductions over the next 10 years.

Finally, perhaps most tellingly and most importantly, the Senate budget never balances—ever. It never balances. What does that say? They have no plan for ever repaying the debt. You cannot repay the debt until we start moving to surplus, and any budget that never goes to surplus never pays down the debt. I've said it before and I'll say it again: if you borrow money from people and are never intending to pay it back, you're not borrowing it from them—you're stealing it from them. That's exactly what this budget contemplates: borrowing money and borrowing money with no intention—a stated position of no intention—to ever be able to pay the money back.

I'm glad they did it. I'm glad to think that they did it of their own accord without ''no budget-no pay'' hanging over their heads, and I applaud them for at least taking the first step in the last 4 years to put forth their vision of spending and of what the future of this country should hold. At the same time, I think it's incumbent upon us to have this debate and then to send a very strong message to the Senate that their ideas are not the right ideas for this country. I hope we get a chance to debate this further.

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I actually had been prepared to come to the floor of this House and say this was a refreshing moment, that this was going to be a moment of bipartisanship. I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) for finally offering a balanced plan to reduce our long-term deficit and a plan that will make sure our economy grows rather than offering a plan that results in over 750,000 fewer American jobs by the end of this year, and I hope that the gentleman will demonstrate his sincerity in the support of his own bill by voting for it. We will be able to tell whether this is simply some kind of stunt or a genuine effort.

Mr. Chairman, let me say, with respect to the comments about the President's budget, I think everyone in this country knows that this Congress was here until January 2 of this year, trying to work out a compromise to avoid going over the fiscal cliff, and until we'd resolved that, the President had no idea how much revenue would be available for the budget. I think most families recognize that you need to know how much revenue is available as you put together a budget, number one.

Number two, we've been lurching from one manufactured crisis to another. The sequester. You need to know how the sequester is going to turn out before you know how much money is going to be available for government agencies.

Finally, when the President has to put together a budget, it's not like the budgets Members of Congress put together in which you have one amount for all of defense or just one amount for the function for all of health care and all of education. The President actually has to allocate that money among different agencies. That's part of the process. So the President will be submitting a budget now that we know what the revenue stream is, now that we have some idea as to where we are in terms of those other issues.

I'm glad the gentleman brought forward this alternative, because it is the Senate Democratic proposal for the most part. Just for the record, he has left some stuff out, but it's close enough for negotiation and discussion purposes here.

What this measure does is, number one, replaces the sequester. It replaces the sequester with a balanced approach to reducing our long-term deficit so that you avoid the job losses that will result from the sequester. Our referees, our umpires—the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—has told us, if we allow that sequester to remain in place, you will have 750,000 fewer Americans working at the end of this year. We also know that you'll have 2 million fewer jobs next year.

So it's a good thing that the gentleman brought to the floor a proposal to replace the sequester. After all, in comments last year, the Republican leader, Mr. CANTOR, called for a plan to replace the sequester, so we support that.

The gentleman talks about the Senate proposal on taxes. What he doesn't tell you is what the Senate proposal does. Like the House Democratic proposal, it proposes to balance the budget through a combination of cuts but also cuts to tax expenditures. These are the special preferences and deductions in the Tax Code. We say, yes, we should eliminate some of those tax preferences for very high-income individuals. Our colleagues tell us there are about $4 trillion worth of those that mostly go to high-income individuals. We say, okay, let's close some of those tax breaks of about $1 trillion over 10 years to help reduce the deficit. What's different between the Republican plan and this plan that our colleague has brought up is that they propose to provide tax cuts for very wealthy people, financed by increasing the tax burden on middle-income people.

We put that question to the test in the Budget Committee just the other day. We said, if your plan doesn't propose to give folks at the top a big tax break—because you do in your budget drop it from 39 percent to 25 percent. So a millionaire sees more than a third cut in his rate right off the bat. So we said, well, if it's not your intention to finance that by increasing middle class taxes, you should support this amendment. It was called the Protect the American Middle Class from Tax Increases, and it was very simple. It said, as part of tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle-income people to finance your tax breaks for folks at the very top. Every Republican voted ''no.''

So, yes, this plan that the gentleman has brought forward today, apparently under sort of a mock bipartisanship, will reduce the deficit in a balanced way. It calls for shared responsibility, and it certainly does not give folks at the very top a tax break financed by middle-income taxpayers like the Republican proposal does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, you live in a neighborhood. You look down the street, and there's a neighbor there. They've got new cars, and they're remodeling the kitchen, and they take a lot of expensive vacations. You look down the street, and you wonder: How are they doing that? They live on the same street that we live on. How are they doing all that stuff? And you're tempted. You sit there and think, well, why don't we get some new cars, and why don't we redo the kitchen and take some longer, nicer, more expensive trips. Then, one day, the sticker goes up on the window of that house that says that they have to leave. The moving van comes up, and the house is foreclosed upon—the cars go away; they can't use the kitchen anymore; they're not taking any more trips. Then you realize you made the right decision.

It was a mirage. It looked like they could pay for all that, but they couldn't. This is an allegory for what's going on now.

The United States has neighbors in the world—Greece, Spain, Cyprus, Japan—and they have those stickers going up, those foreclosure things going up, because they can't pay for what they're doing. The Senate budget that's before us follows that same path—a mirage of having a lot of what seems to be great things, but you can't pay for them, and eventually that eviction and that foreclosure will come.

We cannot do that. We cannot foreclose on Medicare. We cannot foreclose on the things that we provide for people. We cannot foreclose on the job engine that is this country. And we don't foreclose on it by having a balanced approach, which means balancing the budget, which means bringing the budget into balance, into line, so that those stickers don't go up on this house we call the United States of America.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the only comparison between these budgets we're debating and what's going on in Europe is that the Republican budget proposes the same European-style austerity approach that many European countries tried, and as a result, they've seen their economies slip back into recession. We want to avoid slowing down economic growth in this country, which is why we're really glad that the gentleman from South Carolina brought this particular budget proposal to the floor of the House, and we hope he will vote for it.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a terrific member of the Budget Committee, the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

□ 1300

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. Chairman, Democrats and Republicans agree that deficit reduction is important; and, in fact, over the past year and a half, we've achieved over $2.7 trillion in debt reduction. But now, the Republicans want to take us through a charade with this Tea Party budget.

If enacted, the Republican budget would weaken America's recovery. It would undermine what makes America great and what makes America strong, like education, the ability of students to attend college, medical research and innovation, the ability of our older neighbors to live their lives in dignity in their retirement years through Medicare and long-term care.

Now, we get a lot of advice, and economists across the board, in fact our own Congressional Budget Office, advise that the best and fastest way to reduce the deficit is to make sure that people across America have jobs and are working. So it is inexplicable that the Republican budget proposes to eliminate jobs in construction, in education, scientific research, and instead heap the burden on middle class families.

Experts predict that the Republican budget will result in job losses of 2 million fewer jobs next year alone, and that's on top of 750,000 jobs lost by the end of the year due to the sequester Republicans will not replace, just as the economy is improving for our neighbors and small businesses back home.

In contrast, the Democratic alternative will generate 1.2 million more jobs and stop the sequester. And in committee, Democrats proposed to close those special interest tax loopholes that riddle our Tax Code, and Republicans said, no. Democrats proposed to offset unwise Republican cuts to medical research like Alzheimer's, cancer, diabetes research at NIH; Republicans said, no. Democrats tried to cut the special interest spending in the Tax Code to offset Republican cuts to students who rely on Pell Grants; but Republicans said, no.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 1½ minutes to the gentlelady.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Democrats in the Budget Committee proposed to strengthen Medicare and replace the Republican plan to turn Medicare into a voucher program. All it does is simply shift the cost to our families and older neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget is not consistent with American values. It is not fiscally responsible. It is a charade. It is a capitulation to the Tea Party. It does not serve us well in economic recovery and the ways we want to grow America. It's a plan for economic weakness. It's a receding vision of American greatness in education, scientific research and infrastructure, and dignity for our parents and grandparents in their retirement years.

I urge you to vote ''no'' on the Republican budget and support the balanced Democratic alternative.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 1 minute remaining and the right to close.

Mr. MULVANEY. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Our fiscal problem can be summed up in just three numbers: 39, 37, and 64. Thirty-nine percent is the combined increase of inflation and population over the past 10 years. Thirty-seven percent is the increase in revenues. The third number is what's killing us: 64 percent is the increase in spending. It's nearly twice the rate of inflation and population growth.

This has never been a revenue problem; it has always been a spending problem. Yet characteristic of other Democratic budgets, the Senate further accelerates spending while trying to chase it with $1 trillion of new taxes. And despite $1 trillion of new taxes, they can't ever balance their budget. And there's a reason: because it's a spending problem, and dogmatically trying to address it on the revenue side will simply drive more and more spending until we become Greece or Detroit.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the last time I was at this table and was accused of doing something for a political stunt or a gimmick was for No Budget, No Pay. So I'll take those criticisms because I think we were able to move in the right direction with that particular bill.

I would simply ask my friend if he's more bothered by this political stunt or by the stunt being perpetrated by the President of the United States for not offering a budget. We had time to do one. He had time to do one. The President clearly had time to do one and is intentionally not delivering it to us, and I think that does a disservice to the entire process.

Finally, all of that said, I want to thank my friend from Maryland for reminding us once again that only in Washington, D.C., can a cut never cut, can a freeze never freeze, and a balanced approach to a budget never balance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I will just ask our colleagues to take a look at the latest analysis put forward by our own Congressional Budget Office, the professionals, the referees here. What they tell us is that half of the deficit in this year is as a result of the fact that millions of Americans are still looking for work. Three-quarters of the projected deficit next year is for the very reason, which is why we get to the heart of the issue, by going after the jobs deficit and then reducing the deficit in a balanced manner over a long period of time.

The issue isn't whether we reduce our deficits dramatically; it is how we do it. We call for a balanced approach that, yes, asks the very wealthy people to get rid of some of their special interest tax breaks which our Republican colleagues concede they have, but get rid of them in part to reduce the deficit. Our colleagues refuse to take one penny from closing tax loopholes—not one—to help reduce the deficit. They'll only do that to help finance tax breaks for higher-income individuals.

So, Mr. Chairman, we focus right now on jobs, growing the economy, and a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–21.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the Congressional Black Caucus to offer an amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2014 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2023:

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

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

Fiscal year 2014: $2,485,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,835,492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,025,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,170,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,307,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,441,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,588,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,774,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,980,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,175,445,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $214,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $228,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $246,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $267,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $278,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $292,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $304,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $317,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $330,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $343,300,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $3,325,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,188,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,291,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,442,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,623,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,820,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,017,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,190,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,421,398,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,575,518,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $3,155,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,235,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,354,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,457,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,608,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,787,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,966,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,152,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,389,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,531,318,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: −$669,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$399,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$329,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$286,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$301,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$345,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −$378,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$377,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −$408,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: −$355,873,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2014: $17,946,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,528,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,045,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,571,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,128,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $20,723,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,355,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $21,990,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $22,647,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $23,273,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $13,019,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,511,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,927,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,298,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $14,674,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,104,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $15,583,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,082,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $16,638,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $17,164,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,903,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $560,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,758,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $567,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,443,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $577,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $569,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $588,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,817,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $598,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $588,374,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $612,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,383,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $626,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,415,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $639,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $632,154,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, $654,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,132,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $51,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $46,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $48,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $49,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $50,331,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $51,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $52,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $53,398,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $56,164,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,685,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $37,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $32,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $32,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $32,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $33,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $36,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $36,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,132,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $6,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $5,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $5,291,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $5,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,586,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $49,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $48,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $46,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $47,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $48,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $50,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $52,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $53,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,469,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $23,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $23,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $24,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,697,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,210,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $11,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $17,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $17,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,649,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,318,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $226,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $158,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $169,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $114,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $99,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $98,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $99,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $97,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $99,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $106,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $100,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $101,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,033,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $42,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $28,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $18,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $14,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $14,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $14,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $14,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $15,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $15,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,895,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $197,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $148,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $121,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $123,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $130,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $124,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $120,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $121,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $123,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $125,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $128,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,798,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $429,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $420,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $502,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $557,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $563,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $614,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $651,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $652,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $688,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $687,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $735,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $724,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $768,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $766,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $811,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $809,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $860,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $858,599,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $524,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $526,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $581,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $599,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $624,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $685,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $735,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $734,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $786,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $786,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $862,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $862,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $894,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $894,227,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $538,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $530,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $532,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $542,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $541,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $541,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $544,969,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $535,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $549,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $544,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $562,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $557,788,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $576,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $595,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $603,269,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $598,661,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,231,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,438,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $149,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $154,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $166,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $165,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $165,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $164,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $163,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $175,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $180,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $184,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $183,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $196,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $194,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $192,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,499,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $78,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $62,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $61,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $60,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $62,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $64,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $66,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $68,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $74,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $77,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76.916,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $26,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $26,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $27,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $28,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $28,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $29,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $30,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $31,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $32,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $33,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,721,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $342,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $369,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $417,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $417,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $499,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $499,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $594,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $594,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $664,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $664,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $725,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $725,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $773,662,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $773,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $820,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $820,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $861,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $861,941,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,196,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $2,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $2,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $2,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $2,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $2,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $2,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2.708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $2,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $2,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $3,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,927,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$97,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$97,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$98,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$98,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$103,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$103,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$105,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$105,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$108,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$108,885,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $70,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $32,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $12,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $4,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $33,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000.

SEC. 4. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimate average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law.

(3) This concurrent resolution retains the social safety net that has lifted millions of Americans out of poverty and protects both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid from draconian spending cuts.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 5.9 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-test direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.3 percent under current law.

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

(A) For Medicare, this budget rejects proposals to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance. Such proposals will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks, and they will weaken the traditional Medicare program. Instead, this budget builds on the success of the Affordable Care Act, which made significant strides in health-care cost containment and put into place a framework for continuous innovation. This budget supports comprehensive reforms to give physicians and other care providers incentives to provide high-quality, coordinated, efficient care, in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability. It makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare.

(B) Any savings derived from changes or reforms to Medicare and Social Security should be used to extend the solvency of these vital programs and not be used to offset the cost of cutting taxes.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The underlying Republican budget dismantles the Medicare guarantee. It cuts Medicaid in the last year by 25 percent and includes unspecified cuts in a category called ''other mandatory spending.'' That category, of course, is Social Security and pensions for veterans and Federal employees. And then it cuts other essential Federal programs. It also repeals ObamaCare, but keeps in place the savings and tax increases that pay for it. The Republican budget also includes a $5.7 trillion tax cut that primarily benefits the wealthiest Americans and then somehow claims it will be revenue neutral by raising somebody else's taxes by $5.7 trillion, an average of about $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in America every year.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget on the other hand is based on reality and uses real numbers. Our budget makes tough choices, but not at the expense of the most vulnerable Americans. The CBC budget calls for revenue enhancements of $2.7 trillion over the next 10 years. The budget shows that this is a real and achievable goal by highlighting approximately $4.2 trillion in revenue options that the Congress could use to achieve the $2.7 trillion in new revenues, such as limiting the deductibility of corporate interest payments, limiting the special tax breaks and corporate loopholes that are baked into our Tax Code, treating capital gains and dividends like regular income. And, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, this amount is less than half of the $5.7 trillion in tax increases assumed in the Republican budget.

□ 1310

The revenue enhancements called for in our budget will be used to totally cancel the sequester, to pay for a $500 billion jobs bill that will put more than 5 million Americans back to work, and to provide for an additional $300 billion in long-term investments in our economy through education, job training, health care, science, and research.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Even with these additional investments, our budget is projected to put our Nation back on a sustainable path because the deficit reduction is more than the Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction commission 10-year goal.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC budget shows that we can create jobs, invest in education, transportation, and research, and avoid devastating health care cuts and achieve the 10-year Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction goal. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend, Mr. SCOTT, for bringing forward a budget on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus. I think it's important that we have all sorts of options here on the floor to be able to discuss as they relate to a budget.

I would note a couple of items that he conveniently left out. One is that the budget that the CBC brings to the floor—this will come as no surprise, Mr. Chairman—never gets to balance, which means it continues to spend more money than the government takes in, continues to spend more money than Washington takes in. The people of this great country understand that we can't continue going down this road over and over and over and over.

A couple of points that Mr. SCOTT made regarding the Republican budget, which is the budget that is the base budget here that we're bringing to the floor that, in fact, does get to balance in a responsible way:

It saves and strengthens and secures Medicare, as opposed to the misinformation that was provided by the other side;

It makes certain that States have the kind of flexibility so that they're able to provide the highest quality of health care to their Medicaid population;

It doesn't, as a matter of fact, address in a specific way the issue of Social Security because it provides for a reserve fund so that that is able to be addressed in a more specific way through the committee structure, which is also the important thing to recognize about the issue of taxes.

Our friends on the other side are so specific about what they accuse us of regarding taxes, but, in fact, as you know, Mr. Chairman, it's the Ways and Means Committee that will ultimately define that.

A couple of items that he conveniently left out on the budget that he is proposing is that they do raise taxes. In fact, they raise taxes by $2.8 trillion—$2.8 trillion over the next 10 years—and much of that increase in taxes is in the area of those who create jobs. We all know that if you tax something, you get less of it. So by taxing job creators, we'll get fewer jobs, and, Mr. Chairman, that's the last place we need to be heading right now. They spend $5.7 trillion more than the Republican budget that's being proposed, and they add another $2.9 trillion to the debt relative to the base budget that we're working on today.

I also want to address the issue of business taxes. They talk about removing the incentives that move jobs overseas. Well, Mr. Chairman, the biggest incentive to moving jobs overseas is that the United States now has the highest business tax rate in the industrialized world. If you're a business and you're planning on either expanding your business or you're thinking about starting a business here in the United States and you go to the line that says taxes, the other side of that says, no, go somewhere else, get out of here, because taxes are lower elsewhere, which means that jobs are being created elsewhere. We're driving jobs overseas by virtue of our current tax structure, and our friends on the other side of the aisle, especially with the CBC budget, actually increase that as opposed to decrease that.

I do, however, want to commend them, once again, for bringing a budget forward because, as you've heard earlier today and in the conversations around the budget, the President has not. We did find it. I found the President's budget. Here it is. Not a doggone thing on this poster, Mr. Chairman, because the President hasn't brought anything to us.

Now, that might be amusing to some, but the fact of the matter is that the law states that the President of the United States is required to present a budget to Congress by the first Monday in February. That was February 4 this year. We're a little over 6 weeks beyond that. The President has flagrantly—flagrantly—ignored his statutory responsibility to bring to the United States Congress a budget.

Now, some folks on the other side say, Oh, it happens all the time. Don't worry about that. It happens all the time. Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, in just one term, President Obama has missed the budget deadline more than any other President. He's now missed it four out of five times.

In the 90 years between 1923 and 2013, President Obama is the only President to miss the deadline 2 years in a row. He's the only President who's missed the deadline 3 out of 4 years in his first term, and he holds the record for the longest delay—98 days. Maybe that's the record he's trying to beat, Mr. Chairman.

So I want to commend, again, my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for bringing forward a budget. As I say, I think it's extremely important that we have all sorts of different ideas out here on the floor to be able to debate and have people take a perspective on and have the opportunity to vote ''yea'' or ''nay'' on. I would respectfully suggest, however, that their budget moves this country in the wrong direction, not the right direction, and we'll urge opposition to their budget proposal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a member of the Budget Committee.

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much, gentleman from Virginia, for yielding me the time.

It's really my privilege to discuss the jobs program that is at the heart of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. The Congressional Black Caucus does acknowledge that, while me must address our debt and deficits, in the short run, an austerity budget, as the Republicans have proposed, hurts our economy rather than helps.

We have proposed a comprehensive jobs plan, paid for proudly with the largesse and the revenue that the rich have received and tax reform measures that will propel our economic recovery for everyone, not just the haves, improve our economic competitiveness, and provide opportunities for those communities that still have not reaped the benefit of recent economic resurgence.

The CBC budget includes a $100 billion investment in a national direct job creation program estimated to create 2 million jobs directly, as well as another 800,000 jobs indirectly in the private sector; $50 billion for school modernization; $50 billion for preserving teacher, law enforcement, and first responder jobs, good public service jobs that we all need; $230 billion for investing in our Nation's crumbling infrastructure; $50 billion in rebuilding America's neighborhoods; $13 billion in job training programs; and another $7 billion in summer jobs programs.

Our significant investment in jobs is the core reason why I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, what's the time remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 9¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding the time.

I agree with the gentleman from Georgia. It's good to have debate. It's good to have choices. It's good to have options, but that doesn't mean every option is equally good. And we're faced with that situation right here, right now, and that's why I rise in opposition to the CBC substitute budget.

There are different ways to balance a budget. Many, most Americans, many of us here, think that taking 20 percent of the value of a country's GDP, like this Federal Government does and spends it, is more than enough to run it and most anything else.

But to be fair, there are other ways to balance, and one of those ways is to raise revenue. And I want to examine just a few of the ways that this substitute budget proposes to run the Federal Government by raising revenue.

□ 1320

I see from all the different ideas here that their intention was to take from whom they believe are the richest Americans, the wealthiest Americans, those who haven't paid their fair share, the 1 percent, however you want to phrase it, but let's look at it more closely.

One, taxing capital gains and dividends as ordinary income at a top rate of 39.6 percent, I think this budget forgets how many middle class Americans have 401(k)s, how many of us across the Nation invest in the stock market, how many union members still on the old pension plans, those dinosaur plans, still rely on the stock market for their retirement. What are these capital gains and dividends going to do to them? They're not the richest, for sure.

Taxing financial transactions at 0.25 percent of the asset's value, the same thing, Mr. Chairman. What about all the middle class individuals, so many Americans in this country that rely for their retirement not just on Social Security but on 401(k)s, union members who rely on pensions? And what's it going to be like for them when we're taking simply more from them from their retirement?

And then perhaps the most insidious, returning estate tax levels to 2009, not only are we taxing twice, but we are making it a bad thing, apparently, to pass on our hard-earned wealth to our children, our next generation. It's no way to run a country. It's immoral, in fact.

But let's assume all these tax increases. The fact of the matter is this budget still never balances, never comes into balance. And I was struck this morning, Mr. Chairman, by Mr. MULVANEY from South Carolina, during his 1-minute speech, when he said, when you contract with somebody to borrow money, that's what debt is. You intend to pay it back. When you contract with somebody and have no intention of paying that debt back, that's thievery.

That's exactly what we're doing, Mr. Chairman, to the children of tomorrow, to the people that do not yet exist, that do not have a vote in this matter. That's why I rise in support, and I urge all my colleagues to defeat this substitute budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget claims to be in balance, but it's only in balance if you assume they can raise $5.7 trillion in new taxes and they cut $2.5 trillion in health care and a trillion dollars more in a category that includes Social Security and pensions.

I'd also note that a great deal has been made about the capital gains and dividend benefits in 401(k)s. I would point out to the gentleman that in a 401(k) the people do not get the benefit of that deduction. They don't pay any tax at all as it grows. When they draw it out, they draw it out as ordinary income.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first thank Congressman BOBBY SCOTT for your tremendous leadership in putting together the Congressional Black Caucus's alternative budget; also, our chair, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for her very bold vision in helping to move this forward.

As a member of the Budget Committee, as I said yesterday, I've had a chance to get into the weeds of the Republican budget. And I can say with certainty that I strongly support the Congressional Black Caucus budget because it is pro-growth, pro-people, and pro-American.

I just want to follow up on the gentlewoman from Wisconsin's comments, Congresswoman MOORE, who so eloquently stated the jobs provisions of this budget.

Let me show you the chart with regard to the 5 million jobs that this budget creates. When you look at the fact that without the Congressional Black Caucus's budget it will take us until April 2015 to create enough jobs to take us back to prerecession employment, that is not acceptable with so many people in our country who are unemployed.

This budget enhances Medicare and Medicaid.

It cancels the devastating sequester and it reins in bloated Pentagon spending.

We actually end the Overseas Contingency Fund when the President's goal is accomplished in 2014 of bringing our young men and women home from Afghanistan. This is really a slush fund. It's not even funded through the Pentagon. It's a slush fund through somewhere over at the State Department.

This budget provides $230 billion to revitalize our Nation's infrastructure and creates a $500 million jobs program to accelerate the Nation's economic recovery.

To help families stay secure in their homes until the economy fully recovers, our budget also funds a restoration of critical unemployment benefits to the full 99 weeks.

Also, we support a real effort to eradicate poverty in America with the 10–20–30 formula, which targets resources to communities that need assistance.

And we call for a national strategy to eradicate poverty by cutting it in half in 10 years.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just also conclude by saying our budget protects the safety net and protects those initiatives which create pathways out of poverty, such as the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, the SNAP program, food and nutrition assistance, and the program that assists women with nutrition assistance when they're pregnant. All of these efforts are protected in the Congressional Black Caucus budget; whereas, the Ryan budget would cut these programs. These are needed desperately as we move to a pathway to prosperity.

Our budget is pro-American, pro-growth, and pro-people.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would just point out to the gentlelady that, in fact, multiple economists have looked at the budget that Republicans have brought forward, and a couple from Stanford had an editorial, I believe, in The Wall Street Journal this week and noted that their review, their study, their evaluation of the Republican budget actually demonstrates that 500,000 jobs would be produced in the first year in the Republican budget and 1.7 million jobs in the 10th year.

So if you want jobs, there's a way to get jobs created in this country, and it is to reward those individuals who are creating jobs. That's what the Republican budget does.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to another new member of the Budget Committee and a member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. Our friends on the other side have called for what they label a balanced approach, but let's look at the record.

Is their quench for new taxes insatiable? At the start of this year, they got $600 billion in new taxes due to the fiscal cliff bill that passed. In addition, they added another $1 trillion of new taxes, starting this year, for ObamaCare. A total of $1.6 trillion in new taxes have been added since New Year's. But before the ink was even dry, they began to call for even more tax increases. In fact, the budget that we're discussing here calls for an additional $2.8 trillion of taxes that will be paid for by hardworking men and women around America. Taxes like, if you sell your house, you'll have to pay an excessive tax on the gain from the sale of your house when you're in retirement.

What do they do with their new taxes? Do they take it and pay down the debt? No. Instead, they take these additional taxes and use it to spend more.

This budget is not content with ObamaCare that passed a few years ago, no. It expands that. I do commend our friends on the other side for at least showing your intentions that you're not going to be happy until every American is on socialized medicine. And this expands ObamaCare.

It also expands food stamps. At a time when projections are showing that our economy may improve, certainly we should see individuals moving away from food stamps and on to a job supporting themselves, but that's not what we're seeing. A measure of success of a society should not be how many people can we put on public assistance. The measure of success of a society should be how many men and women can we allow to help themselves.

But this budget does cut spending in one area. It cuts into our national defense, even more so than the President's budget that he submitted last year. So while we're increasing spending on things that would drain our economy and deprive our children of obtaining jobs, we're compromising the very defense of our Nation. And when does it balance? Never.

Mr. Chairman, I reject this budget and urge you to vote ''no.''

□ 1330

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just before I yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands.

First of all, the gentleman just complained about the ObamaCare taxes. What he didn't say is that the Republican budget keeps all the taxes; they just repeal the benefits.

The Republican budget also does not cancel the sequester. The sequester is estimated to cost 700,000 to 2 million jobs. They do not cancel the sequester. In fact, they have additional cuts that will even add to those job losses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you for yielding, and for the excellent job that you and your team did on the budget.

The CBC budget is proudly a statement of CBC, but also of American, values. As a physician, I'm particularly proud of its investment in health. It protects and strengthens Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and children's health insurance; fully funds the Affordable Care Act, adds a public health option, and includes provisions that will reduce health disparities.

It fully funds the AIDS Drug Assistance Program, mental health and substance abuse, maternal and child health, community health centers, the Offices of Minority Health, and the National Institute for Minority and Health Disparity Research at NIH.

It preserves Healthy Start, funds programs to increase the number and diversity of the health workforce, and gives communities the tools to improve health and well-being through restoring programs like REACH, dental health projects, the National Minority AIDS Education and Training Center, and other related programs. And it ensures that minority physicians and those practicing in poor neighborhoods and their patients will have the benefit of health information technology.

The CBC budget in its entirety addresses the socioeconomic determinants of health, beginning with the 10/20/30 program to reduce poverty. All of these provisions will reduce health care spending in the medium and long term. It is a masterpiece of a budget, and I urge everyone to vote for it. And yes, we will not be happy until every American has access to quality health care.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side, please?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. May I inquire of my friend how many more speakers he has?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I think we have two more speakers, including myself.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am so very, very proud to be here in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. This is a budget with a centerpiece: Job creation. This is a budget that is balanced. This is a budget that is in opposition to the Ryan budget that would slash and burn and cut and deny our senior citizens, deny our children, do away with Head Start and many programs that the American people deserve to have.

I am a member of the Financial Services Committee, now serving as a ranking member. I created the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program is a program that goes into communities that have been devastated by foreclosures based on the subprime meltdown that we had in this country, where so many people were tricked into signing onto loans and mortgages they could not afford. Thus, they went into foreclosure. These communities have been devastated with boarded-up homes, with stray animals on the property, with police and fire having to spend more money in these cities to try and upkeep them. The Ryan budget would do away with the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

The home values must be maintained in these communities. Some people are trying to keep up their homes, but with these boarded-up properties, the value of the homes go down. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program is a project that would revitalize the properties and put them back on the market as affordable homes. Instead of doing away with this program that helps to keep the value of our American citizens' homes, we protect it. The Ryan budget would do away with it.

Thank the CBC for understanding how to protect our neighborhoods, how to protect our consumers and our citizens, and how to make our neighborhoods safe, despite the fact that we almost went into a depression based on the financial services meltdown.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Is the gentleman ready to close?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I have one more speaker outside of myself, and then I will be pleased to close.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. We are prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the CBC for actually coming to the floor with a budget, something that the President of the United States has not been able to do four out of five times, even though it is the law of the land that he is required to do so. So I commend them for doing so.

We should look to see what is it that we agree with in this and what do we disagree with. We do agree on several points, such as that we want to have a just and fair Tax Code. We do agree, as we have in our budget, to make sure that we address the most vulnerable, those people who are out of work, the poor in the country, those who are trying hard to make ends meet, to try to end poverty as well, to try to make sure that there is health care in this country. But where we differ from the CBC is the impact that their budget would have on each and every one of these.

Their budget would have a devastating impact on those who are out of work, those who are trying to not just get a handout, but get a hand up; those who are looking for health care and not being able to afford it; those who are looking for health care from the Federal Government and realizing that within a short period of time, over the next decade, we will see, actually, the money in the Federal Government for the health care that they're receiving right now basically run out.

So that is why I applaud their attempt to come to the floor with a budget. But I ask them to take a look at what the impact of their budget will do as opposed to what the Republican budget will do. We will actually be able to create jobs in this country. We did so before in something called the JOBS Act, which we passed in a bipartisan manner.

We are going to take the next step to make sure that there is a level playing field in this country versus other countries, to bring back those jobs that have been lost to other foreign nations and bring them back into this country as well. We will be able to reform the system with regard to the poor. We will be able to provide for a system that provides for the American family in a fair and just Tax Code.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself the balance of the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget reacts to this chart which shows the recovery over past recessions.

This recession has been deeper and longer than any others. We still haven't gotten the jobs back. At the rate we're going, we're not going to get the jobs we lost in the 2008 recession for another 2 years. That's why it's important that the Congressional Black Caucus has a budget that has $500 billion in jobs. That will create about 5 million jobs as soon as we can get the money out the door, 5 million jobs, which will significantly reduce the impact of that recession. That's in stark contrast to the Republican budget, which maintains the sequester. The suggestion there is that 700,000 to 2 million jobs would be lost.

So we have a choice: 5 million jobs or lose jobs. We have a choice in terms of investments in education, transportation, scientific research, investments in our future, or cuts in those investments.

We have a credible path to achieve the Simpson-Bowles 10-year goal rather than a budget that depends on $5.7 trillion in unspecified tax increases to offset their $5.7 trillion tax cut that they say is revenue neutral. Also, it is a budget that requires massive cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and other health care programs, pensions, and everything else that will adversely affect those most in need.

The one-third cut, 25 to 30 percent cut in Medicaid, we have to remember that two-thirds of the Medicaid expense goes to the elderly and disabled. What is their plans for them if you're cutting Medicaid by 25 to 30 percent?

We can do better. We can have a progressive, pro-people, pro-growth, pro-jobs agenda; or we can have the devastating cuts in the Republican budget, which has $5.7 trillion unspecified tax cuts in it if you believe they will come up with that kind of money.

☐ 1340

I think we should make the right choice. That right choice is the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would, once again, remind my friends on the other side of the aisle and those listening that the Republican budget creates 500,000 jobs by the end of the first year, and it will result in over 1 million jobs in the 10th year. It's important to appreciate that. And I agree with my friend on the chart that he has about the jobs decreasing, the deepest and longest period of poor job growth in any recession. He's absolutely right. He's correct on that.

But what this budget does that he proposes is doubles down on policies that don't work. Spending money that we don't have is not a prescription for more job creation. A little honesty, Mr. Chairman, on this: only in Washington, as the American people know, is spending at a lower rate a cut. More spending at a lower rate in this town is a reduction, is a cut accused by the other side.

The fact of the matter is that the Republican budget increases spending on average 3.4 percent each year over the next 10 years. It's a responsible budget. It's a budget that actually gets to balance, which means that we don't spend money at the end of this budget that Washington doesn't have, and gets us on a path to paying off the debt.

It's that way that we realize that we can create jobs for the American people, we can ensure that young people in this country will be able to get out of college and be able to find a job in their sphere of education, and we can make certain that seniors have the kind of services that they need, the kind of things that have been destroyed by the current administration and by the budget being proposed on the other side. The Republican budget is a responsible budget.

I urge that Members of our party vote down the budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chair, every year since 1981, the Congressional Black Caucus has offered a fair and balanced alternative budget.

The CBC Alternative Budget for fiscal year 2014 is a "Pro-Growth, Pro-People, Pro-America" budget. It acknowledges that only by investing in people can you build a bridge to a better America.

America doesn't need an austerity budget. Americans need and deserve more.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the CBC "Pro-Growth, Pro-People, Pro-America" Budget Alternative.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to ask my colleagues to reject the budget put forth by Chairman RYAN and the Republican led Congress and support the FY 2014 Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget, the Congressional Progressive Caucus Alternative Budget, and Democratic Substitute Budget. These budgets will protect our families, put Americans back to work, restore fairness to our tax code, and make critical investments in education, transportation, innovation, research, and job creation.

The proposals submitted by the Republicans would undermine vital programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and SNAP. The Ryan budget cuts programs that assist low-income families, communities of color, young children, students, older people, individuals with disabilities, the unemployed, and the uninsured.

Specifically, the CBC Alternative Budget proposes a balanced plan that focuses on economic growth, invests in communities, and creates economic opportunity for all.

The CBC budget:

Cancels the sequester; creates a $500 billion jobs program to accelerate the Nation's economic recovery; provides $230 billion in investments for America's crumbling infrastructure; reduces the deficit by $2.8 trillion over the next 10 years; addresses the Medicare Doc Fix;. protects and enhances Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, and TANF; proposes the 10–20–30 plan which targets resources to the communities that need assistance the most; addresses health disparities through full funding for the Affordable Care Act and strong support for the National Institutes of Health.

Again, I ask my colleagues to vote against the Ryan Budget that does not balance the budget, and will harm our children, seniors, and the middle class, and to vote for resolutions that strike a sensible balance between revenue increases and spending cuts.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–21.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

(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 2013 through 2023:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,007,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,539,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,090,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,312,805,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,467,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,594,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,731,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,890,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,090,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,311,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,521,978,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: −$30,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $268,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $483,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $533,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $563,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $565,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $581,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $606,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $633,351,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $660,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $689,833,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $3,490,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,802,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,699,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,661,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,745,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,912,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,085,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,236,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,394,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,628,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,786,461,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $3,446,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,737,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,694,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,664,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,736,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,873,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $4,044,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $4,180,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,349,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,590,188,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,735,162,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the

amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: −$1,438,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: −$1,198,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: −$604,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: −$351,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: −$268,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: −$279,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: −$313,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: −$290,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: −$259,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: −$278,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: −$213,184,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $17,613,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $19,003,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $19,765,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $20,279,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $20,770,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $21,296,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,853,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,392,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,904,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,427,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $23,907,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $12,796,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $14,077,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $14,748,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $15,161,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $15,497,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,842,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $16,234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,620,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,995,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,418,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $17,799,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $653,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $627,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $533,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $577,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $532,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $551,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $530,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $541,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $552,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $564,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $554,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $578,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $566,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $590,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $583,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $602,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $590,707,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $65,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $74,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $66,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $65,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $63,666,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $64,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $66,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $67,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $68,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $70,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $72,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,420,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $32,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $37,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $40,301,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $39,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $40,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $41,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $42,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $43,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $44,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,747,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $13,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $19,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $24,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $21,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $22,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,305,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $47,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $50,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $53,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $52,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $53,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,651,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $54,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $55,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $57,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,063,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $58,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $59,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $61,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,084,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $16,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $17,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $17,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $16,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,098,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $17,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $18,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,531,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$26,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$22,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,477,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $20,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $24,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $25,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $25,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $29,769,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $30,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,422,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $263,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $269,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $264,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $271,121,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $266,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $272,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $242,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $218,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $223,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $194,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $145,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $151,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $126,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $128,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $135,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $130,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,190,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $55,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $35,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $33,860,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $33,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $34,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $35,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,664,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $36,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $37,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,057,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $395,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $432,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $432,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $254,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $144,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $136,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $142,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $137,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $139,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $142,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $145,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $148,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $146,217,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $372,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $433,346,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $423,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $517,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $505,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $569,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $623,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $659,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $696,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $695,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $743,148,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $731,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $776,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $774,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $820,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $817,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $870,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $867,771,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $507,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $525,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $525,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $547,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $546,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $593,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $608,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $608,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $631,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $631,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $691,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $690,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $738,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $738,339,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $787,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $787,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $862,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $861,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $893,584,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $893,155,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $633,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $703,311,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $690,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $730,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $717,121,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $642,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $639,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $606,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $602,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $609,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $615,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $630,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $648,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $643,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $672,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $671,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $685,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $678,911,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,231,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $36,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,038,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $148,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $159,837,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $169,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $164,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $179,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $175,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $175,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $174,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $173,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $185,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $184,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $190,399,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $194,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $193,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $207,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $205,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $204,760,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $202,814,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $56,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $73,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,265,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $66,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $68,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $67,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $69,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $71,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $73,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $75,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $82,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $85,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,045,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $25,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $24,631,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,542,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $25,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $26,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $26,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $27,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $28,524,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $29,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $30,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $31,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $32,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,579,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $332,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $332,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $350,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $379,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $379,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $433,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $433,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $526,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $629,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $629,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $701,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $701,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $763,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $763,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $810,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $810,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $852,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $852,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $890,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $890,245,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $2,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $2,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $6,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $7,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $6,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $6,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $6,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $6,823,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,809,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$76,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, −$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$90,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$90,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$97,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$97,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$98,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$98,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$103,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$103,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$105,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$105,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$108,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$108,885,000,000.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 201. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 6.3 percent under current law.

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

(A) State budgets have suffered significantly during the economic downturn. According to the National Governor's Association, half of all states are projecting lower total revenues in 2013 than they saw in 2008. To assist struggling states, the Back to Work Budget temporarily increases funding for Medicaid – the single largest portion of total state spending – through the Federal Medical Assistance Percentages program. This will help stabilize Medicaid, which is a vital program for low-income and middle-class families, providing health and long-term care services to those stricken with catastrophic illness, injury, or disability, or facing prolonged infirmity.

(B) The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act expanded a number of tax credits targeted at working families to boost relief during hard economic times. The Back to Work Budget retains the improvements made to the Earned Income Tax Credit (qualifying children and phase-out range), Child and Dependent Care Credit, and the American Opportunity Tax Credit. These credits fuel demand for American businesses by putting money in the hands of families that truly need it.

(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 2014 is 5.9 percent.

(2) For non means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 5.1 percent under current law.

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

(A) Medicare is a cornerstone of the American health care system for more than 45 million America seniors. It is an exemplary program that provides the most efficient care to a segment of the population that costs more to treat. The Back to Work Budget protects beneficiaries and makes the system even more efficient. It amends Part D of Medicare to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prescription drug prices with pharmaceutical manufacturers, as the Department of Veterans Affairs currently does, which will save Medicare $157 billion over 10 years and will reduce costs for seniors. The budget adopts policies to prohibit ''pay for delay'' agreements that reduce competition and modifies periods of exclusivity to increase availability of needed therapies. The budget also accelerates the use of bundling payments as an alternative to fee-for-service payments. It builds on Affordable Care Act efficiencies in administration of information and payments. Using standardized electronic systems for administration information such as claims, billing, payments and eligibility creates a more efficient and less fragmented health care system.

(B) The bulk of agriculture commodity subsidies go to large corporate farms that grow commodity crops such as corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and soybeans. These crops are often grown using unsustainable methods that require high levels of fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides, leading to polluted waterways and degraded soil. The Back to Work Budget eliminates certain commodity subsidies, which will save billions, while reducing environmental impacts.

Amend the title so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and fiscal years 2015 through 2023.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in presenting our Back to Work budget, a budget of the Progressive Caucus of this House, we are first pleased to announce that in less than 48 hours, 105,000 citizen cosponsors have joined with us in presenting this budget. They are pleased to affirm, and the point of this is House Budget Committee chairman, Representative PAUL RYAN, has released a budget proposal that is the most reckless austerity plan he's ever proposed. Instead, we get a budget that will slow the economy and kill jobs.

We urge you to vote for the Progressive Caucus' Back to Work budget which will grow the economy, create 7 million jobs, and ask the wealthy and multinationals to pay their fair share so we can make investments in our people and our future—105,000 citizen cosponsors in less than 48 hours.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the cochair of the Progressive Caucus, my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, KEITH ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just congratulate everybody with the Progressive Caucus and thank all of the staff that did such a good job preparing this excellent budget which gives us an amazing choice as Americans to confront this jobs crisis. I'm so proud that our Speaker has told the world—Speaker BOEHNER—that the debt crisis is not immediate. He's right, it's not. But let me tell you what is immediate: the jobs crisis.

That's why the Back to Work budget brings down unemployment to 5.3 within 3 years by investing in people—our construction workers, our teachers, and our police officers. We're also fiscally responsible, reducing the deficit over the long run by $4.4 trillion.

The Republican budget makes the wrong choices for our country. I respect the fact that they have honestly projected a vision, but it's an austere vision for the American people. It's no surprise that this message lost the election that we just had. It was put in front of the people. They said we will have none of it, but the American people do want what's in the Back to Work budget.

Gallup released a poll that confirms what you and I already know, and that is that the American people want jobs, not austerity; 72 percent, Mr. Chairman, of Americans said that they support putting people back to work repairing our Nation's infrastructure, including a majority of Republicans.

Now, the fact is that the Back to Work budget is about putting people back to work. As the Speaker and I agree, it's not the moment where we need to clamp down on debt. It's the moment we need to put Americans back to work. So which budget meets the test? The Progressive Caucus budget invests at the level the American Society of Civil Engineers says is needed to close our infrastructure gap. The Republican budget cuts transportation by 20 percent.

Mr. Chairman, it's time to get back to work, and let's pass the Back to Work budget.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today, as they say, in opposition to the Progressive Caucus substitute. While my friends across the aisle are motivated by good intentions, I believe that their substitute is, frankly, a blueprint for fiscal disaster. Instead of restoring the certainty to the economy by promoting fairness and providing American families the opportunity for more prosperity, this budget is simply a black hole for American families.

I can at least give credit to both the Progressive Caucus and the Democrat Caucus for offering a budget because the President of the United States has failed to do so. As you are aware, on February 4, the President, as required by law, is to give us a budget. It's March 20 now; and the American people, well, we're still waiting. That is the fourth time in 5 years that President Obama has failed to submit a budget on time and failed to abide by the law.

The Senate Democrats, well, they're not much better. It has taken them almost 4 years to produce a budget that basically now increases government spending by $265 billion, taxes up by almost $1 trillion, and cuts health care providers by almost $300 billion. Over the period covered by the budget, deficits under the Senate plan are nearly $4 trillion larger than those under the House plan.

So, today, we have a Progressive substitute on the floor. This budget will do what? It will raise taxes by almost $6 trillion over the next 10 years, including a new tax on carbon. $5.7 trillion in new taxes necessarily means greater tax burdens on who? The American family. These tax cuts put job creators in the penalty box again, and that means more Americans will be where? Without jobs.

These tax policies are deceptively sold under, really, a warped notion of what ''fairness'' is. The reality is this ''fairness'' of theirs is merely a heavy-handed government taking from one pocket and putting in another pocket.

This budget's tax policy is based on the equality of outcome rather than equality of opportunity. When he's talking about equality, Milton Friedman once pointed out that a society that puts equality before freedom will get neither. A society that puts freedom before equality, however, will get a high degree of both.

So true fairness is the freedom to manage and direct one's own life and one's own future. Those who take risks giving their all in the pursuit of the American Dream deserve to keep what they've earned. Those who work hard day in and day out, they deserve to keep what they've earned.

But the Progressive budget is nothing but regressive. There's nothing fair about this budget, especially to the risk-taker or to the hardworking American family. Their budget would spend nearly $9 trillion more than the Republican budget. Note, now, when I say those numbers—where does that money come from—that means from our children and our grandchildren. They ultimately will be the ones who will have to bear this burden.

This budget would also establish a government-run health insurance option under ObamaCare and let the government basically set price controls on drugs. What does that mean? That means for those who were around back in 1970s, I think that's most of us, price controls on gasoline. How did that work out for us? Not too long. Waiting lines for gas is one thing. Waiting lines, however, for lifesaving medicine is a whole other story.

This budget would also expand the current, broken, and failed Federal job-training program without any reform whatsoever. This budget calls for even more money for the bureaucrats in Washington with regard to education, and this budget calls for even more money into the broken-down highway transit system that we have in this country.

□ 1350

And this budget even fails in the government's first responsibility—providing for the common defense. This budget further goes and guts the Defense Department by calling for almost $700 billion in cuts to the Pentagon compared to our budget.

This Progressive substitute then would put this country basically on the wrong path. For that reason, I urge a ''no'' vote on this budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, there is some adage about if you do the same thing over and over again without changing it, that that is a mark of insanity. That adage applies to the Ryan budget 2, the same as Ryan budget 1, and to 10 years of failed fiscal policy that our budget, by putting people to work, attempts to get us out of that fiscal black hole.

With that, let me yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California, Congresswoman LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank Congressmen GRIJALVA and ELLISON for their bold and visionary leadership of the Progressive Caucus.

As a member of the Budget Committee opposed to the job-killing ''Pathway to Poverty'' Ryan budget, I stand in strong support of the Progressive Caucus Back to Work budget. The number one priority of the Progressive Caucus budget is fixing the job crisis. That is exactly what we want to do in our Back to Work budget. That is what it does.

Most economists argue that job creation equals deficit reduction. The CPC budget asks the wealthiest 1 percent, Big Oil, and huge corporations to pay just a little more so we can invest in the American people and create 7 million American jobs.

Our budget saves over $1.8 trillion in bloated Pentagon spending by eliminating the Overseas Contingency Operations account, which really is a slush fund that has funded two wars off budget. We refocus our resources into a modern military able to face 21st century threats.

We also require the Pentagon, the single largest Federal agency, with the highest waste, fraud, and abuse, to pass an audit test and pass it now. It is the only Federal agency not subject to an audit.

Our budget replaces the disastrous sequester by supporting critical spending in education, infrastructure, and we reject benefit cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give support to what is happening for the Path to Prosperity. It is a responsible budget.

And I also rise to encourage my colleagues. It is a good thing for us to come down and get a chance to talk about budgets and where we are headed. It is a good thing to propose multiple options to be able to have this kind of dialogue about where we are headed as a Nation. This is what is happening in the Senate this week as well. For the first time in 4 years, the Senate has an ongoing dialogue about budgets and about the future.

While almost $6 trillion of debt has been added to our children, we have not done a budget between the House and the Senate in almost 4 years now. It is time to be able to do that. I encourage my Senate colleagues as well, and congratulate them for also taking this up.

I do look forward to one day seeing the President's budget. I did see today in the news that the President has released his final four bracket for the NCAA men's basketball bracket, but we have yet to actually see his budget. At some point, we hope to be able to see our national priority be on budgets, not on NCAA brackets, in the days ahead.

The budget that we are proposing focuses on families that need certainty. The way that you budget and you plan for the future and the way to set aside finances for the future is some kind of certainty in what is happening. We don't have that right now as a Nation.

For most families that actually live month to month, they don't have a large amount of resources to set aside for future investment. If a ticking debt bomb is coming for them, they expect the people in Washington to actually pay attention to that so that the little bit of money they can set aside for retirement doesn't blow up in some giant debt crisis in the days ahead.

This is a moment to deal with our debt. The budget that we are proposing is a responsible budget that takes 10 years to slowly start to bring us back into balance. Only in Washington is a drastic draconian cut actually reducing the increase.

What the Ryan budget does, what we are proposing, is a 1.6 percent decrease on the increase. Right now, the Federal budget is scheduled to increase by 5 percent over the next 10 years. We will actually just increase the budget 3.4 percent. I would say that is fairly modest. That is a way to be able to deal with what is happening in the Nation, and it is also a way to deal with what is happening to come in the days ahead.

We are not promoting additional stimulus spending as the budget that is being proposed now is. A giant proposal for additional spending did not help us several years ago. What was promised right now is that we would be at 5½ percent unemployment rather than still hovering near 8 percent unemployment, as we have for so long now.

Jobs do not come from additional Federal spending long term. If you want real jobs, it has to be in the private sector. That is the only thing that can be sustained; otherwise, you are dependent year after year after year with additional taxes and additional spending. We need to have the private sector be engaged in this. The way to do that is to encourage the private sector with some level of stability.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support the Back to Work budget. The Back to Work budget puts jobs first, which is actually the best way to reduce our deficit. Jobs equal deficit reduction.

Our budget will create nearly 7 million jobs and bring unemployment down to 5 percent in 3 years. It protects Social Security and strengthens the critical benefits of Medicare and Medicaid. Our budget responds to what the American people say they want: job creation, more revenues from those who can afford to pay, and smart spending cuts that target waste, not opportunity.

A new Gallup poll released today found that more than three-quarters of Americans, including a majority of Republicans, support Federal Government efforts that focus on creating jobs. Americans don't want austerity or tax cuts, more tax cuts for the rich. They want jobs, good jobs.

So you can vote for good jobs by voting for the Back to Work budget.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman who played a critical role in fashioning the budget that is before us, the Republican budget, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, like speakers before me, I am thankful and appreciative that others are proposing substitute budgets. It is good to have options, Mr. Chair. It is good to have a debate. But not all options are equally good, so I rise against the substitute budget that is now before us.

Admittedly, there are a couple of different ways and a combination thereof that you can balance a budget: spending cuts—and, by the way, when a Federal Government already takes, on average, 20 percent of the value of all the goods and services that a country produces, a lot of us think that is more than enough to run the government and that spending reductions are actually the solution.

Revenue increases might also get you to balance. That is certainly what this Progressive substitute tries to do. Nearly $6 trillion in tax increases over the next 10 years. And, by the way, Mr. Chairman, they don't get to balance. It doesn't happen. $6 trillion more of the people's property this budget confiscates, and they still can't balance the budget.

Why is balancing the budget so darn important? Well, a couple different reasons. You cannot start paying off the debt until you get to a balanced budget so that you have a surplus to start paying that debt down.

So their intention, Mr. Chair, is not to pay down the debt. That is what they are stating in this budget, and, frankly, that's immoral.

If you intend to pay a debt back in any contractual situation, or even in this country's budget situation, it is called a debt. When you take money from future generations, when you take money from people that don't yet exist with no intention to pay it back, as this budget does, have no intention to pay it back, it is called thievery, and that's wrong. That is why this budget needs to fail.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, when, in the course of the last decade-plus, multinational corporations, billionaires in this country have been curried favor with tax breaks, loopholes that have allowed them to pay less than the average American, that has hurt the economy. And I would suggest that, aside from thievery, that is gaming the system and not sharing in the full responsibility we all have as Americans to take care of this country.

I would now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman POCAN.

□ 1400

Mr. POCAN. The number one issue before our country is not the deficit; it's getting the economy going and creating jobs. We have 12 million people who are still unemployed and millions more who are underemployed in this country. That's why the best budget we could put forward is one that creates jobs, not one that costs us 2 million jobs as is estimated by the austerity policies of the Republican Party. It's not just the Congressional Progressive Caucus that says this. Our Congressional Budget Office says that three-quarters of the deficit we're going to see in 2014 is caused by underemployment and unemployment.

The real enemy to deficit reduction is not a new made-up spending crisis; it's the need for jobs.

The Back to Work budget makes a real commitment to job creation, creating 7 million jobs and reducing unemployment to 5 percent within 3 years. It invests in education, in police, firefighters, teachers, infrastructure; and it ends the job-killing cuts of the sequester. Instead of balancing the budget on the backs of the middle class and the neediest, the Back to Work budget has the back of America's middle class, and it does it while responsibly reducing the deficit by $4.4 trillion.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Back to Work budget.

Mr. GARRETT. In recognizing that we can create the jobs and the prosperity by not raising taxes at the same time, I yield now 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. It's time for our Nation to get our priorities right; and according to the Constitution, there are only a few things that we should be doing here in Congress. One of them is to provide for the common defense; but, sadly, this substitute bill guts our national defense and leaves us very vulnerable as a Nation. Let's review where we've been.

A couple of years ago, Defense made some efficiencies under Secretary Gates and cut $78 billion. Then with the Budget Control Act, immediately, $487 billion more was cut from the national defense. Then sequestration has kicked in, which is another $500 billion from national defense, and this proposed budget here goes even beyond that.

Our Republican budget replaces cuts from the sequester back into the national defense and keeps it a priority. It makes sure our men and women in uniform have what they need, but this budget cuts an additional $658 billion from the Pentagon. Even Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta earlier said that, with sequestration, it would hollow out our forces. So, certainly, this would do even more.

With sequestration, if we don't replace it, which this budget does not, we're going to see 100,000 fewer soldiers and marines; the Navy will likely have to mothball 60 ships, including two carrier battle groups while a quarter of our bombers would be jeopardized; we would also see the elimination of 250 fighter aircraft and higher fees for military health care. Now, that's not providing for the common defense. In addition, if sequestration is not overturned, for which our budget allows, then we could see up to 2.1 million jobs cut.

They're calling this budget a Back to Work budget, but when our men and women in uniform come back from Afghanistan, instead of being met with ticker tape parades, they're going to be met with pink slips. It's wrong, and we can do better.

There are serious ramifications. Our budget replaces those cuts, and it's needed. There are threats in the world, and this is no time for us to be cutting our defense. We have Iran threatening not only our neighbors, but us; and it is getting closer to having a nuclear capability. We have even this week North Korea shooting off a missile and putting out YouTube videos of that missile coming here and hitting not only cities of the United States, but even the U.S. Capitol. In addition to that, there are radical Islamists around the world who still want to harm us.

Now is not the time to cut our national defense. We need to keep our priorities right. We need to provide for the common defense. We need to pass the Republican House budget and reject this substitute that will hollow out our forces and endanger our families.

Mr. GRIJALVA. The Back to Work budget sets a level of 2006 for defense. Pentagon spending has doubled over the last decade; 2006 was the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and the war on terrorism. We just celebrated the 10th anniversary of Iraq. There has been $2.2 trillion spent on that war—a war, I might say, that was not paid for at all. This does not cripple defense; this merely brings it to a realistic level so as to share in the reconstruction of this economy of ours.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I want to thank Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GRIJALVA for their leadership with the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

I rise in support of the Back to Work budget. Let me just say it again—back to work. This is what this budget is all about, ladies and gentlemen—investment in our infrastructure. We have bridges that are falling apart, streets that need repair, water systems that need upgrading. We can create jobs. The Republicans and the Ryan budget talk about jobs. They talk the talk, but they don't walk the walk.

I tried to get an amendment on the TIGER program, which would increase the funding for jobs in transportation that we need so badly. They rejected that. They rejected that because they're focused on making sure that they give tax cuts to the richest people in this country, making sure that they keep those tax loopholes for the privileged—not investing in America's future and in America's growth.

The people are expecting us to make them their priority, to make sure that we are investing in opportunities for them, their families, their children, and their neighborhoods. No, the Ryan budget pays no attention to any of that. These privileged people on the other side of the aisle, who don't have to worry about jobs and who don't have to worry about any of that, deny the people the right to just participate.

Mr. GARRETT. I would ask the Chair how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. That being the case, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, the Back to Work budget is the first budget that recognizes the truth about our so-called ''deficit crisis'': we don't have one. Speaker BOEHNER and Chairman RYAN went on television on Sunday and said that there is no immediate crisis, that it is the unemployment numbers we should be worried about.

Now is not the time for austerity. It is the time for the government to invest where the private sector won't. They're sitting on their money, waiting. This is the time to bolster our new and growing industries, like biomedical research and technology. Now is the time to rebuild our infrastructure. Creating jobs, as this budget does, is the only way we will become self-sustaining. With lower unemployment, fewer people need public assistance, and more people pay taxes. That's how you shrink the deficit. That's fiscal responsibility.

My Republican colleagues love to talk about balancing household budgets. Well, I don't know any American family that would use its children's lunch money to pay down its credit cards, and that's what they're proposing in the Ryan budget. Most families choose to invest in college educations, health care and retirements, trading current debt for future returns.

It's time to choose what kind of country we're going to live in. Do we grow with education, investments and a strong social safety net; or do we cut our way to higher unemployment, instability, and class divide?

Mr. GARRETT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the radical Republican budget, which will increase unemployment and savage Medicare and Medicaid and other programs that families depend on, mostly to finance tax cuts for the rich and partly to fix the deficit crisis that we have already tamed. In 2009, the deficit was 10.1 percent of GDP. Next year, it will be down to 5.3 percent. This is the largest and fastest reduction in deficits since the demobilization after World War II.

To add insult to injury, the Republican budget would make sweeping, regressive changes to the Tax Code, which would raise taxes on middle class families by up to $3,000. Millionaires, however, would actually see a tax cut averaging $245,000 a year. This is just wrong. Working families should never have to pay more just so the rich can pay less.

We no longer, if we ever did, have a deficit crisis. With 12 million people searching for employment and with almost 5 million Americans without jobs for more than 6 months, we do have a jobs crisis. According to the Economic Policy Institute, the net effect of the Republican budget would be to decrease the gross domestic product by 1.7 percent, resulting in 2 million additional jobs lost in 2014 alone.

If budgets are truly a reflection of our values, then what does it say about the priorities of House Republicans when their budget increases health care costs for seniors, cuts 2 million jobs, and hits middle class families with a tax increase in order to subsidize another tax cut for the rich?

□ 1410

In contrast, the Back to Work budget addresses the jobs crisis head on by creating nearly 7 million jobs in the first year, by making stark investments in our infrastructure, schools, and transits. It protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and family support systems.

Conservative governments in Europe have instituted the same austerity policies offered by the Republican budget. The result has been a double-dip recession and 12 percent unemployment. We should learn from their stupidity.

I rise today to oppose the radical Republican budget, which is merely a repackaging of the same extreme agenda that the American people rejected last fall.

Simply put, this bill is a disaster.

The House Republicans' budget would again try to end Medicare as we know it by replacing the guarantee of health coverage with a private voucher program that would reduce benefits. This throws seniors back onto the mercy of the private insurance market, while every year giving them less and less of the health benefits they have earned through a lifetime of hard work.

The Republican budget would not only make permanent the arbitrary, across-the-board budget cuts known as 'sequestration,' it would go further—making even more savage cuts to domestic programs. Critical social services like food stamps, college assistance for low-income families, Section 8 housing, home heating assistance, and Medicaid—all would face drastic cuts. Under the Republican proposal, our transportation investments would be cut by 20% over the next 10 years, exacerbating the challenges posed by our outdated roads, bridges, and airports. The bill also completely eliminates support for PBS, NPR, AmeriCorps, and the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

The Republican budget makes all of these cuts while refusing to cut a dime of military spending. What's worse, the Republican plan actually reverses planned reductions to military spending by increasing cuts to vital social programs—a callously unfair proposal that will have terrible consequences for millions of American families.

To add insult to injury, the bill before us today would make sweeping, regressive changes to the tax code which would raise taxes on middle class families by up to $3,000. Millionaires, however, would actually see a tax cut that averages $245,000 a year. This is just wrong. Working families should never have to pay more just so the rich can pay less, which is just one more reason why we must defeat this bill.

We no longer, if we ever did, have a deficit crisis. What we have is a jobs crisis, with 12 million people searching for employment, and almost 5 million Americans without a job for more than 6 months.

In contrast with the Republican spending plan, the Back to Work Budget addresses the jobs crisis head-on by creating nearly 7 million jobs in the first year by making historic investments in our infrastructure, schools, and transit. It would enable States and local governments to hire laid-off teachers, cops, and firefighters, putting them back to work in strengthening our communities.

The Back to Work Budget would preserve our commitment to seniors by making no cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security, while reducing health care costs by negotiating drug prices, increasing competition in the health care marketplace, and reducing fraud.

Our budget would also adopt a commonsense tax system that asks the wealthiest to pay their fair share while lowering the tax burden on middle class families. We would also extend the Making Work Pay tax credit to help low-wage workers get back to work and providing for their families.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, the net effect of all of these policies would decrease GDP by 1.7%, resulting in 2 million jobs lost in 2014 alone. If budgets are truly a reflection of our values, then what does it say about the priorities of House Republicans when their budget increases health care costs for seniors, cuts 2 million jobs, and hits middle class families with a tax increase in order to subsidize another tax cut for the rich?

The American people rejected this extremist ideology last fall, and I hope that my colleagues follow their lead and reject this bill today.

But the larger problem with the Republican budget is that it will increase unemployment and savage Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs that families depend upon, in order to fix a deficit "crisis" which we have already tamed. In 2009 the deficit was 10.1% of GDP. By next year, it will be down to 5.3%. This is the largest and fastest reduction in deficits since the demobilization after World War II.

Basic economics tells us that government should pay off debt during good times while protecting jobs and middle class security during bad times. By balancing revenues with investments and creating millions of new jobs, the Back to Work Budget would produce significant economic growth while reducing the deficit by $4.4 trillion over 10 years.

But callous, unbalanced cuts to domestic programs, particularly of the magnitude that House Republicans are proposing, would spell disaster for our economic recovery.

While GOP leaders claim to be making tough choices when it comes to our spending priorities, again and again they seem to only be making the wrong choices. They choose tax breaks for millionaires and the largest corporations over tax fairness for the middle class. They choose to reduce access to health care by voucherizing Medicare instead of protecting the benefits that seniors have earned through a lifetime of hard work. They choose to avoid required reductions in military spending by instead cutting programs that feed hungry children, heat family homes, and make college affordable.

Conservative governments in Europe have instituted the same austerity policies offered by the Republican budget. The result is a double-dip recession and 12% unemployment. We should learn from their stupidity.

Mr. GARRETT. And just to take a word from the gentlelady from California, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), who has actually walked the walk and created jobs to create more American prosperity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, we owe it to the American people to produce a smart, responsible budget; a budget that balances, that encourages job growth, and supports job creators; a budget that simplifies our overly complicated Tax Code and lowers tax rates for corporations and the middle class.

This budget just doesn't add up. In fact, it further complicates the Tax Code and will greatly hamper job creation. It would create five new tax brackets for upper-income individuals and small businesses, and would raise taxes on hardworking middle class Americans. It's not good policy to raise taxes ever, and especially not in a struggling economy.

I know what it takes to run a successful business. I have owned and operated my small business for 41 years, and it was said I walked the walk, I talked the talk.

This budget won't work in the real world, and it won't work in any world. This budget contains trillions in new taxes, trillions in new spending, and adds trillions more to the deficit. Pretty soon this budget would need its own bailout.

The American people deserve better. They beg for the Ryan budget. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this substitute.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), the cochair of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my Republican friends on convincing some Americans that the only thing they should be thinking about is debt and deficit. While it is important, we acknowledge that, even Speaker BOEHNER last weekend said that it was not an immediate crisis. But the immediate crisis is the jobs crisis, so we should be comparing these budgets based on who creates more jobs.

Now, the Progressive Caucus Back to Work budget creates 7 million jobs in its first year with a jobs package that repairs 35,000 public schools, rehires 300,000 laid-off teachers, and boosts consumer demand with a tax credit for working families. I believe my friend who just spoke said that we raise taxes on middle class families. Not true. We actually cut taxes on middle class families.

The Republican budget would kill 2 million jobs in its first year by slashing investment in research, education, and public safety.

Now by a job-to-job comparison, not just a debt-to-debt, deficit-to-deficit comparison—again, an important thing, but not the most important thing—on the jobs measure, the Back to Work budget is superior in every way to the Republican budget. It puts people back to work doing jobs that need doing.

The American Society of Civil Engineers, experts who are completely nonpartisan, have said we have $3.3 trillion in unmet maintenance needs. We make a downpayment on that infrastructure gap, and we put Americans back to work with the Back to Work budget.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has the right to close.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Back to Work budget is a budget that is common sense, and it reflects the values of the American people. It is a budget that deals with the realities of our economic times and our social times in this country.

This budget is about investment. It's about saying that the greatest resource we have in this country is the American people. We need to put them to work. We need to educate them for the future, and we need to provide them with some economic security for the middle class, working people, so they, too, can enjoy the economic benefits of this great Nation of ours.

We also do not step on those who are the most vulnerable. We provide them with the security, with Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid, so that they, too, can continue to utilize the full benefits of those earned benefits that they have.

This fiscal debate today with the Ryan budget, too, and the other good budgets that have been proposed today is really an argument and a debate about the values and the future of this Nation. The Back to Work budget accepts the reality that we're in. It does not try to repeat a failed policy of the past, and takes us in a direction that in 10 years—and in 10 years, this country will be more solvent, more secure, and unemployment will be down and the investment in this time will pay off tremendous dividends for the future. Our budget is about the future. It is not about being mired in the past, as the Ryan budget is.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, so here we are at the end of the debate, and where are we?

The Progressive substitute, what would it do? It would raise taxes on the American family. It would increase spending throughout the country. It would put programs such as Medicare, to allow them to go bankrupt, if you will, within the decade, in 2023. It would do all this and put the burden on our children and never, ever balance.

In contrast, before us is the House Republican's Path to Prosperity. What does it do? It takes the first step. It takes the very first step toward reversing this trend, this path to debt and decline that the President and his fellow Democrats on that side of the aisle, and the Senate Democrats as well, have laid out for the American people. See, the Republican budget stops spending money that we do not have. The Republican budget simply does the right things in this area.

The Republican budget fixes our broken Tax Code. It does away with all of those unfair corporate deductions and the like that we've talked about. There is some commonality there. So it fixes our broken Tax Code, and it does so in a way at the end of the day creates jobs, increases wages, and helps the American family. The Republican budget will protect and strengthen important priorities like Medicare and national security, not allowed by the other side of the aisle. The Republican budget will also reform our welfare programs, such as Medicaid, so they can actually deliver on their promise and not go bankrupt.

Every American family, every family in this country understands the necessity of having a balanced budget. The President and the Democrats could surely learn by talking to them across the country. Budgets are more than numbers. Budgets basically come here to Congress and set priorities, if you will; and beyond that, they have real impact on human beings.

Unlike the Progressive substitute that's before us right now, the Path to Prosperity will provide real economic security for workers, for parents. It will ensure security retirement for the elderly and our seniors. It will expand opportunity for the young. For that reason, I urge this Chamber to vote on the side of freedom and opportunity and reject the Progressive Caucus budget substitute.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the Grijalva substitute amendment.

The amendment before us right now does nothing to get our nation back on a sustainable spending path. Instead, it proposes devastating cuts to the Department of Defense that would threaten our national security. It does nothing to protect the solvency of the Medicare trust fund. And this budget further complicates the tax code by creating five additional income tax brackets.

Americans are in this economic crisis together. We must work together to overcome these challenges that are having devastating effects on our economy, the jobs market, and could seriously hinder the standard of living for the younger generations.

The House budget, the Republican Path to Prosperity, builds upon the bipartisan Fiscal Commission which my bill, the 'Bowles–Simpson Plan of Lowering America's Debt Act,' also does. To be effective, Congress must eliminate waste and restore fiscal discipline to the government. The Simpson–Bowles Commission has given us a framework to implement targeted cuts so we don't have to subject the American people to arbitrary across–the–board–cuts again. The budget before us today is the way to go.

At a time when our country is more than $16 trillion in debt—all of which is saddled on our children and grandchildren—Congress must act to end the years upon years of rampant, runaway federal spending that has occurred under both political parties.

It's Congress' job to pass a budget that is balanced and carefully spends Americans' hard–earned tax dollars. I urge my colleagues to reject the Grijalva amendment and instead implement the House Republican budget, the responsible, balanced budget which builds on the Simpson–Bowles Commission's suggestions, and will foster a healthier economy and help create jobs across America.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113–21 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment no. 1 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

Amendment no. 2 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

Amendment no. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

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

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 154, noes 261, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

AYES—154

Andrews
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
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—261

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
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)
Guthrie
Hall
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
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
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Aderholt
Amodei
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1446

Messrs. WEBER of Texas, SCHWEIKERT, BARBER, DUNCAN of South Carolina, GOSAR, ROONEY and BARTON, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, NEAL and TONKO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 105, noes 305, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—105

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Deutch
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—305

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
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
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Negrete McLeod

NOT VOTING—20

Aderholt
Amodei
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Hurt
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Pelosi
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman

□ 1456

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I was detained and missed this vote for the RECORD. I support this amendment and would have voted for it. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 84, the Scott of VA Substitute amendment to H. Con. Res. 25, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 84. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 84, noes 327, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

AYES—84

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
Davis, Danny
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Takano
Tierney
Tonko
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Welch
Yarmuth

NOES—327

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Himes
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock

Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Negrete McLeod

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt
Amodei
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, Austin
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Wilson (FL)

□ 1503

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–21.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2014 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

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

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2023:

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

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

Fiscal year 2014: $2,238,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2.569,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,736,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,855,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,977,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,094,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,226,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,394,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,583,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,758,528,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: -$42,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$48,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$55,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$62,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$66,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$71,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$76,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$82,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$88,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$95,000,000,000.

(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 2014: $2,731,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,637,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,784,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,879,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,949,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,107,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,214,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,321,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,444,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,514,166,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $2,776,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,691,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,778,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $2,851,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,924,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,060,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,175,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,279,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,430,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,470,191,000,000.

(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 2014: -$538,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$122,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$41,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $4,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $52,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $34,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $50,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $114,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $153,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $288,337,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $17,770,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,078,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $18,314,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $18,575,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $18,835,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $19,150,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $19,468,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $19,747,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $19,992,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $20,141,240,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2014: $12,843,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,061,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,195,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,302,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,381,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $13,531,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $13,696,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021; $13,839,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $13,984,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $14,032,720,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2014 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2014:

(A) New budget authority, $560,225,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $579,234,000,000.

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, $574,359,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $563,976,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, $585,556,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $570,288,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, $598,822,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $575,457,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, $612,125,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $582,678,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, $625,445,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $600,508,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, $639,780,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $614,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, $654,096,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $628,265,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, $671,181,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $649,221,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, $688,640,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $660,461,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2014:

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

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

Fiscal year 2015:

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

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

Fiscal year 2016:

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

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

Fiscal year 2017:

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

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

Fiscal year 2018:

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

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

Fiscal year 2019:

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

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

Fiscal year 2020:

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

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

Fiscal year 2021:

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

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

Fiscal year 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2023:

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

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

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

Fiscal year 2014:

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

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

Fiscal year 2015:

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

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

Fiscal year 2016:

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

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

Fiscal year 2017:

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

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

Fiscal year 2018:

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

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

Fiscal year 2019:

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

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

Fiscal year 2020:

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

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

Fiscal year 2021:

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

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

Fiscal year 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2023:

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

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

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2014:

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

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

Fiscal year 2015:

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

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

Fiscal year 2016:

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

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

Fiscal year 2017:

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

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

Fiscal year 2018:

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

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

Fiscal year 2019:

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

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

Fiscal year 2020:

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

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

Fiscal year 2021:

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

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

Fiscal year 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2023:

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

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

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2014:

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

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

Fiscal year 2015:

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

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

Fiscal year 2016:

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

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

Fiscal year 2017:

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

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

Fiscal year 2018:

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

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

Fiscal year 2019:

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

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

Fiscal year 2020:

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

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

Fiscal year 2021:

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

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

Fiscal year 2022:

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

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

Fiscal year 2023:

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

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

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2014:

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

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

Fiscal year 2015:

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

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

Fiscal year 2016:

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

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

Fiscal year 2017:

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

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

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.

(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $352,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $352,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $369,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $406,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $406,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $472,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $472,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $540,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $540,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $590,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $590,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $632,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $632,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $657,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $657,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $678,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $678,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $688,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $688,759,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $1,819,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,845,094,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,694,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,758,667,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,792,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,800,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,808,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,803,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $1,796,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,801,238,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $1,891,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,869,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $1,942,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,928,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $2,010,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,993,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $2,094,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,102,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,136,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,120,971,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, an amount to be derived from function 920.
(B) Outlays, an amount to be derived from function 920.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF SPENDING REDUCTION.—The House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit, not later than May 31, 2013, recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives. After receiving those recommendations, such committee shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(2) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(4) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(5) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(6) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(7) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(8) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—(A) The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by at least $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

(B) The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report a reconciliation bill not later than September 15, 2013, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $42,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and by not more than $685,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

(1) The Veterans Health Care Budget and Reform Transparency Act of 2009 provides advance appropriations for the following veteran medical care accounts: Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities.

(2) The President has yet to submit a budget request as required under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, including the request for the Department of Veterans Affairs, for fiscal year 2014, hence the request for veteran medical care advance appropriations for fiscal year 2015 is unavailable as of the writing of this concurrent resolution.

(3) This concurrent resolution reflects the most up-to-date estimate on veterans' health care needs included in the President's fiscal year 2013 request for fiscal year 2015.

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

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

(d) LIMITATIONS.—For fiscal year 2015, the aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) $55,483,000,000 for the following programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs—

(A) Medical Services;

(B) Medical Support and Compliance; and

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

(2) $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (c).

(e) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 302. CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

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

SEC. 303. ADJUSTMENTS OF AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—If a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2014 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO IMPLEMENT DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS AND TO FUND VETERANS' PROGRAMS AND OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—

(1) FINDINGS.—(A) The President has not submitted a budget for fiscal year 2014 as required pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, by the date set forth in that section.

(B) In missing the statutory date by which the budget must be submitted, this will be the fourth time in five years the President has not complied with that deadline.

(C) This concurrent resolution reflects the levels of funding for veterans' medical programs as set forth in the President's fiscal year 2013 budget request.

(2) PRESIDENT'S BUDGET SUBMISSION.—In order to take into account any new information included in the budget submission by the President for fiscal year 2014, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels for veterans' programs, Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, or the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations set forth in the report of this concurrent resolution to conform with section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as adjusted by section 251A of such Act).

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

(c) DETERMINATIONS.—For the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution on the budget in the House, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2014 and the period of fiscal years 2014 through fiscal year 2023 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust such applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 304. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

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

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning with fiscal year 2024.

SEC. 305. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

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

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels for legislation reported by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform that reforms the Federal retirement system, if such adjustments do not cause a net increase in the deficit for fiscal year 2014 and the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 306. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

(c) BUDGET COMPLIANCE.—(1) The consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 604.

(2) Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution, if—

(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report;

would not cause the appropriate allocation of new budget authority made pursuant to section 302(a) of such Act for that fiscal year to be exceeded or the sum of the limits on the security and non-security category in section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act as reduced pursuant to such section.

SEC. 307. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

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

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

(2) The fair-value accounting method uses discount rates which incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length. In contrast, cash-basis accounting solely uses the discount rates of the Treasury, failing to incorporate risks such as prepayment and default risk.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the $635 billion of loans and loan guarantees issued in 2013 alone would generate budgetary savings of $45 billion over their lifetime using FCRA accounting. However, these same loans and loan guarantees would have a lifetime cost of $11 billion under fair-value methodology.

(4) The majority of loans and guarantees issued in 2013 would show deficit reduction of $9.1 billion under FCRA methodology, but would increase the deficit by $4.7 billion using fair-value accounting.

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

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

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

SEC. 308. TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND THAT INCREASE PUBLIC INDEBTEDNESS.

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

SEC. 309. SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the ''first fiscal year'' and the ''total of fiscal years'' shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2014. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism under section 302(a) of such Act. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation. The Committee on Appropriations may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under section 302(b) of such Act. Spending that counts toward the allocation established by this section shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, for purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2014, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 310. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

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

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

TITLE IV—POLICY

SEC. 401. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE LAW REPEAL.

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

SEC. 402. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:

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

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

(3) Today, there are approximately 70 Federal programs that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

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

(b) POLICY ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

SEC. 403. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING FEDERAL REGULATION.

It is the policy of this resolution that the cost of regulations on job creators should be reduced by enacting title II of the Jobs Through Growth Act (H.R. 3400), as introduced on November 10, 2011. Further, it is the policy of this resolution that H.R. 309, the Regulatory Sunset and Review Act of 2013 as introduced on January 18, 2013, should also be enacted.

SEC. 404. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

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

(1) More than 51 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

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

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2023 and unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.4 percent per year on average over the next ten years, and under the Congressional Budget Office's alternative fiscal scenario, direct spending on Medicare is projected to reach 6.4 percent of GDP by 2035 and 13 percent of GDP by 2085.

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

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution—

(1) to protect those in and near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits and offer future beneficiaries the same health care options available to Members of Congress; and

(2) that H.R. 309, the Regulatory Sunset and Review Act of 2013 as introduced on January 18, 2013, should be enacted

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

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in and near retirement, without changes.

(2) For future generations, when they reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs, including an option to remain in the traditional Medicare fee-for-service program.

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

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

SEC. 405. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

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

(1) According to the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies will hold $698 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2013.

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 406. POLICY STATEMENT ON BLOCK GRANTING MEDICAID.

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

SEC. 407. POLICY STATEMENT ON A CARBON TAX.

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

SEC. 408. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE USE OF OFFICIAL TIME BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR UNION ACTIVITIES.

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

SEC. 409. POLICY STATEMENT ON CREATION OF A COMMITTEE TO ELIMINATE DUPLICATION AND WASTE.

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

SEC. 410. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION.

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

SEC. 411. POLICY STATEMENT ON READABLE LEGISLATION.

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

SEC. 412. POLICY STATEMENT ON WORK REQUIREMENTS.

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

SEC. 413. POLICY STATEMENT ON ENERGY PRODUCTION.

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

SEC. 414. POLICY STATEMENT ON REGULATION OF GREENHOUSE GASES BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

The Environmental Protection Agency is prohibited from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change.

SEC. 415. POLICY STATEMENT ON CREATING A COMMISSION TO ELIMINATE WASTE AND DUPLICATION.

It is the policy of this budget that a new commission styled after the ''Byrd Committee'' shall be established as called for in H. Res. 119., as introduced on March 14, 2013.

SEC. 416. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING THE FEDERAL BUDGET PROCESS.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Federal budget process should be reformed so that it is easier to reduce Federal spending than it is to increase it by enacting reforms included in the Spending, Deficit, and Debt Control Act of 2009 (H.R. 3964, 111th Congress).

TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 501. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

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

SEC. 502. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REFORM OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms or replaces the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 503. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 504. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 505. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 506. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that implements a trade agreement, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 507. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 508. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under P.L. 106–393 in the future and would not increase the deficit or direct spending for fiscal year 2014, the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, or the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SEC. 509. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

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

TITLE VI—EARMARK MORATORIUM

SEC. 601. EARMARK MORATORIUM.

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

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

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

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

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—The point of order under subsection (a) shall only apply to legislation providing or authorizing discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority, providing a Federal tax deduction, credit, or exclusion, or modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule in fiscal year 2012 or fiscal year 2013.

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

SEC. 602. LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The House Committee on Rules may not report a rule or order that would waive the point of order set forth in the first section of this resolution.

TITLE VII—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 701. 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 2014 is 6.7 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 2014 is 6.2 percent under current law.

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

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

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

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

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2014 is 5.9 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 2014 is 5.3 percent under current law.

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

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

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

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

I bring a budget today, a substitute, on behalf of the Republican Study Committee, a budget that balances the Federal budget in just 4 years. It does that, Mr. Chairman, by setting priorities for this Nation, priorities that our constituents back home know need to be set.

I want to begin, Mr. Chairman, by showing you the priorities as they relate to revenue and spending. Within 4 years, we bring revenue above the level of spending so that we can begin to repay our debt and eliminate our deficits for the first time since the Clinton administration, which will bring deficits and revenues in line, Mr. Chairman.

What we do is we prioritize those programs that are important to so many Americans. As you see from this chart, Mr. Chairman, Social Security spending is up each and every year in our budget while extending the life of the Social Security trust fund; Medicare spending is up each and every year in our budget while extending the life of the Medicare trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, if a budget is nothing else, it is a statement of our values and our priorities. And the Republican Study Committee's value and priority is to end the passing of responsibilities from this generation to the next, to be responsible for the bills that we create today and pay for those priorities today.

In 4 short years, Mr. Chairman, we can be out of this conversation about debt and deficit and begin the conversation about freeing the next generation from the $16.7 trillion that you and I and previous Congresses have racked up on their behalf.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we had a discussion yesterday and today about different approaches to the budget, and we've had a discussion about the Budget Committee budget, the Ryan budget, that was on the floor and will be voted on later.

That budget, of course, is an uncompromising budget. If you look at this budget, it's even worse. And on top of that, this budget has even more gimmicks than the earlier budget that we talked about.

□ 1510

So what are those gimmicks? Well, first of all, this budget says it comes into balance in 4 years. Look, if you want a race to a fake balance, obviously you should vote for this one over the Republican caucus budget. But the reality is, it gets to that balance by keeping the savings from ObamaCare, which our Republican colleagues say they want to eliminate, that they want to repeal.

You don't have to take my word for it. The Heritage Foundation did a quick action alert on this budget. Here is what they say: ''Another failing of this RSC budget is that, like the committee budget''—in other words like the principal Republican budget—''it keeps revenues near the levels reached with ObamaCare tax hikes even though it repeals the health care bill's spending provisions.''

So let's just be really clear what that means for the American people. They are repealing the spending provisions. That means they are getting rid of all the benefits in the Affordable Care Act, including the provision to make sure that your child can stay on your insurance policy until they are age 26 so a family is not bankrupted by an accident or some disease that their child gets. It means the provisions that make sure people can't get denied coverage because of preexisting conditions, that is gone. So they get rid of all that, but they keep the ObamaCare taxes. That is what the Heritage Foundation says.

Guess what? They also keep the savings from the Affordable Care Act in the Medicare area that we achieve by ending the overpayments to some of the insurance companies and other changes in the incentive structure. We did it without hitting beneficiaries. They have railed against that in the past, but it is right here in their budget.

And here is the catch: they say their budget gets a surplus in just 4 years. Well, the surplus is $22 billion, they claim. But here is how much of it comes from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare. They have got a little under $100 billion in revenue that year coming in, and then they have got Medicare savings. So not close to balance in 4 years without those provisions, which, as the Heritage Foundation points out, are in there.

And do you know what? Even at the 10-year window, even at the end of the 10-year window, they claim to have a $246 billion surplus, and yet they wouldn't get there without the savings from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare.

That's a hoax. To come to the floor and say you will have a balanced budget in 4 years or 10 years, but guess what, you are going to repeal ObamaCare, your budget doesn't work when you do that. That just doesn't add up.

Now, they have another big sort of gimmick in this one that is not in the other Republican budget that has to do with taxes. So the problem with the main Republican budget is that it will provide tax breaks to very wealthy people and help finance those tax breaks by bringing down those rates by raising the tax burden on middle-income people.

As we discussed earlier, we actually put that question to the test in the Budget Committee. We offered an amendment that says: Well, when you do tax reform, don't make it a Trojan horse for raising middle class taxes to finance tax breaks for the wealthy. Protect the American middle class from tax increases. A simple amendment. Every Republican on the committee voted ''no.'' So that is their problem with the main Republican budget.

This one has another problem. It creates two tax systems and says: Taxpayer, you get to choose. And then it assumes that they are going to choose the one that is worst for them. Because if they choose the one that is better for the taxpayer, from the taxpayer's perspective they don't have enough revenue in their budget to come to balance.

Now, look, the American people are smart. If you give them two choices, obviously people are going to add them up, and they are going to pick the tax return where they pay less. And if the American people are as smart as I think they are, they will blow another hole in this RSC budget.

So I am not even beginning to talk about the fact that they, once again, more than double the sequester cuts to places like NIH and places where we do scientific research, that they slash our investment in infrastructure. They do all that. They do even more of that than the other Republican budget, but it has the same fundamental gimmick with respect to ObamaCare. And then on top of that, it has this other tax gimmick in it.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, while I regret the Rules Committee didn't give us more time to correct that misinformation, they did give us wonderful speakers. I would like to yield 4 minutes now to a former chairman of the Republican Study Committee, a former chairman of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and thank him for his leadership on this critical issue.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard from so many of our colleagues that budgets are about priorities, and I believe this to be true. So what does it say about Democrats' priorities when the President is almost 2 months late in submitting his budget, and Senate Democrats have taken over 4 years to even bother to write a budget?

I suppose it says, Mr. Chairman, that budgets have a way of getting in the way of Democrats as they wish to tax us more, as they wish to borrow more money from China, money our kids have to pay back, and budgets get in the way of Democrats wanting to spend more of our money on a Washington insider economy that doesn't work for the rest of us.

We know that ObamaCare just raised $1 trillion of taxes, much of it falling on working families. The so-called ''fiscal cliff'' raised taxes almost another $700 billion, much of it falling on small business owners who can no longer offer raises, promotions, or even hire new workers. And now all these Democrat budgets are looking for an additional trillion dollars of tax increase on top of that. That comes out to about $9,000 for every working household in America.

Mr. Chairman, that is not fair, that is not helpful to this struggling economy. No nation in the history of the world has ever taxed its way into prosperity. America will not be the first.

Mr. Chairman, no nation has ever spent its way into prosperity; yet the Democrat budgets continue a spending spree that is driving us towards national bankruptcy. A day of reckoning is coming. You cannot have Federal programs going at 2 percent, 4 percent, 6 percent, 8 percent when the new reality under this President is 1½ to 2 percent economic growth, and the family budget, which ultimately pays for the Federal budget, is stagnant.

The families that I represent in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas have several concerns. They want to feel more secure in their jobs. They want to quit seeing their paychecks shrink in the face of higher prices. They want a healthier economy where their success is dependent upon how well they work, not on who they know in Washington. In other words, they don't want a Washington insider economy where they can only succeed if Democrats choose to invest in them.

Mr. Chairman, not every American belongs to a government employee labor union that supported the President in the last election. Not every American has a failing bankrupt solar energy company. So for the rest of them, these hardworking Americans, they want an opportunity, and they want a Main Street economy that, if they work hard and they play by the rules, every American can succeed.

And, finally, the people I represent believe it is just immoral, immoral to saddle our children with this trillion dollars of debt. That is why I am proud to support both the Republican Study Committee budget and the House Republican budget. They will help bring us a vibrant, competitive economy through pro-growth tax reform, a whole new Tax Code which is fairer, flatter, simpler, and more competitive, a budget that is guaranteed to grow jobs and paychecks. And contrary to the Democrat budget, no tax increases on anybody.

□ 1520

We quit spending money we don't have, and I know my Democratic colleague is very sensitive about the balance issue because they have a budget which never balances. The American people demand one; the Republican Study Committee and the House Republican budget deliver it. For a fairer economy, for a balanced budget, for a greater future for our children, we need to support these Republican budgets.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, our budget focuses first and foremost on jobs and getting the economy growing. It does balance in the same time that the Republican budget last year balanced. And unlike the Republican budget, the main one, we do not give tax breaks to the folks at the very top financed by increasing taxes on middle class taxpayers.

I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a great new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CARDENAS. Mr. Chairman, my friends across the aisle constantly say we should act like families and small businesses who balance their budgets. So let's look at families and businesses in this country.

The fact is that most American families don't have a balanced budget. When you graduate college, you get a mortgage or you go into debt, either way. Many families are suffering through unemployment or underemployment or even foreclosure. When you lose your job or your house, you don't just pack it in and say, Well, I don't have a job anymore, so no more food for me. No, you get your suit cleaned, get out there and interview. You get your résumé professionally printed. You invest in training courses to make yourself more marketable. You spend money to make money.

It's the same thing for businesses. Small businesses are not profitable right away. Businesses take time to pay off a lot of start-up costs like equipment, inventory, insurance, and training. Businesses have to invest to make business work. Sometimes your business goes into a slump. So you train your employees, you buy new inventory and invest in your company so it will grow. You don't just stop investing.

Mr. Chairman, the logic that they use to create this fiction that responsible businesses and families are always in balance is simply not true. Just like folks who are out of work or need to clean their suit and improve their skills, we need to build infrastructure and train our workers. Just like businesses who need new inventory and new ways to sell, we need to find new technologies to build here at home and invest in the education of our future workforce.

The very examples that they use of families and small businesses are simply examples that demand investment, not austerity. You dress for the job you want, not for the job you have. Let's pass a budget that invests in our country, in our future, starting today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this budget to the floor. I rise in strong support of the RSC budget that we have here today, and I want to talk about a few of the great things that it does to get our economy moving again and get our country back on track.

The first thing that it does, it balances in 4 years. That's right, we really do think it's an important priority of this country that we balance the Federal budget. I have a 6-year-old daughter and a 3-year-old son, and I don't think that it's asking too much that we balance the Federal budget before they graduate from high school. And so we do that.

What else do we do with this budget? We get our economy moving again through tax reform that's pro-growth oriented and actually lower overall rates and close loopholes so that we can create jobs and be competitive again and get the country moving on track again.

Another thing we do, we save Medicare from bankruptcy. On the current path, according to President Obama's own Medicare actuaries, right now Medicare is scheduled to go bankrupt in 11 years. We don't think it's responsible to let that happen, so we actually put a plan in place to save Medicare from bankruptcy and ensure it for future generations.

We also repeal the job-killing ObamaCare, and not just the policies behind it, but all the taxes, many of which fall on middle class families, by the way. And so that's going to help get our economy moving again.

But let's contrast this vision, this document that's being criticized by my friends on the other side, with the President's budget. What's the President's budget? It doesn't exist. Today the President released his Final Four picks. He released his brackets. He's not a day late on that. Yet, under the law, the President is now 45 days late on releasing his budget. So what kind of set of priorities does that show, the fact that the President doesn't think that it's important enough to meet the legal deadline to file his own budget, he's 45 days late, and yet we know his Final Four picks?

So we have a plan to get the economy moving again. We're laying this plan forward to get a balanced budget and to get our economy moving and start putting some pro-growth policies in place so we can create jobs in this country.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to a distinguished new Member from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain my strong opposition to the Republican budget and strong support of the Democrat budget amendment because it offers a balanced approach that is fair to seniors, the middle class, and invests in the right priorities.

I want to give an important example. My district is filled with people from all walks of life—teachers, entrepreneurs, and nurses—who've worked hard and spent their lives earning the Medicare guarantee. They live with the comfort of knowing that if they get sick or injured, the health care they've earned will be there for them. I know this firsthand. My own mother beat cancer with the help of Medicare. Fortunately, I didn't have to make the choice that many Americans will face under the Republican budget: having to choose between helping a parent pay for a cancer treatment or saving for our own children's college tuition.

The Democratic budget, on the other hand, secures Medicare by stopping overpayments to insurance companies and incentivizing efficiency in our health care delivery.

Mr. Chairman, we were sent here to get things done, to solve problems and not to create new ones, and that's why I will proudly vote for the Democratic budget.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), one of the visionaries of the Republican Study Committee.

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

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of reasons that I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee budget. It repeals ObamaCare. It repeals the death tax. It repeals the alternative minimum tax. It authorizes the Keystone pipeline. It authorizes drilling in ANWR up in Alaska. But the real reason and the primary reason is that it balances, and it balances sooner rather than later.

The first 4 years of the Obama Presidency, our deficits approached $7 trillion. The President has yet to submit a budget that ever balances. None of the Democratic alternative budgets ever balance. The Republican Study Committee balances in 4 years. It reduces the deficit immediately, larger, and it balances.

If I were to come before this body and ask for an amendment to be made in order to spend an additional trillion dollars a year to infinity, I don't think too many people would vote for that no matter what was in it. That's basically what you do if you vote to pass a budget that never balances.

The Republican Study Committee balances sooner rather than later. It balances in 4 years.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Maryland for his leadership on these very difficult issues.

Mr. Chairman, if you like sequestration that cuts $1.2 trillion in discretionary domestic spending, you're going to love the Republican budget which actually quintuples that. And then there's the RSC budget that goes even further. So while the Ryan budget cuts almost $6 trillion over the next 10 years in investments, this budget, the RSC, cuts $7.7 trillion. Yes, it cuts funding, as the last speaker just said, but at what expense? At what cost? We are, with this budget and with the underlying Ryan budget, we are disinvesting in America. We are walking away from research and development investments. We're walking away from infrastructure investments.

□ 1530

We are walking away from STEM and education investments. Those are the three legs of a stool that makes a great country great.

George Washington understood that and was a big champion of infrastructure investment and education.

Abraham Lincoln understood that in the midst of the Civil War when he invested, and this Congress invested, in the Transcontinental Railroad, in the Land Grant Research College System, in the Homestead Act, yes, and even completing the dome of this building, because they understood it was important to invest in the future of this country.

These two budgets walk away from that future. In fact, they almost guarantee a bleak future for America with respect to the competition. The Chinese aren't making these kinds of mistakes, we should not either.

I urge defeat of both the RSC budget, Mr. Chairman, and the Ryan budget when it comes up.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my great pleasure to yield 1 minute to a colleague of mine from the great State of Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm amazed by the sheer ignorance of the economic disaster that our country is facing. Not only are our leaders ignoring this crisis, they're denying there is even a problem.

This week we'll vote on six budget options, and five of them actually increase spending above today's level. Simply reducing the growth of spending will do nothing to address the economic emergency that we face. The idea that we're increasing spending, but not as much as the other guy, is severely misguided.

We have to dig deeper and make real, targeted cuts, and there has to be a sense of urgency about it. Only the RSC budget actually cuts our baseline spending level and will lead to a balanced budget faster than the alternatives.

We must live within our means.

I thank my friend, Congressman WOODALL, for recognizing that we need to cut the outrageous spending and offering this budget today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has the right to close.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my very good friend from Maryland, the ranking member of our Budget Committee. I thank him for his leadership, and for his common sense, and for advancing approaches that make the right investments in the right priorities in this country, investments that expand the middle class, investments that provide for a balanced approach and reduce our debt.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the RSC budget. As House Democrats, we believe that we need solutions-based budgets, not ideology-based budgets. We need solutions-based budgets that rest on three pillars:

Number 1, they take a balanced approach and reduce debt, because we need to reduce debt, but do it in a balanced way.

Number 2, they protect the middle class, because the middle class is still struggling. Make sure the middle class is protected.

And Number 3, they make the right and smart investments in the right and smart priorities, that don't ask us to forsake research and cures and treatments for disease, that don't allow China to move ahead of us in research and development, engineering, science and technology, that keep us competitive in the world.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. ISRAEL. So we want these solutions-based budgets that achieve these three critical priorities, and the way we get to those three critical priorities is through one thing, and that is compromise. It is the ability of both sides of the aisle to pursue these three priorities in a balanced way.

The budget before us right now is not about compromise, it is about ideology. It is not about common sense and solutions, it is about extremism.

The American people have sent us here to get things done, to find solutions to move them forward.

Let's not go backwards, Mr. Chairman. Let's not continue gridlock, Mr. Chairman. Let's find a balanced approach that rests on compromise and supports the middle class. And that is why I rise today in opposition to the budget before us.

I thank my distinguished friend from Maryland.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a gentleman who came into the House with me in 2010.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you today. And it's very interesting as we sit here and discuss the balanced approach.

How do you have a balanced approach, Mr. Chairman, if you can't have a balanced budget?

There are two different visions here. You either trust the people in Washington who have given us $16.7 trillion of debt, or you trust the American people.

What the RSC budget does is trust the American people with their money by taking back the big tax increase that was given to us in January, by taking away the big ObamaCare controls that were given to us in 2010, and actually returns that power to the States and to the people, and actually balances the budget in 4 years.

This is real progress. This is a returning to what the American people demand. And what we need to create growth and prosperity in America is to pass these types of budgets.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I'd inquire of my friend if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. No, we do not.

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

Mr. Chairman, you and all Members can find every word of this budget on the Internet at rsc.scalise.house.gov. This isn't just about trying to go through the math. This is about laying out priorities. That's what every budget is.

This budget provides flexibility to States to care for our poor and our underserved in our health care communities. This budget provides the flexibility to seniors to find doctors, doctors that are no longer taking Medicare today and are threatening the health care quality that folks like my mom and dad are having to contend with.

This is a budget that makes tough decisions. You're not going to find a family in this country, Mr. Chairman, that hasn't had to make tough decisions during tough economic times. And the question is, why won't the U.S. House of Representatives, why won't the U.S. Senate, why won't the United States President do exactly the same thing?

We're trying to fulfill that request of the American people today, Mr. Chairman, in this budget. Every word laid out right here talking about, Mr. Chairman, responsible budgeting, prioritizing, as we did, our seniors who are counting on Social Security, our seniors who are counting on Medicare, our seniors who are counting on the solvency of both of those programs.

We ensure that that does not continue, Mr. Chairman, because solvency is not guaranteed. In fact, it's guaranteed not to be there under current funding systems. We change those systems to ensure that it will be a sustainable path, Mr. Chairman, a path where revenues and spending align, radical idea for this Chamber. And you'll hear it described in radical terms by my friends, where spending and revenues align. We commit ourselves to that, and we achieve it.

They say that talk is cheap, Mr. Chairman. That's why we back up this budget with real ideas, real proposals, real solutions. But when they say talk is cheap, and as my colleague from Maryland begins to close, I want to observe that talk, in this case, is not cheap at all.

The words that you'll hear from the gentleman from Maryland, in opposition to our proposal, in support of his proposal, are the difference between the $33 billion surplus that our budget generates and the $5.11 trillion deficit that the gentleman's proposal creates.

These are not questions of math, Mr. Chairman. These are questions of what kind of future do we want to leave to our children and our grandchildren. I feel the burden of responsibility for the $16.7 trillion this Nation has already put on its credit card. We take difficult steps in this budget to begin to reverse that for the first time.

In the absence of this budget, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of powerful ideas, like what you see in the House Budget Committee budget, we relegate our children to a second-class future, a future in which they owe $5.1 trillion more than the already immoral debt load that they face today.

□ 1540

There is a better way, Mr. Chairman. There are alternatives in this town. We are presenting one right here. It's called the Back to Basics budget, Mr. Chairman. It's a product of the Republican Study Committee.

To close, Mr. Chairman, these things don't happen by themselves. While the President has been unable to produce a budget, we've produced five in this house. It's because of the work of folks like Nick Myers on my staff. It's because of the work of folks like Will Dunham on the RSC staff. I know the gentleman from Maryland has the same kind of hardworking team working with him. These things don't happen in a vacuum. They happen because folks put in hour after hour after hour. I'm grateful to them. I hope America will support the product of their minds.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I think the American people know full well that the best way to attack the deficit right now is to help put more Americans back to work. That's the sense in this country and that's what all the numbers show from the Congressional Budget Office.

If you take the austerity approach recommended in either this budget or the main Republican budget, we know from the referees, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, that we'll see 750,000 fewer jobs just by the end of this calendar year. We also know you'll see 2 million fewer jobs next year, which is why we say let's focus on the jobs deficit and address the budget deficit in a sustained way where we bring it down in a balanced way, where we ask for shared responsibility and not another round of tax breaks for the folks at the very top.

And yes, we achieve balance in the same year the Republican budget last year achieved balance, but our priority is getting the country fully back to work.

We also believe that when we put together these budgets, we shouldn't pretend that you can have it all ways. And as I have said repeatedly, the Republican budget, including this RSC budget, is based, on the one hand, on the claim that it gets to balance in 4 years—one, in 10 years—but at the same time that they're repealing ObamaCare, and that just is not the case. It doesn't add up.

So if you're in a race to fake balance, then you should vote for this one because it gets to fake balance in 4 years instead of 10 years. But if you're in a race to put America back to work, you should vote for the Democratic plan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the substitute amendment offered by my colleague from Georgia, Mr. WOODALL. I commend him on authoring this substitute amendment on behalf of the Republican Study Committee.

At a time when we have over $16.5 trillion in debt, this budget reduces spending by $6.5 trillion over ten years and reduces deficits by $5.9 trillion. Furthermore, the Woodall amendment completely repeals ObamaCare, and it rolls back the tax increases associated with the fiscal cliff. In doing so, this budget decreases taxes by $685 billion over the budget window.

Mr. Chair, unlike any other of the substitutes offered today, the RSC budget will achieve balance by 2017 without holding funding for our servicemen and women hostage. This budget also significantly reforms our entitlement programs so we can ensure their long term solvency for future generations.

Mr. Chair, I believe that this is a sensible budget that puts the proper priorities in line. I ask all of my colleagues to support it.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 104, noes 132, answered ''present'' 171, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

AYES—104

Amash
Barton
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Camp
Cassidy
Chabot
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cotton
Culberson
DeSantis
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Long
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Pearce
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Radel
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (TX)
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOES—132

Alexander
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Ellmers
Esty
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Granger
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Joyce
Kelly
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Petri
Pitts
Posey
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Schneider
Schrader
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—171

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Clarke
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fortenberry
Foxx
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Matheson
Meng
Miller, George
Perry
Peterson

Rangel
Sanchez, Loretta
Schock
Smith (NJ)
Thompson (CA)
Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1606

Messrs. SALMON, MARCHANT and ROE of Tennessee changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. BARROW of Georgia and SCHRADER changed their vote from ''present'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RYAN of Ohio and COOPER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''present.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 86, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, my vote on rollcall 86 did not reflect the way I intended to vote. I wished to vote "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I was not present during the rollcall votes Nos. 76–86, on March 18–20, 2013. I would like the record to reflect how I would have voted: On rollcall vote No. 76 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 77 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 78 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 79 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 80 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 81 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 82 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 83 I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 84 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 85 I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote No. 86 I would have voted "no."

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

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–21.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2014 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

(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 2013 through 2023:

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

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

Fiscal year 2013: $1,982,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,242,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $2,693,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $2,903,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,032,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,162,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,287,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,428,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,606,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,807,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,996,779,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: -$55,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$28,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $87,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $124,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $128,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $134,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $138,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $144,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $149,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $157,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $164,634,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $3,117,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,982,872,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,020,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,230,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,416,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,611,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,772,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,975,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,149,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,383,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,540,638,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $2,966,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,038,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,088,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,255,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,396,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,563,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,754,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,935,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $4,120,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,359,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,500,492,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: -$983,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: -$796,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: -$394,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: -$351,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: -$364,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: -$400,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$466,934,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$506,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$514,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$551,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$503,713,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2013: $17,158,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $18,142,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $18,719,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $19,259,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $19,862,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,519,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,234,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,996,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,766,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,567,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,340,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2013: $12,340,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $13,215,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $13,702,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $14,141,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: $14,589,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,065,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,616,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,224,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,858,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $17,558,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $18,232,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2013 through 2023 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $559,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $610,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $560,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $572,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $560,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $567,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $577,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $569,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $588,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $598,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $588,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $612,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $626,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $613,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $639,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $632,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $654,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,132,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $47,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $47,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $46,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $48,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $49,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $50,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $51,639,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $52,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $54,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,430,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $29,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $30,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $32,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $33,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $34,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $35,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,021,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $6,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $11,469,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $4,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $4,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $4,926,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $5,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,950,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $44,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $39,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $39,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $39,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $40,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $42,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $42,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $43,533,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,899,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $43,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $44,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $45,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,935,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $23,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,327,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,721,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$30,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$24,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $17,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $10,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $11,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $12,175,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$3,511,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $16,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $16,983,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $17,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $20,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $586,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $150,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $87,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $109,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, $116,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $123,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $129,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $95,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $96,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $98,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $100,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $102,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,921,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $77,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $12,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $13,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $13,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $13,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $13,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $13,043,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $13,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $13,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $13,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $14,161,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,870,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $160,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $83,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $92,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $102,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $115,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $120,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $116,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $117,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $119,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $121,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $120,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $124,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,856,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $365,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $420,426,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $415,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $501,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $555,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $612,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $615,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $649,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $649,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $686,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $733,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $721,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $765,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $764,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $808,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $806,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $857,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $856,154,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $511,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,240,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $524,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $527,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $581,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $581,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $599,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $599,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $624,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $686,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $685,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $735,523,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $735,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $786,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $786,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $863,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $863,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $895,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $894,764,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $544,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $530,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $527,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $528,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $524,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $538,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $537,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $538,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $533,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $541,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $545,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $541,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $557,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $553,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $571,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $567,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $590,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $591,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $598,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,842,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $27,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $30,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $33,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $47,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $54,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $58,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,848,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $140,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $138,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $146,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $149,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $149,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $162,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $160,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $159,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $158,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $171,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $170,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $175,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $174,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $179,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $191,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $187,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $186,882,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $57,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $66,480,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,974,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $55,925,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $58,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $57,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $59,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $61,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $63,242,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $65,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $71,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $73,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,433,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $25,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,273,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $27,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $29,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $35,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $37,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $40,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $42,919,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $45,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,056,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $331,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $331,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $343,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $343,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $371,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $371,611,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $419,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $506,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $506,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $607,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $607,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $681,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $681,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $748,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $748,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $803,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $803,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $856,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $856,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $904,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $904,907,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$8,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$18,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$16,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$19,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$26,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$25,161,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$31,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$29,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$35,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$33,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$39,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$37,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$44,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$42,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$49,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$46,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$54,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$51,947,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$76,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$76,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, -$75,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$75,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, -$80,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$80,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$90,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$90,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$97,574,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$97,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$98,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$98,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$103,177,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$103,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$105,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$105,117,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$108,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$108,885,000,000.
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $70,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $32,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $12,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $4,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $33,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000.

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 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

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 protects workers and supports jobs by reauthorizing Trade Adjustment Assistance by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

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 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

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

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;

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

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

(4) 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 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 205. 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 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 206. 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 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 207. 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 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023. 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.

SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.

(a) PRE-KINDERGARTEN.—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 related to a pre-kindergarten program or programs to serve low-income 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 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

(b) CHILD CARE.—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 related to child care assistance for working families, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

(c) HOME VISITING.—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 related to a home visiting program or programs serving low-income mothers-to-be and low-income families, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023

SEC. 209. 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 reform Federal student aid policies to ensure that subsidized student loan interest rates do not double in July 2014 at the end of the one-year extension of the current 3.4 percent interest rate assumed in the resolution; or efforts to ensure continued full funding for Pell grants, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 210. 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 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 211. 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 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

SEC. 212. 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 2013 to fiscal year 2018 or fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2023.

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 2014 is 6.7 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 6.3 percent under current law.

(3) The resolution retains the social safety net that lifts millions of people out of poverty.

(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 2014 is 5.9 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the

total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2013 is 5.1 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.

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 2015 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 2016, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(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 2014 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2014.

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 2014 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 2014.

(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 2014 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 2014.

(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 2014 that appropriates $9,753,000,000 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 $1,018,000,000, 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 2014.

(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 2014 that appropriates $60,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $20,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments 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 2014.

(c) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—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 2013 or fiscal year 2014 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 the amounts of budget authority specified in section 102(21) for fiscal year 2013 or the 2014 level for Overseas Contingency Operations in the President's 2014 budget 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.

(d) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—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) and (c) 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 821,000 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 6.4 million private jobs over the past 36 consecutive months;

(3) multi-year across-the-board spending cuts under sequestration will cost Americans millions of jobs with up to 750,000 jobs lost this year alone, slow economic growth by up to one third this year alone, and impair our global competitive edge;

(4) as part of a ''Make it in America'' agenda, U.S. 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;

(5) 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

(6) 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 U.S., and help middle class families by increasing the minimum wage.

(2) JOBS.—This resolution—

(A) assumes enactment of legislation to replace sequestration under the Budget Control Act of 2011 with at least the same amount of deficit reduction from a balanced approach that would increase revenues without increasing that tax burden on middle-income Americans, and decrease long-term spending 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.

(B) assumes enactment of—

(i) the President's $50 billion immediate transportation jobs package;

(ii) other measures proposed in the American Jobs Act and reflected in the President's 2013 budget; and

(iii) the President's proposed surface transportation legislation;

(C) assumes $1 billion for the President's proposal to establish a Veterans Job Corps;

(D) assumes $80 billion in education jobs funding for the President's initiatives to promote jobs now while also creating an infrastructure that will help students learn and create a better future workforce, including $30 billion for rebuilding at least 35,000 public schools, $25 billion to prevent hundreds of thousands of educator layoffs, and $8 billion to help community colleges train 2 million workers in high-growth industries with skills that will lead directly to jobs; and

(E) 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 TAKING A BALANCED APPROACH TO DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) 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; and

(2) sequestration is a meat-ax approach to deficit reduction that imposes deep and mindless cuts, regardless of their impact on vital services and investments.

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

(1) the Congress should vote on H.R. 699, which would replace the sequester for calendar year 2013 with a balanced mix of targeted and better timed spending reductions and revenue increases to prevent the loss of jobs and the drag on economic growth in the near term; and

(2) the Congress should replace the entire 10-year sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 with a balanced approach that would increase revenues without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans, and decrease long-term spending 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. 503. 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 2011, 56.8 million people relied on Social Security;

(3) 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;

(4) 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;

(5) 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

(6) 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. 504. 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 2012, 50 million 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 and program costs than private insurance for a given level of benefits;

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

(5) destroying the Medicare program and replacing it with a voucher or premium support for the purchase of private insurance that fails to keep pace with growth in health costs will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks;

(6) 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

(7) versions of voucher or premium-support policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely cause traditional Medicare to weaken and 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 and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance should be rejected.

SEC. 505. 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 signed into law in 2010 will expand coverage to 27 million Americans and bring costs down for families and small businesses;

(3) consumers are already benefitting from the Affordable Care Act's provisions to hold insurance companies accountable for their actions and to end long-standing practices such as denying coverage to children based on pre-existing conditions, imposing lifetime limits on coverage that put families at risk of bankruptcy in the event of serious illness, and dropping an enrollee's coverage once the enrollee becomes ill based on a simple mistake in the enrollee's application;

(4) 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

(5) 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. 506. 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 28 million low-income children, 5 million senior citizens, 10 million people with disabilities, and 14 million other low-income people who would otherwise be unable to obtain health insurance;

(2) 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;

(3) Medicaid pays for 43 percent of 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

(4) 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 health care costs or economic conditions.

SEC. 507. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that it is the stated position of the Administration that Afghan troops will take the full lead for security operations in Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution that consistent with the Administration's stated position, no funding shall be provided for operations in Afghanistan through the Overseas Contingency Operations budget beyond 2014.

SEC. 508. 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) 750,000 jobs will be lost in calendar year 2013 if the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration remain in effect, hampering the economic recovery and jeopardizing the foundation of our security,

(5) because it puts our economy at risk, the Nation's debt is an immense security threat to our country, just as former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen has stated, and we must have a deficit reduction plan that is serious and realistic;

(6) 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;

(7) in 2011, the U.S. spent more on defense than the next 16 countries combined (and more than half of the amount spent by those 16 countries was from seven NATO countries and four other close allies);

(8) Admiral 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;

(9) more can be done to rein 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;

(10) 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;

(11) 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;

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

(13) the Pentagon's operation and maintenance budget, which now totals $200 billion per year, 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;

(14) excluding those involved in war operations, 200,000 military personnel and their dependents are stationed overseas, and the Administration should further review the benefits and costs of alternatives to permanent overseas basing of personnel;

(15) more than 94 percent of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce since 2001 is due to increases at security-related agencies—Department of Defense (31 percent), Department of Homeland Security (32 percent), Department of Veterans Affairs (26 percent), and Department of Justice (6 percent)—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;

(16) 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

(17) 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 this resolution that—

(1) the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 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;

(2) further 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 security strategy; and

(3) veterans programs are fully funded and if there is new information provided in the President's 2014 budget that would justify the need for funds in excess of the amount reflected in section 102(15), adjustments shall be made from within the discretionary totals to meet any such new requirements.

SEC. 509. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM TO REPLACE THE SEQUESTER AND REDUCE THE DEFICIT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the sequester represents a meat-ax approach to cutting government spending and will cost the economy 750,000 jobs in 2013 alone, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office;

(2) the House must therefore replace the sequester with a balanced approach to deficit reduction that would raise revenues in addition to making targeted spending cuts;

(3) this balanced approach to deficit reduction must include overhauling our outdated

tax code –which contains numerous, wasteful tax breaks for special interests – to make it simpler, more progressive, and more competitive;

(4) 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;

(5) the corporate income tax does include a number of incentives that help spur economic growth and innovation, such as the research and development credit and clean energy incentives;

(6) but tax breaks for special interests can also distort economic incentives for businesses and consumers and encourage businesses to ship American jobs and capital overseas for tax purposes;

(7) the President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform observed that the corporate income tax is riddled with special interest tax breaks and subsidies, is badly in need of reform, and it proposed to streamline the code, capturing some of the savings in the process, to achieve deficit reduction in a more balanced way;

(8) even Speaker Boehner indicated that he has a plan that would raise an additional $800 billion in revenues through closing tax loopholes and eliminating special interest tax breaks.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) POLICY ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES.—

(A) This resolution encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to help reduce the deficit and replace the sequester through a balanced approach that includes limits on tax expenditures and tax breaks for very high-income individuals. This resolution expressly rejects the approach in the Republican resolution that provides millionaires with even larger tax cuts at the expense of middle-class taxpayers. This resolution also expressly rejects raising taxes on middle-class taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes below $200,000 ($250,000 for married couples) and reflects the tax rates and income thresholds established in the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012. This resolution therefore encourages the House Committee on Ways and Means to raise the revenue needed through closing loopholes and ending tax breaks for special interests and the very wealthy, consistent with key proposals made by both the President and the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform to limit tax expenditures.

(B) This resolution supports working families, encourages increased labor force participation, and boosts access to higher education by permanently extending the expansions to the child tax credit, the EITC, and the American Opportunity Tax Credit, respectively, first legislated under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

(C) This resolution extends policies that reinvest in domestic manufacturing to bring jobs back to our shores; builds up the renewable energy production capacity of the United States in order to limit our reliance on foreign oil while creating green jobs; expands access to higher education, which everyone agrees is essential for building up a highly-skilled workforce and building out the middle class; and supports saving and capital formation that will raise future standards of living.

(2) POLICY ON CORPORATE INCOME TAXES.—

(A) This resolution proposes eliminating unproductive or unwarranted corporate tax preferences and subsidies, as well as pernicious tax breaks that reward U.S. corporations that ship American jobs – rather than products – overseas for tax purposes.

(B) This resolution adopts pro-growth corporate tax incentives like those in the President's FY 2013 budget proposals, such as: enhancing incentives for domestic manufacturing to support a ''Make it in America'' agenda, including providing a tax credit for companies that return operations and jobs to the U.S. while eliminating tax breaks for companies that move operations and jobs overseas; closing loopholes that allow businesses to avoid taxes, by subjecting more of their foreign earnings sheltered in tax havens to U.S. taxation; the research and development credit; and enhancing clean energy incentives.

(C) This resolution therefore urges the House Committee on Ways and Means to consider the President's proposals for business tax reform in determining how to best overhaul our corporate tax code so that it promotes economic growth and domestic job creation without increasing the deficit and the debt.

SEC. 510. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AGRICULTURE SPENDING.

It is the policy of this resolution that the House Committee on Agriculture should reduce spending in farm programs that provide direct payments to producers even in robust markets and in times of bumper yields. The committee should also find ways to focus assistance toward struggling family farmers and ranchers in a manner that creates jobs and economic growth while preserving the farm and nutrition safety net.

SEC. 511. 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, Barber shop, 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.

SEC. 512. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO ERADICATE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY.

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

(1) The prospect of upward mobility should be the right of every American.

(2) Targeted, means-tested Federal programs help lift millions of Americans out of poverty.

(3) These programs empower their beneficiaries through job training, educational assistance, adequate food, housing, and health care to rise to the middle class.

(4) The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program alone lifts over 4 million people out of poverty, including over 2 million children. It is particularly effective in keeping children – over 1 million – 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.

(5) The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and Child Tax Credit together lift over 9 million people, including nearly 5 million children, out of poverty. President Ronald Reagan proposed a major EITC expansion in 1985 and then referred to the 1986 Tax Reform Act, which included the expansion, as ''the best antipoverty, the best pro-family, the best job creation measure to come out of Congress''.

(6) However, some areas of the country have been left behind. They face persistent high levels of poverty and joblessness. Citizens 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 the 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. As Congress works to protect low income and middle class Americans from the negative impacts of budget cuts on the critical domestic programs that millions of American families rely on to get by, priority must be given to creating a national strategy on poverty to maximize the impact of anti-poverty 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 will 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 poverty, unemployment and general distress. The plan must also include provisions that work to remove the barriers and obstacles that prevent the most vulnerable Americans from taking advantage of economic and educational opportunities and moving up the ladder of opportunity to join the middle class and reach for the American Dream.

SEC. 513. 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 2014, 42 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.

Amend the title so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and fiscal years 2015 through 2023.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 122, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

□ 1610

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, today we are offering a budget with commonsense solutions that first focuses on the issue that's most pressing for the country and the American people today: kicking our economy into higher gear and putting more Americans back to work.

We know from the Congressional Budget Office—the professionals—that one-half of this year's deficit is due to the fact that millions of Americans are still looking for work and that three-quarters of next year's deficit is because we're not at full employment.

Our budget goes to the heart of the issue. It attacks the jobs deficit because we know we can't get the budget deficit under control until people are back to work and we take a balanced approach to long-term deficit reduction where we ask for shared responsibility.

We do ask people at the very high end of the income ladder to give up some of the tax preferences and tax breaks they have in order to help reduce the deficit. It's very different than the Republican budget that doesn't close one tax loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Theirs only lowers tax rates for folks at the very top by increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans. We don't do that.

We make sure that people can get back to work by replacing the sequester, which we know will result in 750,000 fewer Americans working at the end of this year. We also have a jobs program investing in this country, especially in the area of infrastructure, to help rebuild our aging infrastructure and build the modern infrastructure that's necessary to compete in the 21st century. Those measures will make sure that, compared to our Republican colleague's budget, we have 1.2 million more Americans working by the end of this year and 2 million more by the end of next year.

We also make sure we keep our commitments to our seniors. Unlike the Republican budget, we don't reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, which will mean seniors with high prescription drug costs will have to pay thousands more out of pocket over the period of this budget, and we don't turn Medicare into a voucher program that leaves seniors facing the risks and costs of escalating health care costs in the future.

We make sure that students don't face a doubling of the interest rate in July, scheduled to go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. The Republican budget keeps that doubling of interest rate in place. We don't.

We fully fund the transportation program for the next 10 years. The Republican budget cuts it by 20 percent, even at a time when we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

Mr. Chairman, we get at the budget issues by putting more people back to work, by dealing with this in a balanced way. We reduce the deficit way down so it's growing much slower than the economy. We stabilize the debt, and we balance the budget in the same time period that the Republican budget for the last 2 years had balanced the budget, but our focus is on jobs and the jobs deficit as a way to tackle the budget deficit.

With that, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my colleague and friend, the distinguished whip from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. HOYER. I first want to thank the ranking member for the work that he's done on this budget that he offers as an alternative.

It is a reasonable alternative that can be implemented. To that extent, it's a stark difference to the majority's proposal, which will not be implemented, and they know it.

Let me start with an observation, a headline, ''Blunt Report Says GOP Needs to Regroup for '16.''

In that, there is this sentence from the report. It's not from a Democrat, not from the newspaper, not from an editorial writer. It says, ''We have become expert''—''we,'' being the Republican Party.

We have become expert in how to provide ideological reenforcement to like-minded people.

With all due respect to my friend, Mr. RYAN, that's what his budget is: it is a vision. It is a vision that will not be implemented, and he knows it.

He knows that the Appropriations Committee will not be able to report out bills consistent with his budget, nor will the Ways and Means Committee come even close to reporting out bills that will implement his budget. Why? Because they're so draconian. And as I have said before, if every Democrat were taken out of this House and every Democrat taken out of the Senate, you would not implement the Ryan budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN has put together a balanced plan. Yes, it has revenues, and, yes, it keeps the Affordable Care Act in place, and, yes, it provides for funding for investment in growing our economy.

Mr. RYAN knows—and I have great respect for Mr. RYAN. I have great respect for his intellect and, frankly, from time to time, for his political courage. We voted together on TARP. It was a tough vote for him. It was a tough vote for me. It was a tough vote, period. But it was the right vote for the economy. We would have been in a depression had we not voted for that bill, and I congratulate Mr. RYAN on doing that.

But I'll lament the fact that we do not have an equally honest but tough resolution of a big deal in how to get from where we are—too much debt, too much deficit—to where we need to be: a fiscally sustainable path.

We will not get there, I tell my friend, by vision alone. Courage will be much more important than vision in that case. And Mr. VAN HOLLEN has shown courage by offering a budget that will provide for our people, for our country, and for our economy.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Van Hollen alternative. Why? Because it is a responsible, fiscally implementable—there's a word for you—fiscally doable alternative.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. HOYER. Ezra Klein, who may not be your favorite writer, says:

Ryan's tax reform plan costs more than all his spending cuts combined.

That's why I say it can't be implemented. And if we were in private and there were no politics involved, I think my friend would admit that. He shakes his head ''no.'' I didn't expect anything different than that.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an important statement of vision. It's an important statement of what our priorities are. It's an important statement to the American people, to seniors, to students, to families, to children where our priorities are.

The Van Hollen priorities are the right priorities for America, and I urge my colleagues to support the Van Hollen alternative.

□ 1620

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I enjoyed my friend from Maryland, and I appreciate his attempt to speak on my behalf. I will just try to do that myself. There is one thing that is identical in this budget—the base budget—and the Senate budget: it's the appropriations No. 966. It's the one thing that is equal in both the House and the Senate budgets.

The reason I rise in opposition to this budget, unlike what the gentleman just said, is that there is no way this could pass. I would say the opposite. Why? This budget never balances the budget.

You will hear Mr. VAN HOLLEN claim that, in 2040, because of certain assumptions they, on their own, make and that cannot be verified by the CBO, they think they'll balance. It never, ever balances the budget. Here is why:

We are going to go from a $16-plus trillion debt to a $25 trillion debt in this budget—period. What does this great budget do? It shaves $612 billion off the debt. It has a $1.2 trillion tax increase. It has a $476 billion spending increase. We've got a $1 trillion deficit. We're piling debt as high as the eye can see, and they bring a budget to the floor that is increasing spending?

Let's look at every budget offered by the other side: a $1.2 trillion tax increase by Mr. VAN HOLLEN and a $476 billion spending increase; the Congressional Black Caucus has a $2.8 trillion tax increase with $1.1 trillion spending increase; the Progressive Caucus—that's the doozy of them all—has a $5.7 trillion tax increase with a $4.065 trillion spending increase.

Here is the theme:

Take more money from the economy; take more money from families; take more money from small businesses—spend it in Washington, and hope everything works out.

It's not working out.

Families are struggling because of this borrowing, because of this debt. We need to reject this amendment and go with something that works, and that means balancing the budget to get a healthier economy to create jobs, which is precisely what our budget does.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 18, 2013]

HOW THE HOUSE BUDGET WOULD BOOST THE ECONOMY

(By John F. Cogan and John B. Taylor)

This week the House of Representatives will vote on its Budget Committee plan, which would bring federal finances into balance by 2023. The plan would do so by gradually slowing the growth in federal spending without raising taxes.

Still, the plan has been denounced by naysayers who assert that it would harm the economic recovery and that, at the least, any spending reductions should be put off until later. This thinking is just as wrong now as it was in the 1970s.

According to our research, the spending restraint and balanced-budget parts of the House Budget Committee plan would boost the economy immediately. With the Budget Committee's proposed tax reform included, the immediate impact would be even larger. The entire plan would raise gross domestic product by one percentage point in 2014, equivalent to about a $1,500 increase for each U.S. household. Ten years from now, at the end of the official budget horizon, we estimate that the entire plan would raise GDP by three percentage points, or more than $4,000 for each U.S. household.

Our assessment is based on a modern macroeconomic model (developed with Volker Wieland of the University of Frankfurt and Maik Wolters of the University of Kiel) whose features include a recognition that the resources to finance government expenditures aren't free—they withdraw resources from the private economy. The model provides for other essential attributes of the economy—that consumers, businesses and workers respond to incentives, and they are influenced by their expectation of future economic conditions when making decisions today. None of these features is provided for in old-style Keynesian models.

The House budget plan keeps total federal outlays at their current level for two years. Thereafter, spending would rise each year, but more slowly than if present policies continue. By 2023, federal expenditures would decline to 19.1% of GDP in 2023 from 22.2% today.

Since the Congressional Budget Office projects that revenues will equal 19.1% of GDP in 2023, the House plan will balance the budget that year. Also by 2023, the publicly held federal debt relative to GDP would decline to 55% from its current high level of 76%.

The House budget is hardly austere: The federal spending claim on GDP would still be considerably higher than it was in fiscal 2000 (18.2%) and only slightly below its claim on GDP in 2007 (19.7%).

The reductions in the growth rate of spending are to be achieved primarily through entitlement reforms. The Affordable Care Act would be repealed. Medicaid and food-stamp administration would be turned over to the states. Medicare would be fundamentally reformed. Anti-fraud measures would be applied to federal disability programs. Among the major entitlement programs, only Social Security would remain unchanged; this is a deficiency in the plan. As for discretionary spending, the House budget plan would provide for only slight reductions from the levels that are set by the budget sequester.

The long-run economic gains from restraining government spending would not, despite what critics claim, harm the economy in the short run. Instead, the economy would start to grow right away. Why?

First, the lower level of future government spending avoids the necessity of sharply raising taxes. The expectation that tax rates won't need to rise provides incentives for higher investment and employment today.

Second, since the expectation of lower future taxes has the effect of raising people's estimation of future disposable income, consumption increases today. This change comes thanks to Milton Friedman's famous ''permanent income'' hypothesis that the behavior of consumers reflects what they expect to earn over a long period. According to our macroeconomic model, the higher level of consumption induced by the House budget's effect on consumer expectations is large enough to offset the reduced growth of government spending.

Third, the new budget's reduction in the growth of government spending is gradual. That allows private businesses to adjust efficiently without disruptions.

Still, our macroeconomic model likely underestimates the positive impact of the House budget plan. The model doesn't account for the greater economic certainty that results from preventing the national debt from soaring to dangerously high levels and from stabilizing the federal tax burden. Nor does the model account for beneficial changes in monetary policy that could accompany enactment of the budget plan. Lower deficits and national debt would reduce pressure on the Federal Reserve to continue buying longterm Treasury bonds.

The U.S. economy has been experiencing its slowest recovery from a deep recession in modern history. Tragically, fewer people are working as a percentage of the working-age population than when the recovery began—and economic growth was only 1.6% last year. The large federal budget deficits—by increasing uncertainty and delaying private spending—are an important cause of this lackluster economic performance.

For too long, policy makers have been misguided by models that lend support to bigger government or to the politically convenient objective of delaying any reduction in spending. It is better to recognize the flaws in this approach and get on with the sensible budget reforms the country so sorely needs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think, if you ask the American people, they know what the challenge is right now. It's getting the economy back in full gear, and they're struggling because too many of them can't find a job, and the Republican budget will make that even worse. That's not me saying it. That's not a Democratic economist saying it. Those are the professionals at the Congressional Budget Office saying it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I don't have enough time. On your time, I'm happy to, my friend, but I can't do it right now.

Let me say another thing, Mr. Chairman, with respect to balance. It's really interesting.

One of the reasons the Republican budget that last year came into balance in 2040 and the year before was able to balance this year is that the increase in per capita health care costs has come down significantly, in part because of the Affordable Care Act and the changes in incentives. In fact, if you applied much more reasonable assumptions to our proposals than the Congressional Budget Office applied to the Republican budget last year, you'd get balance. I know our Republican colleagues don't want to hear it. Now our focus and our priority is on dealing with the jobs deficit. That is the best way to reduce the long-term deficit and to do it in a balanced way.

I now yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished assistant Democratic leader, my friend from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you so much for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Ryan budget.

The Ryan budget ignores the express will of the American people and doubles down on the ''you're on your own'' Republican platform that the voters soundly rejected just a few months ago. Rather than taking a fair and balanced approach to deficit reduction, the Ryan budget will kill millions of jobs, slash needed investments, raise taxes on working families, and create big, new tax breaks for the wealthiest few. The Ryan budget will block grant Medicaid, voucherize Medicare, and rip up the safety net that's at the heart of the social contract in this country. There are many words that can be used to describe the Ryan budget, but the one word that cannot be used is ''balanced.''

I am pleased that the Democratic alternative and the CBC budget that we voted on both include versions of a proposal I have worked on for several years. We call it the ''10–20–30.'' The purpose of the 10–20–30 plan is to target Federal funds to communities that have experienced persistent poverty. Specifically, this proposal targets 10 percent of funding to neglected communities where 20 percent or more of the population has lived in poverty for 30 or more years.

The 10–20–30 plan was originally signed into law as a part of the Recovery Act. It has proven to be successful in steering needed rural development funds into neglected communities for water and sewage and economic development projects. It's time to build on this success and expand the 10–20–30 plan.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you.

I am also pleased that all of the Democratic substitutes reject the austerity-for-working-families plan that the Republicans are proposing. Democrats will honor our commitment to senior citizens and invest in a brighter future. The Van Hollen budget will create jobs now, and that's the tried and true way to achieve deficit reduction.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today, we are stealing from the next generation—our kids and our grandkids. We are making false promises that Medicare and Social Security benefits will be there to take care of folks when we know that Medicare is bankrupt in 8 to 12 years. It's time for Congress to do something to help Americans and their families.

While House Republicans seek to bring taxes and spending back to historically stable levels this country operated under for the past 60 years and seek to balance the budget, there is nothing balanced about the Democrats' plan. We are spending more money today than we did last year, and we are collecting more taxpayer dollars than ever before. Instead of cutting spending, the Democrats' plan would add $4 trillion to the debt and take in another $1.2 trillion out of people's pockets, not to buy down our debt, but to spend even more.

Instead of raising taxes, the House Republican plan includes pro-growth, comprehensive tax reform. Tax reform is critical to increasing U.S. competitiveness abroad as well as attracting business here at home. It will close loopholes and special interest deductions and credits for personal and corporate income taxes and lower the rates for everyone.

I am pleased House Republicans are the only people in this town with the courage to balance the budget. It's time to return the economy to an engine of growth and job creation and to increase opportunities for all hard-working Americans. This is what the House Republican budget will achieve, and this is what Americans deserve.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. The way to save Medicare is to bring down costs overall in the health care system, not give seniors a voucher that puts all the risk on the senior, which is what the Republican approach does.

I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, a budget shows our priorities for financial expenditures but our moral priorities as well. There are many reasons to oppose the Ryan budget, but what it does to Medicare and Medicaid are on the top of my list.

They would end Medicare as people have known it. Rather than have a guaranteed benefit, they turn it into a voucher. There would be no guarantee that people would be able to get the services they need and get those benefits provided to them under this voucher. Every year, that voucher would be capped, so they would have to buy a cheaper and cheaper policy with fewer and fewer benefits.

For Medicaid, the Ryan budget cuts $810 billion, ending the coverage for over 70 million Americans: 17 million are seniors or people with disabilities, and 33 million are children, for whom we want to have at least a chance of starting life in the best of health. They would make this into a block grant, cutting $110 billion, shifting the cost on to the States, on to the providers, on to the beneficiaries. They don't hold down costs. They simply shift them.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to simply say that I think that people know over here that we're not proposing a voucher plan. The premium support is quite different, and it's the only bipartisan solution to save and strengthen Medicare.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership as well as to thank all of the members and staff of the Budget Committee.

We have a good product here. It balances. Balance is important because, until you balance, you can't even begin to start paying off this debt, and we do that. The budget that's on the floor right now never balances. It might claim it does, but the math bears otherwise.

□ 1630

I want to address the Medicaid reforms that we put in our budget, because they were just attacked. We believe in balancing the budget. We believe in balancing, not by raising taxes, but by cutting spending. But you don't just have to cut to cut spending. You can reform.

You can reform these programs, Mr. Chair, so that they are around for the generations to come. Medicaid, a program that by all accounts is failing those whom it is intending to serve, needs reform. It leads to poor outcomes for patients.

A 2010 study suggested that surgical patients on Medicaid were 13 percent more likely to die, Mr. Chairman, than those without health insurance at all. That bears repeating. If you're a surgical patient on Medicaid, you are 13 percent more likely to die. That needs reform.

It drives away doctors who want to serve the poor. On average, doctors who participate in Medicaid earn 56 percent of what those in the private sector do. It also is pushing our States closer and closer to the brink of fiscal collapse. States on average now spend more on Medicaid than on any other expense, including K–12 education, Mr. Chairman. And the dramatic expansion of Medicaid under ObamaCare will only make these problems worse.

We have to address these failing programs. The States are doing it already. In Rhode Island, with the help of a waiver from the Federal regulations, they are able to take a cap in spending for 5 years and put everyone in managed care successfully. In my home State of Indiana, 40,000 more people who really needed the care were put on without one more dime of expense.

Mr. Chairman, reform is needed, reform cuts costs, and reform will make sure these programs are around for generations to come. Please do not support this budget. Support the Ryan plan.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana just made the point that under the current Medicaid system States have lots of flexibility, including Indiana, to help bring down costs. But when you have a tight program, cutting another $820 billion is not a lifeline; it's throwing them an anchor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds simply to say that Indiana is being denied their waivers, so they're being denied the flexibility they are asking for to run Medicaid as they see fit to serve their populations. Point made.

I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the House majority party for putting together a budget that takes a balanced approach. It balances the interest of two very future vulnerable groups.

One is my age, because in 11 years I'm going to be on Medicare and Medicare is going to be broke, completely insolvent, absolutely broke.

At the same time, earlier today, I met with some kids who were here with the Close Up program. They were high school students full of hope. In 11 years, they're going to be starting families, buying cars and gasoline and houses and insurance and raising kids; and they'll be at a financially vulnerable age.

Now, the House Republican budget protects both of us. It makes Medicare solvent for me when I am there and I need the money. And it doesn't do it on the backs of those young high school students today that will be 28-years-old when they need to be raising families and saving for their children's college and their own retirements. It doesn't with the premium support system, not a voucher system, a premium support system, which is what I have as a Member of Congress, where I get to choose from among government pre-approved insurance programs that don't deny me for a preexisting condition. I pay part of the premium and the government pays part of the premium. The healthy and wealthy get less premium support, the unhealthy and unwealthy get more.

It solves both parties. It's the balanced approach. I ask you to reject the minority party's budget and support the House Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI), the very distinguished Democratic leader, who just returned from the Vatican and hopefully will bring some hope from the Pope, as I say.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him, Mr. Chairman, for his tremendous, tremendous leadership and giving us an opportunity in the House today to vote on a budget that is a reflection of American values—values of work and jobs, promoting them, a value of fairness, a value of advancing the success of America's families. I thank him for giving us a budget—I think we can all be the judge—where we say that a budget is a statement of our national values. What is important to us as a Nation is a place where we allocate our resources.

This budget is in stark absolute contrast to the Republican budget that is on the floor today.

Contrast number one: jobs. The Republican bill, the Ryan Republican budget, is a job killer. Nearly 2 million jobs lost right out of the gate, and more lost after that; whereas the Van Hollen Democratic substitute is a job creator. It invests in rebuilding the infrastructure of America. It invests in innovation, energy, and education. Speaking of infrastructure, the American Society of Civil Engineers has given us a D in terms of the condition of the infrastructure in our country. So the need is there. This budget recognizes that need, but it also does so in a way that creates jobs in a very innovative way.

It is in strong contrast when it comes to fairness, fairness as to how we, again, establish our priorities to invest in education, rather than continue to give tax breaks, loopholes that are unnecessary, unworthy of a values budget that the Republican budget continues.

And in terms of our seniors, the contrast could not be greater. The Ryan budget, in 10 years there will be no Medicare guarantee—flat out, absolutely. There will be no Medicare guarantee.

In the meantime—in the meantime—the Ryan budget takes the resources that we have in the health care reform bill, repeals the bill, and takes the money and runs to give it to his priorities, rather than strengthening Medicare and keeping it strong for a longer period of time, keeping the benefits that are in the Affordable Care Act, prevention and wellness services right from the start, closing the prescription drug doughnut hole, and the list goes on.

I listened intently to the gentlelady speak about our high school 18-year-old seniors and where they'll be when they're 28 years old. And since young people are always used as sort of a point of discussion, and rightfully so—we're here to provide for their future—I think it's important to listen to what they have to say.

And the young people that have passed through the Capitol—as you know, many do—I frequently invite them to sit down and tell me what they would like us to say at the table of the discussion of the budget—especially when it comes to them—because we always say we cannot heap mountains of debt on the next generation. I fully agree. That is why I support the Van Hollen budget.

These young people say, We want a strong education system, a strong public education system. We need student loans that are affordable. We need Pell Grants. We need our families to be able to focus on us, and so we need Medicare and Medicaid so that our grandparents' health needs are met.

For a long time to come, they hope, loving their grandparents. But these young people want to be helpful in solving the budget crisis. That's what they have told us: We want to do our share.

The initiative that brings more money to the Federal Treasury is education—education, early childhood, K–12, higher education, post-grad, all the rest of that lifetime learning.

□ 1640

Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than educating the American people, and that is why investing in education, creating jobs, that brings revenue. It's hard to see why we would put forth a budget that stunts the growth of jobs, the growth of our economy with jobs and our investments in education.

On the subject of education, tens of billions of dollars are struck in the Ryan Republican anti-job bill, in that job-killer bill, tens of billions of dollars. They say, it's better to give a tax break to a special interest than to invest in the education of our children.

Would that be a statement of your national values if you were writing a budget for our country? I don't think so. It certainly was not a statement of the values of the young people who have come through here saying how they would help solve the budget deficit challenge we face.

We all know the deficit must be reduced. We've known it for a long time. We've recognized it for a long time. President Clinton recognized it and took us on a path of soundness.

It was totally reversed in the Bush years when our Republican colleagues didn't say a word. They said, no problem; it's the appropriate percentage of GDP. No problem with the deficit. They never complained about it.

But now, with their initiatives, the Ryan Republican job-killer budget is making matters worse in terms of reducing the deficit because it deprives our economy of the very initiatives that would create growth, the education of our people, lifetime learning for the American people.

Investments in education, as I said, nothing brings more money. Investments in jobs, whether it's infrastructure, energy, innovation—absent in the Ryan Republican job-killer budget.

Medicare, so important to the stability of America's working families, the provisions in the Affordable Care Act that affect Medicare have already demonstrated that it is halting the rapid increase in the cost of health care spending, and so that is what has enabled the CBO to say, with more promise, that we can use a different baseline to reduce the deficit, and that has been used in the Republican budget.

So I urge my colleagues to think about the kitchen tables of people in our country. We sit at a table here and have these discussions. What's really important is how the decisions we make here, what we think, and how that relates to the challenges they face, the education of their children, are they going to be able to keep their home, keep their job, keep their pension, all of this heaped one on top of another of concerns.

And the economic and health security of our seniors not only has an impact on them, the seniors, but on their families. And if we're going to be true to those young people, those 18-year olds, we must recognize how important their education is, but also, how important caring for their grandparents is to the economic success of their entire family.

I'll end where I began. The most important part of all of this is this issue of jobs, jobs, jobs, and the fairness in our budget to promote jobs and to reduce the deficit for the success of America's families.

The choice is clear: Job-killer Ryan Republican budget bill, job-creator Van Hollen substitute bill. I urge my colleagues to support the Van Hollen bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I'm just not going to agree with that one, Mr. Chairman. I'll yield myself 30 seconds.

The minority leader says she's concerned about the debt that is befalling the next generation. I'm glad to hear that. Doing nothing, the debt will go up by 56 percent if we just do nothing.

If this budget passes, the Democratic substitute, it will go up by 54 percent. That's basically doing nothing as well.

Jobs: the CBO statistic the gentleman talks about, it's not even an estimate of this budget, it's the sequester.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself another 10 seconds.

But the Stanford economist who did look at this Republican budget says that we will create 500,000 jobs in the first year and 1.7 million each and every year by the end of this budget window. Faster economic growth, more jobs, getting the government to live within its means, balancing the budget.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, today we're not talking about balancing a budget for the sake of balancing a budget. The goal is not to just check a box. What we're discussing today is about more than just this procedure of a budget. We're debating the kind of future that we're going to leave our kids.

Today, the choice is clear: if Congress does not get spending under control, our Nation faces a debt crisis that will only make our financial situation worse. House Republicans did recognize this and the urgency of the hour, and we acted.

I'm proud to have worked with my colleagues on the Budget Committee to produce a budget that does make responsible reforms, promotes economic growth and job creation. The House Republican budget does balance in 10 years and gets our Nation back on track.

The Democrats' budget doesn't balance at all within CBO's budget window, and it includes a $1.2 trillion increase in taxes. Our budget reforms the Tax Code and lowers taxes for everyone.

Hardworking Hoosier families sit around their kitchen tables today, tonight, this evening, and make tough choices to keep their budgets. Our households and businesses work hard to live within their means, and the Federal Government should do the same.

The basic principle of keeping budgets is important to all American families. When I'm home in the Second District in the State of Indiana and I'm in the grocery store on Saturday mornings, there are moms that come up to me and they're worried about the rising cost of eggs. They're talking about the price of a gallon of milk.

They're concerned about whether their kids will have a future. Will they really go to college? Will there be jobs for them when they come out of college? Will there be jobs for them if they don't go to college? What happens when they do enter the workforce?

The truth is this: the uncertainty in Washington is what burdens our families at home. It's time for us in Washington to be accountable and pass a responsible budget.

According to Stanford University, in addition to what the chairman mentioned, their economists said that this Republican budget would result in $1,500 more for each household in 2014 and $4,000 more for each household by 2024.

Our budget includes commonsense policies that will spur investments and job creation and roll back the regulations that hurt businesses and stifle economic growth.

History will be our judge by the future that we leave to our children. If we refuse to make responsible, serious decisions about this budget, we'll jeopardize the American Dream for future generations. We have to ensure that our children have the same, if not better, opportunities to succeed than we have.

I urge my colleagues to make a responsible decision, oppose this amendment, and support the House Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I support the Van Hollen budget because it recognizes that reducing our deficit is important, and that fiscal restraint, spending cuts, more revenues in a balanced way, is the way to do that. But I also support it because it chooses American economic growth over the European-style austerity.

Prior to 1965, in this country, when you got old and retired, you moved in with your kids and hoped you didn't get sick. And only the very lucky or the very wealthy got to go to college.

In 1965, two things changed. We adopted Medicare that said that retired people had health security, and we adopted the Higher Education Act that said that sons and daughters of truckdrivers and teachers could get a college education.

What happened?

Prior to 1965, on a per capita basis, our economy grew by $323 per person per year. After 1965, our economy grew by $523 per person per year. Investing in Medicare, investing in education yields growth.

The Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantees and will severely raise the cost of going to college for American families. Vote ''yes'' on the Van Hollen plan.

□ 1650

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Little do some know that ObamaCare ended Medicare as we know it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to a distinguished senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. VAN HOLLEN recently pointed out that Democrats and Republicans both want to get rid of a range of tax loopholes but Democrats want to spend that money and Republicans want to lower the overall burden. That difference is very important.

We have the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world. That's the principle reason why we're losing American jobs to nations with much lower taxes. As economist Arthur Laffer has warned, there's nothing more portable in this world than money.

This policy might fit the left's ''eat the rich'' crusade, but the jobs it destroys are eating our middle class alive. We are sacrificing permanent, upwardly mobile, productive private sector jobs for makeshift subsidized ones that disappear the moment the money runs out. That is precisely the difference between FedEx and the post office or between Apple and Solyndra. And that's all the difference in the world.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. May I inquire again how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The fundamental choice here is whether we want a budget like the Democratic budget that focuses on economic growth and strengthening the middle class or whether you want to take a budget like the Republican budget that imposes European-style austerity by more than doubling the size of the sequester on essential investments to help the economy grow. Investment in our infrastructure, when we know we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry. Investment in our kids' education, not doubling the student loan interest rate in July, as the Republican budget would do. Investment in science and research. If we don't make those investments, our global competitors are going to eat our lunch.

And yes, we do ask the very wealthy to get rid of some of their tax breaks and loopholes to help contribute to the reduction of the deficit so that we can reduce the deficit in a balanced way that calls for shared responsibility. And no, we do not ask middle-income families to pay higher taxes in order to finance tax breaks for the wealthy. And yes, we get the deficit down in a steady way. We balance it in the same year the Republican bill balanced last year, and we don't pretend that we're going to balance and get rid of ObamaCare at the same time. That's fake balance, not real balance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this green graph shows you the revenues we've historically had in America. The blue line shows you the tax increases our friends are hoping to achieve, some of which have already occurred. The red line shows you where spending is going. We have a spending problem. But the time my kids are my age, the government will be taking twice as much money to spend on the Federal Government.

Austerity is what you do when you have a debt crisis. You raise taxes and you cut spending on seniors to try and please the bond markets to stop the panic. That's the path we're on. What we're trying to do is prevent austerity.

What do we propose? Let's grow the economy. Let's reform the tax system. Let's stop picking winners and losers through loopholes, lower tax rates for everybody—families and businesses—to create jobs and economic growth. Let's open up the resources we have in this country—oil, coal, and gas—so we can bring down gas prices, increase paychecks, create jobs, help manufacturing.

We have a safety net that isn't working. We have the highest poverty rates in a generation. There are 46 million people in poverty. We need to fix this safety net so it works to get people back on their feet again. We need to save Medicare so that it's not bankrupt—because it is on a path to bankruptcy—so that current seniors can rest in comfort knowing it's not going to be taken away from them, so that the ObamaCare rationing board won't take it from them, and so that those of us who are younger can plan for it.

We need to balance the budget. Balancing the budget is necessary for a healthy economy, for creating jobs, and for giving our kids a debt-free Nation. That's why we do this. Their budget, despite what they say, never, ever balances. The budget the Senate is considering today never, ever balances.

The budget that they're talking about here, the budget that they're passing in the Senate, it actually has a net spending increase. And don't forget the fact that taxes just went up by $1.6 trillion. What do they want to do? Throw another trillion on top. Guess what? They may say it's for the rich. They may say it's for the loophole. Watch out, middle class. The tax man is coming to you. Because that's exactly what all these deficits and all these tax increases are pointing at—taking more out of the paychecks of hardworking families. We're going to balance the budget and stop that from happening. That's why I urge a defeat of the Van Hollen substitute and passage of the base bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I support the Democratic budget. It is a responsible roadmap that invests in our future and approaches deficit reduction in a balanced way. It accomplishes this without singling out domestic energy production with unfair tax provisions.

I cannot support the Republican budget. It cuts taxes for the wealthy and pays for it by raising taxes on middle income earners and betraying our commitment to our seniors. It is misguided and does not reflect the values Americans hold dear.

The Republican budget slashes Medicaid, which provides necessary care to our nation's most vulnerable, especially low-income seniors and children. Denying them the care they need does not make the costs go away, it just shifts the burden on to doctors, hospitals, non-profits, and others.

The Majority budget repeats the same tired and failed tactic of repealing the Affordable Care Act. Repeal increases the deficit and means Seniors will pay more for prescription drugs, receive less preventive care, and bring back the days of abusive insurance companies capping coverage and denying coverage to those with pre-existing conditions.

Alternatively, the Democratic budget makes good on the commitments we have made to our Seniors. It makes sure that the Affordable Care Act is fully implemented and that the benefits are maximized to protect patients and begin to bring down the cost of healthcare. This budget also provides the necessary funding for medical research, which will spur the innovations of the future that end disease and improve outcomes.

Additionally, I appreciate the Ranking Member for making education a top priority in this budget. Investing in education is key to growing our economy, strengthening the middle class, allowing for upward mobility and ensuring our children and grandchildren have brighter futures than previous generations. Robust early education programs, jobs initiatives and financial aid programs to make college more affordable invest in our future and build a stronger America in the long-term. Making it harder for out-of-work Americans to get job training or for families to access quality early learning programs undermines the strength of our workforce and diminishes our ability to compete in the global economy.

Spending on domestic programs is already on track to be at the lowest level as a percentage of the economy since the 1960s, but the Ryan budget would make even deeper cuts. It imposes spending caps on non-defense programs for two additional years at a level that is $700 billion below the level set by the Sequester. It slashes billions of dollars in mandatory funding for Pell Grants and allows interest rates on student loans to double this summer at a time when student loan debt is nearing $1 trillion and is the only type of household debt that continued to rise through the Great Recession. We should be working to help Americans who seek to better their livelihood through higher education rather than allowing them to be crushed by debt or denied access due to skyrocketing costs.

Under the Ryan budget, students will face larger class sizes, more debt, fewer afterschool programs, and less support for special needs. Robust funding for educational investments is critical to growing our economy. Cutting these programs shortchanges our future and threatens the ability of our children to pursue the American Dream.

Finally, I want to thank our Ranking Member on the House Budget Committee and Democratic Leadership for not including provisions in this budget that would unfairly single-out and punish our domestic energy industry by repealing tax provisions for them that are afforded to any business operating in our country. The oil and natural gas industry is one of the largest employers in our country, supporting more than 9.2 million jobs. In fact, this industry delivers $86 million a day to the federal government in revenue. Any changes to these tax incentives should be addressed in the context of comprehensive tax reform and not a budget.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, let me thank our Ranking Member, Congressman VAN HOLLEN.

As a Member of the Budget Committee, I rise in strong support of the Democratic Alternative Budget to the disastrous Republican Budget.

The Democratic budget will close special interest tax loopholes to raise the critical revenue we need to create 1.2 million new jobs, and make key investments in education, health care and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, the Democratic Alternative not only fully funds the SNAP program, it includes language that calls for the creation of a National Strategy on Poverty.

Democrats understand that fully supporting our safety net programs, like Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, and Social Security, will reduce poverty, grow the middle class, and promote job creation and economic growth.

Finally, the Democratic Budget eliminates off budget spending in the Oversees Contingency Operations slush fund to stop our cycle of perpetual wars and bring our troops home safely.

The Democratic Budget offers a balanced alternative to the failed economic and fiscal policies of the Republican majority.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic Budget.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 253, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

AYES—165

Andrews	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Bass	Brady (PA)	Carney
Beatty	Braley (IA)	Carson (IN)
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Cartwright
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Castor (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Castro (TX)
Blumenauer	Capuano	Chu

Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
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
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—253

Alexander
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
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
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
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)
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
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
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
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
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
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
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 (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Amodei
Engel
Fortenberry
Grimm
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Meng
Miller, George
Schock
Smith (NJ)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1718

Messrs. COFFMAN and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS, 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. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1720

THE NATIONAL FAB LAB NETWORK ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the National Fab Lab Network Act of 2013. I introduced this bill because America needs a well-trained workforce for advanced manufacturing.

When I go home, people ask me, Where are the jobs? But when I talk to manufacturing groups like the Tooling & Manufacturing Association in Illinois, they tell me there is a mismatch between job openings and students and workers with the right skills to fill them.

Fab labs can help bridge that skills gap. Fab labs are workshops equipped with computer-controlled machine tools that allow children and adults to build almost anything. The first fab lab was started at MIT, and they have spread worldwide.

My bill would create a Federal charter for a nonprofit organization called the National Fab Lab Network. This chartered status would be similar to that enjoyed by Little League Baseball or the Veterans of Foreign Wars. My bill would help American manufacturers fill job openings and encourage students to become more active in STEM fields, all at no cost to taxpayers.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this initiative and to cosponsor the National Fab Lab Network Act of 2013.

AMERICA'S NATURAL GAS REVOLUTION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, science is beginning to prevail in the debate over America's natural gas revolution, and it's time to begin telling the real story of what it means for all Americans.

Just 7 years ago, America was facing the fact that we would have to import an increasing amount of natural gas to fulfill our domestic demand. Today, new technologies have enabled us to access previously inaccessible energy resources, and almost overnight America's energy resource picture flipped from deficit to surplus.

In the past 5 years, we've become stronger as a Nation through the development of these God-given resources. As a result, we're more competitive. From the low-income to the high tax brackets, everyone is benefiting.

The future is bright, but only if we educate, dispel myths and half-truths, and begin telling the real story of America's natural gas revolution and what it means to all Americans.

The story is about technology, private sector innovation, investment, financial risks, thousands of new jobs, new competition, new growth, a growing and better standard of living for more Americans, lower energy costs, new industries, a revitalized manufacturing sector, more growth, more jobs, energy security, and optimism. This is the story of America's natural gas revolution.

THE RYAN BUDGET AND MEDICARE

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Ryan budget once again places the burden of deficit reduction on working Americans while failing to stop the frivolous spending of subsidies for oil and gas companies that cost the American people billions of dollars every year.

I'm especially concerned that the Ryan budget will end the guarantee of Medicare for hardworking Americans who have paid into it. Medicare was created precisely because the private market failed to provide seniors with affordable and quality health care.

Even if senior citizens are able to find decent health insurance, they would still have to pay $1,000 more a year for prescription drugs after the Ryan budget reopens the doughnut hole. Overall, their budget will force seniors to pay $59,500 more in health care costs during their retirement. My neighbors, who work so hard to pay their mortgages and send their children to college, can't afford to spend another $59,500.

Rather than ramming through a partisan budget that will never become law, I encourage Congress to work together on a budget that can preserve Medicare, reduce the deficit, and grow our economy.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks, I've been talking to my constituents and I've been talking to former patients about the importance of Medicare and how Medicare has impacted their lives, how they've relied on it.

As a doctor, I've taken care of thousands of patients, patients who have worked their whole life paying into a system so that they could rest easy at a time when they needed their health care. They wouldn't have to worry about it.

This is a value and a program that has served millions of Americans for decades. They've come to rely on Medicare. It is a program that works. It is a program that we've come to rely on as doctors.

Let me make it even a little more personal than that. Let me tell you the story about my parents, who came here as immigrants over 50 years ago.

My mom was a public school teacher and my dad was an engineer and a small business owner. They got up every day. They went to work. They paid into a system over a lifetime so that when they needed their health care, they could rest easy. They knew they had a Medicare system.

Let me even make it more personal. Over these past few years, my dad is in his late seventies and he has needed knee replacements. He was able to get them. His doctor was able to order the care that was necessary to take care of him.

A few months ago, my mom suffered a mild stroke. My dad didn't have to hesitate about whether she could get health care or not. My dad could pick up the phone, call 911 and get her to the hospital. She was able to get the care that was necessary that millions of Americans count on. Her doctor was able to come and see her. Her doctor was able to order the postoperative care that was necessary.

□ 1730

That is why millions of Americans rely on Medicare—so they can rest easy at a time when they need that security of health care. It is a system that works. It is a system that working men and women in America pay into over their lifetimes so that, when they're at their most vulnerable, they're able to get the care that they need. I've seen it time and time again as a doctor. Let me share a story with you.

As a young intern in my training as a doctor in internal medicine, one of my first patients was a Roman Catholic priest, Father Mike. It was my first month working in a hospital and doing my rounds in the intensive care unit. Now, Father Mike was afflicted with ALS, more commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease. Father Mike would be in and out of the hospital, and would be devastatingly sick. For those of you who know about Lou Gehrig's disease, it is a progressive illness that slowly deteriorates and eats away at your body. It takes away your muscles and your ability to breathe. So, over the course of 2 years, I would see Father Mike repeatedly going in and out of the intensive care unit. He needed that care to keep him alive. Without Medicare, he wouldn't have been able to afford the care.

Now, let's ask ourselves as Americans: What are our values?

Our values are that we take care of our seniors, that we take care of our parents and grandparents, and we want to honor them after a lifetime of work. That is who we are. Those are our morals as Americans, and that is why I'm on the floor of the House of Representatives today to talk about how important Medicare is, not only for my parents but for parents throughout this country, for grandparents throughout this country, and also for that next generation that is currently paying into the system. I'm not alone. My fellow colleagues in medicine care about this deeply.

With that, I would like to recognize my colleague, a fellow physician from California, Dr. RAUL RUIZ.

Mr. RUIZ. Thank you, Dr. BERA.

This Congress has a responsibility and an opportunity to work together to grow our economy and to set this Nation on a fiscally responsible path. However, the Ryan budget is irresponsible, and it places the burden of the deficit on hardworking American families and seniors. This plan ends the guarantee of Medicare. As an ER doctor, I know that many of my senior patients are struggling financially and rely on Medicare in the moments of their lives when they need it the most.

Our priority should be reducing health care costs in order to make Medicare stronger and more sustainable, but this budget transforms Medicare into a voucher program, shifting the costs of health care onto the shoulders of our seniors. We must, once again, work together to protect and preserve Medicare, reduce our deficit and decrease health care costs. I urge my colleagues to come together across party lines and put American families and our seniors first.

Mr. BERA of California. Thank you, Dr. RUIZ.

I urge Americans to share their stories. I urge them to share the importance of Medicare and how they rely on it. Share the stories about your parents and grandparents. I urge the Members of this body to share their stories. We all have parents and grandparents. We all care about this program, and we all have stories to tell.

Just today, in my office, I had a colorectal cancer survivor come to visit. She talked about how her cancer was diagnosed early because she was able to go get a colonoscopy—because she was able to get the preventive care services that were necessary. She would not have been able to do that had she not had access to Medicare, had she not had access to basic cancer prevention.

That is what's at stake here—making sure that our seniors, that our parents and grandparents, have access to that care when they need it the most. That's why I'm on the floor here today, because we have to protect Medicare—a program that has worked for decades. It is a program that we rely on, so I want to hear your stories about how we protect Medicare and make sure it's there for generations. This is a program that has worked time and time again. Let me even share another story of patients that I've taken care of.

I've taken care of hundreds of men and women who do physical labor—construction workers, folks who get up every morning and go to work. They don't make a lot of money, but they pay into a system. I'd encourage every American to pull out their paychecks and take a look at them, and you'll see right on there that you're paying into the Medicare system. Even those who are 25 or 30 years old are paying into the system.

Why do we do that?

We pay into the system so that, when we need our health care, we're able to get it. That's what we do as Americans. We know we're in this together, that we care for one another. That is the beauty of Medicare. As I'm working today, I am paying to make sure that my parents and grandparents have the health care they need so that, when I need that health care in retirement, when I'm a senior, I can get it, and so that I can rest easy and not have to worry about that.

That's why we are encouraging you to share your stories. We want to hear your stories about how Medicare has impacted your life and why it is so vital that this body protect Medicare and strengthen Medicare. Share your stories with us on Facebook or Twitter.

I would like to now recognize my colleague, the distinguished gentlelady from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Congressman.

In listening to your talk, I've been inspired to share this personal story of my mom. I told this story a few minutes ago, but it's worth repeating.

About 20 years ago, my mom had just reached Medicare age. She was a widow on a fixed income, and she was diagnosed with breast cancer. I had a young son at the time. He is grown now, but he was 13 years old. Our family was blessed as my mother had Medicare, and she was able to get the good health care that she needed, and she's still with me today. I didn't have to choose between helping my mother with her health care treatment or saving money to send my son to college.

That's the kind of choice Americans are going to have to make under this Republican budget, because the Republican budget doesn't make seniors healthier, it just shifts the burden.

My district is filled with people from all walks of life, from all different professions, whether they be teachers or nurses or accountants. They've worked hard their whole lives, and they've saved up their Medicare accounts and can live with the comfort now of knowing that, if they get sick or if they get injured, the health care that they've earned will be there for them. They will not be a burden on their children, and they will not take the savings that their children have for their grandkids' college educations and use it for their health care.

But it's not enough, Congressman BERA, for us just to say that the Republican budget is bad, because the fact of the matter is the American people and my constituents want answers. They want us to be problem solvers, not problem creators, and they want us to get something done. The Democratic budget gets something done. Just on this issue of health care for our seniors, we secure Medicare for this generation and for generations to come because we focus on what the problem is, and that has been the growing costs of health care.

□ 1740

In the Affordable Care Act, we tackle the problem directly. We reduce overpayments to health care insurance carriers. We look for efficiencies in the delivery of health care. We focus on prevention. We make health care more accessible to more people so that when they enter their Medicare ages, they're healthier. The Democratic budget has a solution, a solution to a challenge that all Americans recognize today.

Congressman BERA, I want to thank you for allowing me to spend some time to speak on behalf of not only my family, but so many of the families in my district in south Florida who depend on Medicare to live full lives.

Mr. BERA of California. Thank you, Congresswoman FRANKEL.

You know, I look at this whole issue from the eyes of a doctor. That's how I have to, that's how I was trained as a doctor. One of the first rules we take when we are sworn in as doctors, the oath and the promise that we make is to do good, benevolence. That is core to what we do, and that is core to what this body needs to understand.

This is not about Republicans versus Democrats. We need to come together to do good for our parents and grandparents, to do good for our seniors, to make sure that we honor the promise that we made to them that after a lifetime of work that they would be able to get the care when they needed it the most. That they could rest easy and not have to worry about getting the care that they needed.

Those are American values. Those aren't Democrat versus Republican. We need to start setting aside that partisanship. And as to the oath I took when I became a doctor and was sworn into the field of medicine, we need to do good. We need to have the courage to put our patients and American citizens first. That is what this is about. That is why I'm on the floor today talking as a doctor about the patients that I've cared for.

Now, I've heard from others that I represent. Tina shared a story with me. Her father died a few weeks ago after spending a month in the hospital.

Medicare meant her family never had to worry about what the cost of his care was during his illness. Medicare meant that her mother doesn't have to live a life in bankruptcy now, that she could rest easy that her husband was able to get the care that he needed. Medicare meant that they knew in her father's last days that he was getting good health care, that his doctors were able to give him the care that was necessary at the end of his life.

Tina has urged me to fight every day to make sure that every family has the same peace and the same support and the same security that her family had and that she felt at a time when her father needed the care. That's what this is about. This is about doing what we do as Americans. We care for one another. We build a system where we're all in this together, where those of us who are working are paying into a system over a lifetime so that the seniors of today are able to get that care and that we pay it forward. Those are our values. Those are American values, and it's not Democrat versus Republican; and we have to get past this.

As we are on this floor, as we're making votes, we have to think about those who came before us, our parents, our grandparents, the seniors who built this country. That is who we are as Americans, and that's why we want to hear your stories about why Medicare is so important. Share those stories with us on Facebook. Share those stories with us on Twitter. Let your Representatives know why it is so important you want us to keep fighting for Medicare every day.

I'd now like to actually hear a story from my colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from the great State of Ohio.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you so much, Congressman BERA. What a great opportunity for me to tell my story when I think about Medicare and what that means to me—but more importantly, what it means to this Nation, what it means to the citizens in the Third Congressional District that I represent, what it means to someone's mother, someone's grandmother, someone's spouse.

Medicare is something that was created and seniors have paid into it, oftentimes for a lifetime. And then they get to a point in their life when they want to be able to use something that they paid into. Medicare is something that you're going to hear about from people.

I agree with my colleagues that Medicare is not, nor should it be, a Democrat or a Republican issue. It should be something when you think about being able to provide health care for the same individuals who put so much money into it that they can now be able to use it. Medicare helps save lives. Medicare is part of what I think of as part of the American Dream. Medicare is something that we should be proud to be able to say that we're going to take care of our seniors.

You see, a few years ago my father was very ill; but it was because of Medicare that I was able to witness him getting quality health care. I'm fortunate, my mother is still living. And like many of my colleagues who have come here today and talked about the wonderful benefit that they had by being able to know that their parent was being taken care of, and they were going to be able to have quality health care, isn't that something that we all want? Isn't that something we want as a Democrat? Isn't that something that we want as a Republican?

Let me tell you what I know the citizens of the Third Congressional District want. Let me tell you what I really believe the citizens of this wonderful country we live in want. I think they want to see us working together. I think they want to hear solutions. I think they want to know that they can trust us, because they sent us here not to be in gridlock, not for us to be fighting, not for us to be arguing without resolve, and that's what Democrats are saying to you today.

We have taken this issue that touches lives and reaches across America, and we are saying it is our responsibility as Members of Congress, Members of this 113th Congress, that we should make it one of our key responsibilities to stand on this floor and tell those stories, to tell those stories about Medicare, to tell those stories about the lady who lives down the street from me and how fortunate she was because Medicare saved her life. We should be able to stand on this floor and give speech after speech to say to America: you sent us here to protect those who are the most fragile citizens, those who have given so much that we stand here.

So you see, my story is quite simple about Medicare. It's about exercising our right to protect those who paved the way for us. It's about me saying proudly as a Democrat our alternatives to the budget as it relates to Medicare is the best solution. It's about saying we should not make it a voucher program. It's about me saying we should not take moneys from Medicare and give to other companies that don't need it.

You see, it's quite simple. It's a story about saving lives. It's a story about doing all the things that we say as public servants. It's about the oath that we took as an elected official that we would serve our communities, that we would come here and make a difference.

□ 1750

So, Congressman BERA, for me, it's about standing strong and saying to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Join us; join us in making a difference to help our seniors and protect and save Medicare. And that's my message and my story.

Mr. BERA of California. Thank you to my colleague from the great State of Ohio.

That's why we are asking folks today to share their stories. We would love to hear your story about how Medicare has affected you or a family member or a friend. Share it on Facebook or Twitter. We want to hear those stories. This body needs to hear those stories. This body needs to make sure, when we're taking votes, we're voting understanding those stories.

As a doctor, I took an oath to do good, to do no harm. Well, if Medicare becomes a voucher program, it will do irreparable harm to thousands of Americans, and that is not what we need.

The reason why I'm on the floor today is to talk about the good that Medicare has done for millions of Americans. Americans, like another one of my constituents, Pat. She shared with us a story.

Pat was a single mom. She worked hard her whole life and raised two kids on her own. Pat is now 77 years old. She has high blood pressure, diabetes, and heart disease. She had to have open-heart surgery and afterwards was prescribed very expensive medications and cardiac rehabilitation. She had to get back on her feet because she wanted to be with her family.

There's no way Pat could have afforded that surgery if she didn't have Medicare. There's no way Pat could have afforded the medications that she needed if she didn't have Medicare. There's no way that the doctors that cared for Pat would have been able to prescribe the therapies that she needed to keep her alive. That is what's at risk here.

This is about protecting our seniors, making sure that after a lifetime of work, after a lifetime of paying into a system, that they can rest easy; that they don't have to worry about whether they can get the health care that they need when they need it the most, they can rest easy.

That's why we want to hear your stories. Please share your story about how Medicare has impacted your life or your family's life on Facebook or Twitter.

I would now like to yield to my dear friend and colleague from the great State of California, my home State, Mr. HONDA.

Mr. HONDA. I want to thank my friend, Dr. AMI BERA, for allowing me to speak for a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to dispel the oft repeated notion that Medicare is somehow the problem in the current fiscal crisis. Republicans have, in budget after budget, attempted to voucherize the program and end the Medicare guarantee as we know it. They would break the promise we made to our Nation's seniors decades ago, one in which we told hardworking middle class Americans that if they paid in through their wages and trusted in their government that they would be taken care of.

Medicare is the most efficient health plan in our country. It has a 2 percent overhead. Let me repeat that. It has a 2 percent overhead. More efficient than any private plan.

The problem isn't Medicare. The problem is the rising cost of health care and what it is we have to do to get that under control. It's a cost that has gone up exponentially in our country compared to the rest of the world.

Republicans want to do nothing about the real problem of rising costs. Rather than tackle the hard issue, they want to shift the costs on to seniors, people like my mom. She's 96 right now, and she depends on that important program.

Six years ago, she had to be checked up for a heart condition. She had had an aneurysm below her diaphragm and it was part of the arterial system. They said that it would be difficult to solve and that they would have to provide a stent because of her age, as she was 70 at that time.

Well, a few years later, that aneurysm grew a little larger, and it became pretty critical that, if nothing was done, she would die. The doctors looked at her again at the advanced age of 90 and concluded that we could do this with her—she walked around acting like she was 70—and would have a 9 out of 10 chance of survival. If she did not do anything, the chance of survival would have been a lot less.

My mom thought about it, she pondered about it, and she said, I'm 90. I've lived a good life. Let's take this 9 out of 10 chance. And she put her faith not only in the hands of the doctors and the system, but also in the hands of her God. After a few hours of operation, she came out, and it was successful.

But none of this could have been possible without Medicare. We would not have been able to afford it, and neither could she have afforded it.

She grew up as a child of a businessman during prewar United States, and in her adult life as my mom, she worked as a domestic, so she had no pension plan. She had no other plans that would help her in her old age, except Medicare.

So, time and time again, when Congress was looking for an easy way out in dealing with these issues, leaving folks like my mom holding the bag, this whole issue is personal. And I'm sure that this is a story that could be shared by almost every family in this country in one way or another when we think about Medicare. So, having the middle class Americans and people like my mom holding the bag is absolutely unacceptable. It is wrong and it is quite cowardly.

One of the major reasons why our health care costs keep going up is because we have not changed the way patients and doctors see each other. We must be innovative and creative in tackling the traditional costs of health care.

As a Representative covering Silicon Valley, I have helped lead the way in this by promoting innovative technologies, such as telemedicine, personal health connected devices, and other tools. I will be reintroducing the Health Care Innovation and Marketplace Technologies Act later this year to continue this effort. Let's hope that folks on the other side will understand its importance.

Most importantly, however, I will continue to stand with my friends here in the Chamber tonight to protect Medicare and the Medicare guarantee. We can fix our Nation's fiscal House by being innovative, rather than using the same old ideology. We can improve our Nation's standing by being courageous and standing by our Nation's seniors.

Mr. BERA of California. I thank my dear friend and colleague from California, Congressman HONDA.

The reason why we are here today, the reason why we are speaking on the floor today, is because of the importance of Medicare. This isn't a Democratic or a Republican issue. This is an issue that affects all Americans. It's an issue that is dear to all Americans, to all American families. It isn't Democratic or Republican.

□ 1800

That's why I'm wearing this pin that says, ''No Labels.'' Because we've got to move past these labels, Democrat versus Republican, and think about what our values are as Americans—the values of making sure we take care of our parents and grandparents, that we honor the foundation that they built for us, that those that came before us built; that we honor, after a lifetime of work, after a lifetime paying into a system, that they can rest easy, that they know they can get the health care that they need when they need it the most.

That's why we want you to share your stories with us about how Medicare has impacted you personally or your family. I think about this and the thousands of patients that I've taken care of, and what Medicare has meant to them; how it saved millions of lives, how it's kept millions of families from falling into poverty because they were able to get the health care that was necessary when they needed it the most.

Another one of my constituents, Katherine, shared a story with us recently. Katherine had a sister who was diagnosed with lung cancer and chronic lung disease. At first, she was hesitant. She was a little bit worried about using her Medicare because she didn't want to be a burden. She wanted to be independent. But she looked at it and she realized she had paid into this system her whole life and was grateful that it was there for her. She realized that she wasn't being a burden and that this is the system that she had paid into, and it was there for her. Medicare covered her bills and kept her alive. That's why we're here on the floor today talking about Medicare.

When I talk about this, it's personal. I talk about this as a doctor. I talk about this as a son whose parents are aging. I think about the people who live in my neighborhood, like my neighbor, Jerry. He's a widower. His wife passed away several years ago. Jerry's also a cancer survivor. He has to go in for routine blood transfusions and routine care. He doesn't have to worry about whether he can get that care or not because of Medicare. Because he paid into the system his whole life, now he can get the care that he needs.

Millions of families across this country depend on Medicare. That's why we're here talking about protecting Medicare. And that's why we want to hear your stories about how Medicare has impacted your life. I would love to here those stories and want you to share them on Facebook or Twitter. Medicare allows patients that I've seen—patients with diabetes, with high blood pressure, with high cholesterol—to get the medications that they need. Medicare allows me as a doctor to write those prescriptions and know that my patients are able to get the care that they need.

Medicare is not about Democrats versus Republican. It is about doing the honorable thing that we do as Americans. Because that's who we are. Those are our values as Americans. As Americans, we want to make sure that after a lifetime of work, we're going to protect the promise that we made to our parents and grandparents. And I know it's not Democrats versus Republican because you can see it in that picture of when the Tea Party first emerged in this country in 2009. They were holding up their signs saying, ''Keep your hands off of our Medicare.'' You know what? I'd say the same thing.

As we go through these budget debates, let's keep our hands off of Medicare. Yes, we've got to address the cost of health care. But as my colleague, Congressman HONDA shared, Medicare works extremely well. It's a program that has worked for decades. It is a program that has allowed me as a doctor and has allowed countless doctors across this country to deliver the necessary care when we needed to and to do what we were trained to do—to be doctors.

That is why I'm on the floor today talking about how we protect that promise that we made to our parents and grandparents, and how we protect and honor the promises that we've made. Yes, we face challenges in this country. Yes, we have to address our debt and deficit. And we have to build for the future so our children grow up in the same vibrant world that we grew up in with a country that's leading the way. But we can't do that by breaking a promise that we made to our parents and grandparents. We can't do that on the backs of seniors, taking care away from them when they need it the most.

This has to be bipartisan. Because how we treat our elders, how we treat our parents and grandparents, is a direct reflection of who we are as Americans. We need to start talking about this in a bipartisan way. We need to shelve the idea of dismantling Medicare and we have to talk about the idea of strengthening Medicare, making it more secure so that it is there not only for today's seniors but that it is there for the generations, that it is there for our children and grandchildren. It is a system that works extremely well.

Yes, we have to talk about the cost of health care. We have to address the cost of health care. But Medicare isn't the problem. Medicare works extremely well. Ask any senior. Eighty percent of seniors love Medicare. They don't want to see it changed. They don't want to see this body messing around with Medicare. They want us to strengthen it, and they understand that we have to deal with the cost of health care. But the system of Medicare has delivered care extremely well.

That's why I'm on the floor asking you to share your Medicare story. I'm asking you to share that story on Twitter or share it through Facebook. Because this body needs to hear those stories. This body needs to understand that Medicare is a vital program for millions of seniors, that our parents and grandparents depend on this program, and that our doctors and our hospitals depend on Medicare.

Now is not the time to be talking about dismantling Medicare. Now is the time to be talking about how we strengthen Medicare, how we make sure it's there for the generations. That's why I'm on the floor today, as a doctor but also as a son whose parents rely on Medicare. That's why I want to hear your stories, and I want you to share your Medicare story on Facebook or Twitter.

I now yield to my great friend and colleague from the great State of Oregon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

The gentleman from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I want to thank my colleague from California for being here this evening, for sharing the time, allowing me to speak with him. And I must say how excited I was that a friend who actually had a rewarding career was willing to jump into the political fray, which has been difficult at times, particularly as we've had the contentious issues surrounding health care, and that you would be willing to bring your expertise, time, and energy when you had other choices with your life and career. We really appreciate it. Because the experience you have had in the medical profession, the years of study, the actual experience with real-life people adds a dimension that is helpful here in ways that I don't know that you fully appreciate, but I certainly do. I also appreciate focusing on the critical nature of Medicare and where we're going in the world of health care reform.

I just spent last week dealing with my Republican friends' approach to the budget. It can only be described as an exercise in fantasy.

□ 1810

They start with the notion that somehow they're going to eliminate ObamaCare entirely; and they seek to transfer the burden of Medicare and Medicaid from the government onto the shoulders of some of America's most vulnerable poor and disabled, and our senior citizens. I really appreciate your focusing on the importance of Medicare in providing dignity and stability to millions of Americans.

Now, I think there have been, between the House and the Senate, about 50 efforts or more to repeal the health care reform. I must say I hope that finally people get it out of their system. I was surprised that we went in this direction, to turn Medicare into a voucher, a block grant for Medicaid, and put this burden on our senior citizens and some of our poor and disabled Americans, because this was the centerpiece of their campaign for the last 6 months. This was part of what our friend PAUL RYAN and Governor Romney preached from coast to coast, advertised, campaigned; and all of a sudden it was rejected by the American public overwhelmingly. The President was comfortably reelected. In fact, there were more Democratic Senators added who support this effort. In the House of Representatives, not only did we gain seats, but more than a million voters—more voted for Democrats than Republicans.

So you would think that this canard would be put to rest; but it is important for people to know that it is still a viable option as far as our Republican friends are concerned. It's unfortunate because we are making some progress in reforming the health care system—not by turning our back on Medicare, not by transferring the risk and responsibility to seniors and the most vulnerable, but by making it more efficient, by taking some of the experiments that we've done in my home State of Oregon—and as you well know there are some health care systems in California that have already found ways to reward value over volume, to be able to extend care, and do so more efficiently, and squeeze the approximately one-third to 40 percent or more of our health care spending that is wasted.

We can do a better job. We start, I think, by protecting Medicare. We start by recognizing that a voucher—or premium support, or whatever they call it—that caps the investment does nothing to reform health care; but, instead, it puts seniors and our most vulnerable citizens out navigating the health care maze with fewer resources and more responsibility and actually making it harder. Because that's why we have Medicare in the first place. The private market did a terrible job meeting the needs of America's oldest and least healthy population.

I am hopeful that we're going to be able to continue this effort that you're spearheading here tonight, for people to understand the opportunities to continue reform, to note that we are actually seeing a gradual stabilization of health care spending right now, and that there are things in the hopper that we can do going forward without taking advantage of people who deserve the security of a solid, reformed health care system, not one that the Federal Government vouchers and turns their back.

I would yield back to the gentleman if there are comments. I look forward to hearing what you have to say, and perhaps there may be a little more interaction if it's useful.

Mr. BERA of California. Well, I appreciate my friend and colleague from the great State of Oregon.

We've heard wonderful stories from all across this country tonight as my colleagues have shared their experience with Medicare, personal stories about what Medicare has meant to their parents. We want to hear your stories as well. Your Representatives on both sides of the aisle need to hear your stories of what Medicare means to you personally and to your families. Because Medicare is a promise that we've made to our parents and grandparents, to millions of seniors across this country. It is a promise that after a lifetime of work, after a lifetime paying into a system, you can rest easy. You don't have to worry about whether you'll be able to get the health care that you need at a time when you need it the most.

This can't be a partisan issue. It can't be Democrats versus Republicans. Because we're all sons and daughters. We all think about our seniors. Those are our values as Americans. It isn't who we are as a Nation. We respect our elders. That's how we were raised.

As a doctor, we rely on the importance of Medicare. We rely on the ability that at a time when our patients are at their most vulnerable, when they need health care, that I can write that prescription, that I can do the treatment or order that surgery when it's needed. That is the promise that we've made, and that's why we're here fighting every day.

I urge this body, and I urge my colleagues, as we are looking to address the challenges of this Nation, we acknowledge and understand that Medicare is not one of those challenges. Medicare is one of the success stories of America. Medicare is a success story that has kept millions of Americans healthy and alive and giving them the care that they need.

Yes, we face challenges. Yes, we have to address the cost of health care. But Medicare is a success story, and it is something that we should be celebrating every day. That isn't Democrat versus Republican; that is a success story of this body, and let's celebrate that.

With that, I'll yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Dr. BERA.

I appreciate your focus on this and pointing out that this is something that shouldn't be a partisan issue, doesn't have to be a partisan issue, and it is in fact a success story that has made a huge difference in the lives of seniors from coast to coast. It's helped, in many cases, stabilize what's happened in terms of local health care economics.

The pattern that we have seen in escalating health care costs for the last 40 years, yes, there are concerns about health care as it relates to Medicare; but if you compare the rate of increase of private health insurance versus the rate of increase in Medicare, Medicare spending has not gone up as rapidly as what's happened with the private insurance sector.

No senior citizen under Medicare needs to go bankrupt because of medical costs. The security that you mentioned, I find it embarrassing and shameful that the United States is the only major country in the world where there are still people going bankrupt for health care costs. Half of all bankruptcies are a result of health care emergencies. It doesn't have to be this way, and it is not that way for American seniors.

But if we're going to change our health care commitment to our senior citizens, taking away the guarantee of Medicare, flinging people into an uncertain private market that failed them in the past, which is why we had Medicare in the first place, that guarantee is not certain to be there.

No one thinks that we shouldn't have a health care system with a Medicare that is flexible going forward. We're open to reforms, absolutely. We want to reward value instead of volume. We want to be able to deal with the pattern of unnecessary medical readmissions for Medicare patients after they've been in the hospital. It's too high still.

□ 1820

But we are working on mechanisms in Medicare and with the hospitals to be able to reward keeping them out of the hospital with preventable conditions that require readmission.

We're in the process of looking at Medicare Advantage, which is growing dramatically. I come from the district that has probably the highest penetration of Medicare Advantage in the entire country, and it serves in many cases my constituencies pretty well, but there are wide variations across the country in Medicare Advantage. Not all Medicare Advantage programs are created equal.

Again, part of what we've done with the Affordable Care Act is not to turn our backs on potential opportunities to improve it, but to dive in and find ways to reward the most efficient and effective Medicare Advantage programs and, frankly, reduce the support for programs that aren't measuring up. That's what we should be doing.

We are moving in this direction. We don't have to take away the commitment that we have made to America's seniors to improve Medicare, Medicare Advantage, to be able to get even more value out of the system—not just tax dollar savings—but better quality care for our senior citizens, which should be our objective.

I know, Doctor, that is something you've practiced both as an elected official and as a professional; and I deeply appreciate it.

Mr. BERA of California. I genuinely appreciate my colleague from the great State of Oregon sharing these stories and the hard work that you've done on this.

I know I'm coming up on the end of my time, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk about Medicare as a doctor and as a son and talk about the success of Medicare. It's something that we should be celebrating.

I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues to hear their stories of how Medicare has impacted their lives, to work with them to strengthen Medicare, to make sure it is there, not only today, but it is there for the next generation and that it is stronger.

We can do this. We know how to do it. Over the coming weeks and the coming months, as we address our challenges, I'll be coming to this floor to share those stories and those ideas of how we move forward as a Nation and how we move forward as Americans making sure we honor the promise that we've made, that after a lifetime of work, after a lifetime paying into a system, that our parents and grandparents, that our seniors can get the care that they need.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2008

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah) at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 933, CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment; the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read; the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 21, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

771. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Declaration of Prion as a Pest Under FIFRA; Related Amendments; and Availability of Final Test Guidelines [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0427; FRL-9372-7] (RIN: 2070-AJ26) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

772. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetochlor; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0302; FRL-9377-6] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

773. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenpyrazamine; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0357; FRL-9373-9] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

774. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyraflufen-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-1002; FRL-9379-6] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

775. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyroxasulfone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0308; FRL-9379-9] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

776. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tetrachlorvinphos; Extension of Time-Limited Interim Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0360; FRL-9380-9] (RIN: 2070-AZ16) received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

777. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board for Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 (c)(2); to the Committee on Armed Services.

778. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General James N. Mattis, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

779. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Economic Development Conveyances Report to Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

780. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Board of Actuaries, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2012 report on the Military Retirement Fund (MRF); to the Committee on Armed Services.

781. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting Buy American Act Report for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

782. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Filings Required of Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements and Certain Other Related Entities (RIN: 1210-AB51) received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

783. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Ex Parte Cease and Desist and Summary Seizure Orders — Multiple Employer Welfare Arrangements (RIN: 1210-AB48) received March 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

784. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "The Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness (PAIMI) Program Activities Report for Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

785. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Evaluation Findings — Performance Improvement 2011-2012 report; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

786. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Amendments to the HHS Notice of Benefit and Payment Parameters for 2014 [CMS-9964-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AR74) received March 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

787. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; The 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Delaware Portion of the Philadelphia Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0141; FRL-9786-4] received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

788. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Identification of Additional Qualifying Renewable Fuel Pathways under the Renewable Fuel Standard Program [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0542; FRL-9686-3] (RIN: 2060-AR07) received February 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

789. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Federal Implementation Plan for Oil and Natural Gas Well Production Facilities; Fort Berthold Indian Reservation (Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation), North Dakota [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0479; FRL-9789-3] received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

790. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program; Clarification of EPA's Approval of the Sunland Park Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R06-OAR-2005-NM-0006; FRL-9788-8] received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

791. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — New York: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R02-RCRA-2013-0144; FRL-9693-2] received March 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

792. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Idaho [EPA-R10-OAR-2011-0640, FRL-9791-2] received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

793. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Consent Decree Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0650; FRL-9789-9] received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

794. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Cleveland-Akron-Lorai and Columbus 1997 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revisions to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0884; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0970; FRL-9790-2] received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

795. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; Control Techniques Guidelines and Reasonably Available Control Technology [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0448; FRL-9791-1] received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

796. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision to Ambient Nitrogen Dioxide Monitoring Requirements [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0486; FRL-9789-2] (RIN: 2060-AR59) received March 13, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

797. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on ''Overseas Surplus Property'' for disposal within fiscal years 2013 through 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

798. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Report on Workforce Planning for Foreign Service Personnel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

799. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting authorizing the implementation of certain sanctions set forth in the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

800. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting authorizing the implementation of certain sanctions set forth in the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

801. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's determination and certification under Section 490(b)(1)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 relating to the top five exporting and importing countries of pseudoephedrine and ephedrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

802. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

803. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report detailing payments made to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommunications services pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses as required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, as amended by Section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

804. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, transmitting ninth and final lessons learned report entitled ''Learning from Iraq''; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

805. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's annual report on the No FEAR Act for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

806. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report on compliance within the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions under Title I of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

807. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Justice Programs' Bureau of Justice Assistance for Fiscal Year 2011, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

808. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Standards: Information (RIN: 3245-AG26) received March 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

809. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Standards: Administrative and Support, Waste Management and Remediation Services (RIN: 3245-AG27) received March 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

810. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Compensation, Retirement Programs, and Related Benefits; Effective Dates (RIN: 3052-AC41) received March 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Small Business and Science, Space, and Technology.

811. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report concerning the operations and status of the Government Securities Investment fund (G-Fund) of the Federal Employees Retirement System during the debt issuance suspension period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 83481(1); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1275. A bill to guarantee the right of individuals to receive Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act in full with an accurate annual cost-of-living adjustment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1276. A bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify that countervailing duties may be imposed to address subsidies relating to a fundamentally undervalued currency of any foreign country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1277. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to require States to implement a drug testing program for applicants for and recipients of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BASS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1278. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 regarding the disparagement of Native American persons or peoples through marks that use the term ''redskin'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 1279. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to issue up to 10,500 E-3 visas per year to nationals of the Republic of Korea (South); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1280. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to increase the penalties imposed for intimidating, threatening, or coercing any person from engaging in voter registration activities or for procuring, submitting, or casting false voter registration applications or ballots, to require election officials to transmit voter registration cards and absentee ballots to voters in elections for Federal office through the use of the automated tagging and tracing services provided by the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 1281. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 1282. A bill to reduce housing-related health hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1283. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for grants to small business development centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 1284. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain disabled veterans for travel for certain special disabilities rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MICA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MARINO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 1285. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make any substance containing hydrocodone a schedule II drug; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. CHU, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MENG, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ESTY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HOLT, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 1286. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 1287. A bill to ensure high standards for Federal agency use of scientific information; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROSS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KEATING, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 1288. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 1289. A bill to provide a Federal charter to the Fab Foundation for the National Fab Lab Network, a national network of local digital fabrication facilities providing community access to advanced manufacturing tools for learning skills, developing inventions, creating businesses, and producing personalized products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JONES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. HARPER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KELLY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HURT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1290. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 1291. A bill to reauthorize the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 1292. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that wages paid to unauthorized aliens may not be deducted from gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1293. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish and provide a checkoff for a Breast and Prostate Cancer Research Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1294. A bill to establish a program that will generate dependable economic activity for counties and local governments containing National Forest System land through a management-focused approach, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MAFFEI (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1295. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 1296. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify a maintenance exemption regarding the removal of sediment, debris, and vegetation from certain structures; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 1297. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to expand eligibility for Farm Service Agency loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 1298. A bill to amend the Export Apple Act to permit the export of apples to Canada in bulk bins without certification by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1299. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain public land currently administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army for inclusion in White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1300. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer programs and community partnerships for the benefit of national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 1301. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1302. A bill to prohibit foreign military financing to Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1303. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to provide flexibility to school food authorities in meeting certain nutritional requirements for the school lunch and breakfast programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1304. A bill to permit the chief executive of a State to create an exemption from certain requirements of Federal environmental laws for producers of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 1305. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide clarification regarding eligibility for services under the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1306. A bill to provide for the partial settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1307. A bill to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to require the Bureau of Land Management to provide a claimant of a small miner waiver from claim maintenance fees with a period of 60 days after written receipt of 1 or more defects is provided to the claimant by registered mail to cure the 1 or more defects or pay the claim maintenance fee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MICA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. CLARKE, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H. Res. 130. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz and acknowledging the Cyrus Cylinder as a symbol of respect for human rights and religious tolerance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

4. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 6 urging the Congress and the President to restate that the congressional intent of the federal Controlled Substances Act is not to prohibit the production of industrial hemp; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 1275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 1276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 1278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8—The Congress shall have Power To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 1279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause I—The times, places, and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing senators.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7—The Congress shall have power to establish Post Offices and post roads.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 1281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 1285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power to enact this legislation is granted in Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Civil Rights Enforcement

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5

Section 1: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 5: The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 1287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution, to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 1290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 1292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and under Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 1294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H.R. 1295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 and Clause 18 of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 1296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 1300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, which states ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

By Ms. SCHWARTZ:

H.R. 1301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 1302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 1303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among several States, and with Indian Tribes.

Also, the Tenth Amendment—

The powers not Delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 1305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 35: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 69: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 125: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 164: Mr. FORBES, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 207: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 258: Mr. PALAZZO and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 261: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 292: Mr. LEWIS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 303: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 318: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 324: Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. Lynch, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 334: Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 337: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 351: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 360: Mr. LONG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DENT, Mr. BARTON, Mr. McCarthy of California, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. YODER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HALL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COLE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 362: Mr. LEWIS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 363: Mr. LEWIS and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 384: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 386: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 454: Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 474: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 479: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 485: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 506: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 519: Ms. BASS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 523: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. HURT.

H.R. 525: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 532: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 540: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 541: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 556: Mr. PITTS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. HALL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 569: Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 570: Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 571: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 572: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 574: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 580: Mr. STEWART and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 612: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 627: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 630: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 637: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 638: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 641: Mr. ENYART and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 647: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. YOHO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 675: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 678: Mr. DAINES and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 724: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 729: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 730: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 735: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 736: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 772: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 792: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 794: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 795: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 801: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 806: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 807: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 819: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HURT, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 846: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 847: Mr. WELCH, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 849: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 850: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 851: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 853: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 855: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 864: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 874: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 879: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 894: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 895: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 896: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 904: Mr. UPTON and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 916: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 920: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 940: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 949: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 961: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 979: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 986: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1000: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1002: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1006: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1014: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1015: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1018: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1020: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1026: Mr. ENYART, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1029: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1030: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1033: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1038: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1039: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1063: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1074: Mr. GOSAR, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1081: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1089: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 1091: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1097: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1101: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1120: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1125: Mr. YOHO and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1149: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1151: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1164: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 1172: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1202: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1204: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1209: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1219: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1242: Mr. JONES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HALL, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1252: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1265: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. MULLIN.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. REED, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H. Res. 69: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 89: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H. Res. 90: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 94: Ms. BONAMICI.

H. Res. 98: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Res. 104: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 108: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H. Res. 110: Mr. AMASH.

H. Res. 112: Mr. OWENS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. JONES, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. CICILLINE.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2013 *No. 41*

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, we are merely moving shadows, and all our busy rushing has no purpose without You. Rescue us from our frenetic pace and teach us to be still as we deepen our relationship with You.

Bless our Senators. Give them enough challenges to keep them humble, enough hurt to keep them humane, and enough success to make them certain they are walking with You. Renew their commitment to pray not only for those with whom they agree but also for those with whom they disagree.

Hear our prayers, O Lord, and give us Your peace. We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter.

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable WILLIAM M. COWAN, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. COWAN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 933.

The clerk will report the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 933) to make appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid (for Mikulski-Shelby) modified amendment No. 26, in the nature of a substitute.

Toomey amendment No. 115 (to amendment No. 26), to increase by $60,000,000 the amount appropriated for operation and maintenance for the Department of Defense for programs, projects, and activities in the continental United States, and to provide an offset.

Durbin amendment No. 123 (to amendment No. 115), to change the enactment date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of the continuing appropriations legislation. The time until 11:15 a.m. today will be divided and controlled equally between the two leaders or their designees.

At 11:15 a.m. there will be three rollcall votes in relation to the continuing resolution: the Toomey amendment, which is a 60-vote threshold; adoption of the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment; and a cloture vote on H.R. 933, the underlying bill.

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the last few years my Republican colleagues have been hollering, yelling, and screaming that the Senate has not passed a budget. They have done so in spite of the fact that Republicans in both Chambers voted for the Budget Control Act which set spending levels for the last 2 years. It was a law. Every reasonable political observer admits that the Budget Control Act, which had the force of law, was a budget, period. No, it was not a resolution. It was a law, which is much stronger than any resolution we do here.

As I indicated, they have yelled and screamed. Still, Republicans pine for the days of the so-called regular order when the Senate would vote on a budget resolution that would set spending priorities for the fiscal year. Republicans—we were told, we heard, we saw—were desperate to have a budget debate. They were desperate. They have had charts out here. They were desperate for an amendment. They wanted a vote-arama. They had charts, speeches, and demonstrations to prove it.

They have had press conference after press conference after press conference. They even had a calendar they brought out almost daily tallying the days since the Senate passed a budget resolution—not a law, which was already in effect, but a resolution.

Yesterday I was amazed, flabbergasted, and stunned when Republicans blocked attempts to begin debate on the budget resolution. In fact, the ranking member of the Budget

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Committee said: Let's put it off for a while. Let's wait until after Easter.

Can you imagine that? They have been pining for regular order, and we now have a chance to have a debate. They said: No, we can't do that. Can't do it. There was a chance, and they were not interested in doing it.

My friend, the junior Senator from Kansas, objected to a request debating the budget unless we vote on his proposed amendment to the continuing resolution. He is concerned about air traffic towers in Kansas because of these across-the-board cuts.

I say to all of my colleagues—I say to the Senator from Kansas—we are all concerned about the impact of these budget cuts. They are senseless, they are ridiculous, and we should do away with them. We have already cut $2.5 trillion from the debt. We can continue to do it but do it in a responsible and reasonable way, not a meat-cleaver way.

More than 100 families in Nevada—almost immediately—are going to lose access to low-income housing because of the sequester. I met with the housing authority people yesterday. Some might say: Oh, that is not such a big deal. It is a big deal for those 100 families. Nationwide, 70,000 little boys and girls are going to lose their ability to go to Head Start. Some may ask: What is that? Head Start will allow them to get started in life.

These cuts—and I have only mentioned a few of them—are painful for millions of Americans, and it is only going to get worse. They are arbitrary.

We are all concerned. The concern for the sequester is not focused on the Senate delegation from Kansas, it is all over. Instead of whining about it, let's do something about it. Let's get rid of it. That is why the Senate Democratic budget proposal actually reverses the sequester. That is one way of doing it, but there are other ways.

The policy outlined in Senator MURRAY's budget will save hundreds of thousands of jobs, safeguard communities by keeping police, air traffic controllers, and meat inspectors on the job. Reversing the sequester would alleviate Senator MORAN's concern about air traffic controllers in Kansas. The Senate cannot debate a thoughtful way to replace the sequester if the Republicans will not even let us debate our budget proposal.

We know Republicans and Democrats will not agree on every aspect of the budget which sets priorities for how the government spends money and how it saves money. Republicans have one plan for Medicare. Their plan is to turn it into a voucher program which will change Medicare forever. Democrats have another plan. The Democrats' plan is to preserve and protect Medicare for our children and grandchildren.

Republicans have a plan for taxes. Listen to this one: They want to lower taxes for the rich and let the middle class foot the bill. Democrats have another plan. We believe the wealthiest individuals and corporations should contribute a little bit more to reduce the deficit. Surprisingly, the intelligent American people agree with us—Democrats, Independents, and Republicans—by almost a 60-percent margin. The only Republicans in America who disagree are those who serve in Congress.

Republicans have one plan to reduce the deficit which will rely on harsh austerity that shortchanges the elderly, veterans, middle class, poor, and others. The Democrats have another plan. We have a balanced approach that couples smart spending cuts with new revenue from closing loopholes that benefit the wealthiest Americans.

We have our differences, and that is fine. But Democrats are willing to discuss these differences; we are willing to debate the issues. Let's debate the issues. The Republicans have said for months and months: Let's debate the budget. Why can't we debate the budget? Because they will not let us.

This is senseless. We have 60 hours of doing nothing—nothing. The American people are on our side. This is a debate we can win, but at least let's have the debate.

Will the Chair announce the business of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11:15 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are not in a quorum call, are we?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are not.

Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the time will be divided equally.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be equally divided.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss with my colleagues here in the Senate an amendment I have filed to the continuing resolution that is now pending before the Senate. It is amendment No. 55. I have spoken about this issue on the floor previously this week but want to reiterate the merits of this amendment and ask my colleagues for their support.

Amendment No. 55 deals with this issue of air traffic control towers. Under the administration's plan in implementing sequestration, the plan is to close, on April 7—just a few days from now—173 air traffic control towers across the country. The amendment I wish to offer avoids that. The administration would no longer be able to do that. I believe they should not for numerous reasons, but what we do, in order to accomplish that, is to transfer $50 million from two accounts, one dealing with research at the Department of Transportation and one dealing with unencumbered balances.

This is an example of what we have talked about before: that we can make better decisions than across-the-board cuts. In fact, the amendment I wish to offer deals with an issue that is not even an across-the-board cut.

In closing the contract towers, in eliminating the Contract Tower Program, the administration is cutting that program 75 percent. Sequestration is described to us as, in most circumstances, an across-the-board 5-percent cut. The amendment I wish to offer continues the 5-percent cut. That would occur for the air traffic Contract Tower Program, so that they would be treated like other programs at the Department of Transportation and throughout government, that they are not singled out for elimination of a program, resulting in a 75-percent reduction in that program's funding, not just the more minor 5 percent. So the administration's decision to close contract towers is far from balanced, and in choosing this program, in my view, has taken the opportunity to damage the safety and security of the flying public of America.

I want to talk about that in a moment. But there was also the suggestion that this is a provincial argument on my part, that it is something I care specifically about for Kansas, my home State. Certainly there is not anything wrong with caring about our home States. That is what we do here, and it is part of our responsibility. But this is far from just being a Kansas issue. Many States and Members of the Senate are more greatly affected by this cut, this elimination, than my home State.

In fact, this amendment has the sponsorship of 26 Republican and Democratic cosponsors. More Democratic Senators here are cosponsors of this amendment than Republican Senators. It is Senators ROBERTS, INHOFE, BLUMENTHAL, BLUNT, JOHANNS, KIRK, MANCHIN, HAGAN, KLOBUCHAR, BAUCUS, TESTER, ENZI, VITTER, BOOZMAN, PRYOR, MERKLEY, WYDEN, KAINE, WARNER, AYOTTE, SHAHEEN, RISCH, CRAPO, MURPHY, ROCKEFELLER, and WICKER.

It does not sound very provincial to me. In fact, 42 States will have their air traffic control towers eliminated. This amendment is broadly supported by the aviation industry. If there is an aspect of this that is unique to Kansas, it is that we manufacture many general aviation aircraft. We are the air capital of the world. But this amendment, while being supported by the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, by National Business Aviation

Association, the National Air Transportation Association, is also supported by the American Association of Airport Executives and the National Air Traffic Controllers Association.

Again, it is not a very provincial amendment when sponsored by so many of my colleagues, affecting 40-some—43 States of the United States, and broadly supported by the aviation industry as a reasonable, commonsense solution to a problem we face.

I have been adamant about bringing this amendment to the floor. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. I will have the opportunity—in fact, I serve on the subcommittee that deals with the Department of Transportation. I should and hope to have the opportunity to deal with this and other issues related to the Department of Transportation in the normal appropriations process that, hopefully, will follow the passage of a budget. So I ought to be in a position to be helpful to the cause I believe in at a point later in time.

But here is the problem: The air traffic control towers will close on April 7. We will never get to an appropriations process between now, here at the end of March, and April 7. So the Appropriations Committee and, ultimately, the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the President will never have the ability to restore a program that is gone April 7.

So while I have tried to put myself in a position to be helpful to the cause in the long run, there is no long-run battle to be fought because the control towers are gone in just a matter of a few short days.

This amendment matters. This is my last opportunity. If and when cloture is invoked later today on the underlying bill, there is no opportunity for amendments to be considered. So my colleagues who indicate to me so strongly that they support my amendment, this is the only opportunity we have to have success.

This clearly is not about my success in an amendment. Although I would love to have the opportunity for this amendment to be voted on, it may or may not pass. But the Senate ought to work its will in making that determination. With the broad support of the industry, with the broad support of my colleagues here in the Senate, one would think this is an amendment which is at least worthy of a vote. That has not been the case.

So it is important for me to again reiterate to my colleagues that if you invoke cloture this afternoon or later this morning, if you invoke cloture, there is no other opportunity for us to address this issue, this problem. So let me again request the opportunity.

I lay awake last night from 3:30 on trying to figure out what it is I can say to my colleagues to get their attention about why this is so important. There are lots of things that can be said. We have so little time before this is either a program that existed in the past and will no longer exist in the future—the consequences are so dramatic that I would again ask my colleagues for their assistance in at least bringing the amendment to the floor so that the Senate can make a decision, yes or no, about the merits of the amendment.

This is about safety. There was an article I just happened to read today in reading my clips from Kansas. This is in a Kansas paper, but it is an AP story from Chicago. The article is entitled ''Trouble in the Air,'' and here is what the AP reporter writes about the planned shutdown. The article says:

> The planned shutdown of nearly 240 air traffic control towers across the country under federal budget cuts will strip away an extra layer of safety during takeoffs and landings, leaving pilots to manage the most critical stages of flight on their own.
>
> But airport directors and pilots say there is little doubt that the removal of this second pair of eyes on the ground increases risk and will slow the progress that has made the U.S. air system the safest in the world.
>
> It's not just private pilots in small planes who stand to be affected. Many of the airports in question are serviced by major airlines, and the cuts could leave towers unmanned during overnight hours that some big-city airports such as Chicago's Midway and General Mitchell Airport in Milwaukee. The plans have prompted airlines to review whether the changes might pose problems for commercial service that could mean canceling or rescheduling flights.
>
> Without the help of controllers, risk ''goes up exponentially,'' said Mark Hanna, director of the Abraham Lincoln Capital Airport in Springfield, Ill., which could see its tower close.
>
> But many in the aviation sector are frustrated by the political brinkmanship in Washington that has affected such a sensitive area of aviation. Jim Montman, manager of the Santa Fe Municipal Airport, which is on the list for tower closures, said the absence of controllers raised the risk of midair collisions ''or some sort of incident where somebody lands on the wrong runway. . . . That critical link is gone.''
>
> Pilots are trained to watch for other aircraft and announce their position over the radio during approaches, landings and takeoffs. But past crashes, however rare, have exposed weaknesses in that system. On November 19, 1996, a 19-seat United Express flight landing in Quincy, Ill., collided with another twin-engine turboprop that was taking off. They slammed into each other at the intersection of two runways, killing all 14 people aboard the two planes. The National Transportation Safety Board concluded the probable cause was a failure of the pilot in the outbound flight to monitor the radio frequency for air traffic and to properly scan for other planes. ''If a tower was there, it's highly likely that the accident would have been prevented,'' said Hanna, who became the director of the Quincy airport about two years after the crash.
>
> The 238 air traffic control facilities that could be closed were chosen because they are at airports with fewer than 150,000 flight operations per year. They are located in every state.

Again, the point of this amendment is not whether or not I find the right words to convince my colleagues to allow this amendment to come to a vote. As much as I struggled through the morning hours trying to figure out what those might be, the real issue is not about my words or my personal success in getting this amendment considered, but it is about the safety of Americans.

I cannot figure out why this amendment cannot be made in order. Again, broad support—broad support with Republicans and Democrats. I have had many Senators, including very senior Senators from the Democratic side of the aisle, come to me and express amazement that this amendment, so broadly supported, so important, cannot be considered. I cannot come up with an explanation. I do not know why this is the case.

Every Senator I have talked to about this amendment tells me they do not oppose it, it ought to be voted on, they support it. Yet for some reason the Senate is incapable of agreeing to even a vote on an important and critical amendment that promotes the safety of the American people. I can only guess—and it is always difficult to attribute motives, but as I talk to my colleagues, the only explanation I ever get that has any semblance of truth is that there is a point to be made here. By denying the amendment's passage, we prove that sequestration cannot work; we cannot cut money from budgets.

Again, I did not vote for sequestration. So when the majority leader says this morning about the hatchet being taken to programs and it is all bad—I did not vote for sequestration. I believe in the appropriations process that allows us to make these decisions to increase funding for some things, decrease funding for other things, and eliminate programs. Yet sequestration, in my view, has an effect upon all programs equally, whether they are effective or ineffective, whether they are valuable or invaluable. We treat them the same.

So I am not here on the cause of sequestration, but apparently there are those in this city, in Washington, DC, who want to make the point that if the air traffic control towers are eliminated, it will demonstrate once and for all—I don't know; to Republican Senators, to Senators in general, to Congress, to the American people—that there is no opportunity to cut budgets.

If people want to make that point and if they can convince people that it is true that there is no opportunity to eliminate $85 billion in spending, that is fine with me. That is what this place exists for, is for us to have the debate about whether we can reduce spending, increase spending, what our Tax Code ought to be, what the value is of government services and programs and how they ought to be funded. But if it is true that the reason this amendment is not being considered is because we want to prove a point—that there is no money to be cut, that sequestration is a bad idea, that reducing spending is a bad idea, that we have to raise taxes—if that is the point that is trying to be made here in the process of denying this amendment's consideration, then it is a very dangerous way to try to prove a point.

Prove your point in argument and debate about the merits of spending, about the merits of the program. Prove your point in the Appropriations Committee, in which we take testimony and hear from people about what is important to them, priorities, what their needs are, what their wants are, what has value, what does not. But do not try to make the political point about this topic by reducing the safety of people who fly in and out of communities across the country. As the article said, this reduces the nature of our air traveling safety from the best in the world to something less than that.

So make the point. Have the debate and argument about the value of sequestration, about the value of what money we spend and do not spend. But let's not try to prove the point by reducing the chances that the American people, when they travel, are safe and secure in our airways.

I do not know, and I hope this is never the case—this point may never be proven about the safety, but once there is an accident and someone dies and a plane crashes, the question will always be, what if there had been an air traffic control tower there? What if we had left the program in place?

These communities that have the air traffic control towers have spent years in developing a plan to put them in place, have worked with the FAA and the Department of Transportation over decades to bring their airports and airport safety, flying safety to high standards. An issue here is that this is going to disappear overnight. So you can be an airport manager, an airport authority, a member of an airport board anyplace in the country with 200-plus air traffic control towers, and you have worked hard over years, decades, to get the standards in place and to have the air traffic control process at your airport. In one day, April 7, one night, the lights go off in the tower. They no longer exist. All the work you have tried to accomplish on behalf of your community and those who fly in and out of your airport disappears in one stroke.

So I speak with a level of passion about this issue, for really the purpose of which I think we are here to do, which is to advance the common good of the American people. It is not a provincial amendment. It is not something that just MORAN and Kansas need. There are many States much more affected by this. But the truth is that every American, every person who flies will have less safety and security in the skies as a result of this issue, as a result of the decision made by the Department of Transportation to eliminate this program.

So, once again, I intend to ask later in the morning, when our leaders are on the floor, for unanimous consent to bring this amendment forward before the time expires. In my time in Congress—I have only been in the Senate a little more than 2 years—I have not been trying to be obstreperous. I have not tried to be difficult to deal with. I believe in the opportunity to reach out and work together. I followed the rules. I did what everybody tells me to do: Go find people who support this amendment who are Democrats and Republicans, bring them together.

And as the leader said earlier in the week—I guess it is now last week—earlier last week about how we are going to get back to regular order, we are going to have amendments offered, I hope we can dispose of them quickly, we have an opportunity to do that with this amendment. It is not controversial. It is not partisan. It is about something that ought to be of importance to all Americans, certainly to every Senator.

Later in the morning when the leaders are present, I will ask unanimous consent once again that we consider this amendment. I know there are others who want to offer amendments. I see my colleagues from Arkansas and Missouri on the floor. I know they have an amendment—I think it is No. 82—with which they want to offer the opportunity to address a problem by taking money from one account and putting it in another account in order to keep meatpacking plants operational, that we have the meat inspectors present at the plants. Boy, that is an important issue too. That is about the safety and security of Americans. It is about food safety. I hope no one objects to the amendment Senators PRYOR and BLUNT are going to offer this morning. That is another amendment which is very similar in nature, about deciding that we are smarter to spend money here than here.

As the Pryor-Blunt amendment comes before the floor, I would ask my colleagues, just as I would ask them to grant unanimous consent, I hope no one objects to their request for unanimous consent that their amendment be considered. I would ask that no one object to the amendment I intend to offer. I certainly will not object to the Blunt-Pryor amendment. I wish it was leverage to get my amendment considered, but it is too dangerous to play that game. That is what we do here in Washington, DC, is strike a deal. In this case, when we strike that deal, we are leaving people behind whose lives are going to be adversely affected.

I certainly will not stand in the way of people who work in the meatpacking industry and the consumers of meat products across our country, in the way of trying to solve a problem that is clearly there. I hope their amendment receives unanimous consent, and I hope it passes by this Senate's will. I would ask the same thing. When the appropriate time comes, I will ask for the same thing on an amendment that is about the safety and security of American people.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his indulgence and at least his appearance of listening to me.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the next quorum call be equally divided between the Republicans and Democrats, the majority and the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MS. AYOTTE. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak about an amendment I made to the continuing resolution. This is a continuing resolution for appropriations bills which are pending on the floor right now, and we are spending over $1 trillion.

I filed an amendment, amendment No. 127, which would have struck the funding of $380 million for a missile to nowhere. This is funding for a program called the Medium Extended Air Defense System, otherwise known as MEADS. Up to this time, we have expended $3 billion for this system. Yet we will never receive a result our Army or our military can use. This is why it is a missile to nowhere.

The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator CARL LEVIN, has said of the funding for this MEADS program: With regard to the committee, we feel strongly that it is a waste of money.

In the 2012 Defense authorization, the Senate Armed Services Committee made very clear this was going to be the last appropriation for this missile to nowhere. In the 2013 authorization, on a unanimous bipartisan basis before the Senate Armed Services Committee, the committee voted to say no more money for a missile to nowhere.

Right now, our military is facing great challenges with sequestration. We have heard this from our military leaders. These are difficult choices they must make to cut training for our troops and cut needed flying hours when our troops absolutely need to be prepared and ready. For equipment, an announcement was made we were going to withdraw a carrier, which sends the wrong message to Iran.

Despite all this, the continuing resolution, which is on the floor with the appropriations bill attached, contains $380 million for a missile to nowhere. This is something our military will never be able to use. And why is it there? It is there because people are worried about their parochial interests, that their State builds part of this, and also because, apparently, they want to provide employment to the Germans and the Italians, because they are getting a substantial amount of this money. Yet we will never see anything our troops can use from it.

My amendment was very straightforward. The amendment would do this: It would take the $380 million and strike it from the MEADS Program, then take those resources and, instead of spending the $380 million on the MEADS Program, it would go to the operations and maintenance fund for our troops for real needs they have on the ground—whether it is equipment or training—rather than for a missile to nowhere that they do not need and don't want.

It seems to me we owe it to our troops to make sure our taxpayer dollars don't continue to be wasted on funding a MEADS Program we will never get a result from. In fact, we have had large unanimous agreement on a bipartisan basis about striking this MEADS Program. In fact, I mentioned the Senate Armed Services Committee has said we should prohibit funding for it. The House Armed Services Committee did the same thing and said we should prohibit funding for it, and the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee zeroed out funding for MEADS. The only committee that allocated funding for it was the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. Talk about a waste of money.

It is shocking to me, by the way, that this amendment makes so much sense, that it has bipartisan support, and yet I can't get a vote on the floor of the Senate to strike the money for this missile to nowhere and to apply the funds to where our troops need them so the funds can actually be used to make sure they have what they need to be prepared. It is appalling that I am being denied the right to offer this amendment, to bring it to the floor, to let people vote on it. At a time when we face great fiscal challenges, it is absolutely appalling to me that here in the Senate we can't strike $380 million in funding for a missile to nowhere when we are almost $17 trillion in debt. This is what is wrong with Washington. It is appalling we cannot be in a position to get a vote that is germane to fund a program that the Concerned Veterans for America has said is wasteful, in support of my amendment; that the Citizens Against Government Waste agrees as well and supports my amendment; and that I have bipartisan support for my amendment. In fact, Senators BEGICH and SHAHEEN are cosponsors of my amendment. So this is not a partisan issue, this is about not wasting taxpayer dollars. I can tell you this sort of thing is what is appalling to the American people, that we cannot and we will not strike wasteful spending. We can't even get a vote on it here in the Senate.

I am going to continue to fight to end the funding for this program and other wasteful spending programs and to make sure the money we have and the taxpayer dollars, particularly in the Pentagon but in every area of government, go for what they are intended—for things our troops need, and not a missile to nowhere where we are protecting, apparently, parochial interests that people are worried about more than they are worried about the overall fiscal state of the country.

This is something that has been very disappointing to me. I think it is appalling we wouldn't allow a vote on such a relevant, germane amendment on a bill in which we are going to spend over $1 trillion. I don't know why we continue to fund things such as the missile to nowhere when there are real needs our troops have. I know this amendment had bipartisan support in the past. Both sides of the aisle do not want to spend money on a missile to nowhere when there are real needs our troops have.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this issue on the floor today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, it took 4 years to get a budget from the Senate majority—4 long years.

As the days go by, it has become increasingly clear why it took so long; their budget is so extreme and so unbalanced. That is why they are having such a hard time selling it to the American people and why they have had to fall back on some tired talking points to defend it, claiming their budget would, for instance, grow the economy from the middle class out. That is a clever sound bite, but it doesn't describe the Senate Democratic budget at all.

Maybe a better way to put it is that the Democratic budget would grow the bureaucracy from the pockets of the middle class out. That is because it would increase Federal spending by almost two-thirds by imposing a massive tax hike that could cost the average middle-class family literally thousands.

The Democrats like to say the up to $1.5 trillion tax increase authorized in their budget—the largest tax hike in American history, by the way—would be funded by closing loopholes for millionaires and billionaires, but the math simply doesn't add up. They will have to come after the middle class to fund this spending spree.

There is something else. The Senate Democratic budget wouldn't balance ever—not in 2013, not in 2023, not in 2023, not ever. It wouldn't balance in any of our lifetimes. It wouldn't balance in the lifetimes of our children or our grandchildren. It would simply never balance.

Think about it. That means a child born today would grow up knowing nothing but massive deficits their entire life. That means trillions upon trillions in more debt and an economy that would never ever reach its full potential. That is simply not right, but it is what we would get with the Senate Democratic plan. It is an extreme approach that is more than just fiscally reckless; it is deeply irresponsible.

That is why so many middle-class families agree with Republicans that we should be growing the economy, not the government. They know we need to control Washington spending and balance the budget in order to kick-start economic growth and to create American jobs. They are so tired of the Obama economy.

They are tired of the endless pivots to jobs that never result in the kind of sustained job creation we need. They are tired of the sluggish growth, of always looking to the future with anxiety or worrying whether Medicare will even be there when they retire.

They are tired of the ideological DC Democratic extremism that got us here: knee-jerk, tax-first solutions to almost every single problem, massive overspending, steadfast opposition to reforms that would make government programs more efficient, effective, and sustainable.

So my friends across the aisle shouldn't be surprised their budget is getting such a rough ride. It contains up to $1.5 trillion in new taxes. This would be the largest tax hike in American history. It contains $½ trillion more in spending, money that could be siphoned out of the economy and into the hands of politicians and bureaucrats.

It lacks meaningful reforms to save and strengthen Medicare, allowing it to go bankrupt in just a few years, and it enshrines massive deficits into law, ensuring they continue forever and ever without end.

The Senate Democratic budget is nothing more than a rehash of the same tired politics that continue to pummel the middle class. It is time to move beyond this failed extremist approach and try a new one. Instead of expanding the power of the bureaucratic elite at the expense of hardworking taxpayers, I would urge Washington to change course. Let's focus on growing the economy, not the government.

OBAMACARE

I would also like to discuss ObamaCare for a moment.

As I just stated, Senate Republicans want policies to grow the economy, not the government. Yet ObamaCare is a law that grows the government and will slow our economy. On Saturday, we will mark the third anniversary of its passage into law.

Republicans have long warned that ObamaCare would have a devastating impact on our country. I have spoken about 100 times on the Senate floor against ObamaCare and I have warned about its consequences: increased premiums, lost jobs, and higher taxes.

Unfortunately, many of those things have already started happening. It is not just off in the future. It has already happened, and the Federal Government has only just begun implementing the law.

Instead of premiums going down $2,500, as President Obama promised, they have actually gone up by about the same amount, $2,500. Congress's own nonpartisan budget experts tell us the premiums will increase by about $2,100 after more rules, more taxes, and more mandates take effect.

The Federal Reserve also came out with a report that confirmed something else Americans already know: ObamaCare is costing us jobs. By some estimates, it could end up costing 800,000 jobs at a time when we desperately need more of them.

Members of the President's own party have begun sounding the alarm about the law's tax hike, including its tax on medical devices.

His union allies are concerned the law will make them less competitive too. Of course it will. Perhaps some of the union bosses should have more thoroughly considered the well-being of their members before supporting ObamaCare's passage in the first place.

ObamaCare has already become a regulatory nightmare. I would call the attention of my colleagues to this chart. This is the ObamaCare law, hundreds of pages in itself. But these are the regulations so far: 7 feet tall, almost 20,000 pages of ObamaCare regulations so far.

The law itself is not small, hundreds and hundreds of pages. But nearly 20,000 new pages of regulations, 7 feet tall, and they are just getting started. This monster of a bill, as I indicated, was hundreds of pages long itself, but that is actually nothing compared to the regulations it has spawned.

This more than 7-foot stack of paper next to me is what has become known as the redtape tower—the redtape tower, almost 20,000 pages of ObamaCare regulations so far. It is nearly 20,000 pages' worth of complexity. That is just what the bureaucracy has dreamed of so far, and we can only imagine how much more is yet to come.

Do we expect small businesses to be able to cope with all the rules in this tower? If you were a small business owner, how could you? Would you even be able to read through all of them and figure out which ones applied to you? I doubt it. I don't expect the average American to have much luck either.

The administration released a draft ObamaCare application last week. It is 21 pages long. Unbelievable. If you like doing your taxes, you are going to love applying for the ObamaCare exchanges.

So Washington Democrats may pop the champagne this Saturday to celebrate the law's third anniversary, but more Americans and small business owners will be reaching for an aspirin once they are forced to start navigating this bureaucratic nightmare.

In my view, ObamaCare is a colossal mistake for our country. There is no way to fix this thing. It needs to be pulled out by its roots, and we need to start all over. This bill needs to be repealed and it needs to be replaced, not with another unreadable law or another 20,000 pages of regulations but with commonsense reforms that actually lower health care costs.

Anyone who thinks we have given up this fight is dead wrong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, in a few seconds I will be propounding a unanimous consent request. We were originally scheduled to have a series of votes at 11:15. We think we have a way of working out some of our concerns if we just take a little bit of a breather and do the kind of negotiation based on the civility and common sense that we have been using during this deliberation.

Therefore, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, all postcloture time be considered expired at 2 p.m., with the time until 2 p.m. to be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, just to give everybody the lay of the land, it means we are working through our legislative issues, and at 2 o'clock we will then proceed to a series of votes which will be announced in plenty of time for people to know what is happening.

I ask unanimous consent that the quorum calls be equally divided, and I thank the able floor staff for giving me advice. There are days when I think it is an opera and they are calling out the arias we need to sing. But we are moving, and I thank Senator SHELBY for consulting with his side of the aisle.

At 2 o'clock we are going to have a series of amendments, and I think the Senate will feel very solid about the direction in which we are going.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, in a minute I am going to call up an amendment that I was speaking about on the floor of the Senate over the last few days. Essentially, this is an amendment that is pending to the bill—the continuing resolution and appropriations bills—that would strike $380 million of spending for the MEADS program. It is essentially a missile to nowhere that our troops will never be able to use in theater. We want to transfer that money to the operations and maintenance funding for the troops so we can make sure there are resources they can use to, obviously, make sure they have what they need for the very best equipment and training—particularly in light of sequestration and what we are facing. I know there is an agreement that is being worked out, and I hope my amendment is included in that agreement.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so I may call up my amendment, amendment No. 127.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. AYOTTE. Thank you, Madam President.

Mr. REID. Madam President, before the Senator leaves the floor, I have listened to most of her speeches, and she has been very articulate. I appreciate how she feels. There are some Democrats who agree with her, but the problem is it is hard to arrive at a list of amendments. I appreciate her intensity, and I certainly do not in any way denigrate what she has been trying to do, but this is the situation in which we find ourselves.

I reluctantly object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I too have an amendment that I have been attempting for a number of days to have made in order. This is the amendment that deals with the air traffic control towers. It is an amendment that very directly and simply transfers money from two accounts that have lots of money in them—the unencumbered balances of the Department of Transportation as well as a research fund—transfers $50 million from those two accounts to the air traffic control program. If we do that, we can at least avert—at least what the Department of Transportation says is necessary to eliminate that program—closing more than 170 air traffic control towers on April 7.

I spoke earlier this morning, and I intend to speak before the vote occurs. I will not repeat myself at this point in time, but this morning I outlined—and I hope my colleagues were listening—the importance of this amendment to the safety of the traveling public. The modest nature of what we are trying to accomplish has the bipartisan support, as well as the wide range of support, from groups outside the Congress that support this amendment.

I again ask unanimous consent to amend the previous order and bring up my amendment. It is amendment No. 55, that 10 minutes be equally divided, and we proceed immediately to a vote on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORAN. Thank you, Madam President.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I withdraw that. My understanding is the Senator from Montana has a brief statement to make regarding a big event in Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. That is basically correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. BAUCUS are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, at an appropriate time I will ask for some consideration of an amendment of mine, amendment No. 6. My amendment would hold the Obama administration accountable for its recent decision to release more than 2,000 undocumented immigrants from detention centers across the country in the past month. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement claimed they were releasing these people because they needed to reduce their average daily detention population of about 34,000 people—a congressionally mandated requirement. They claimed they had to reduce the detention population for budgetary reasons. Week after week, agents were tasked to release so many individuals.

At first the Department of Homeland Security claimed it only released a few hundred people. However, last week the Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement admitted that the administration had misled the American people by confessing that over 2,200 aliens were actually released. They continue to stand by the excuse that budget cuts were the reason for releasing these individuals.

Simply blaming budget reduction as a means to turn a blind eye toward the national security of the American people is a very dangerous plan and one that calls into question the Department's preparation for sequestration, particularly when we consider that months before sequestration the Office of Management and Budget put out an order to all departments that national security, law enforcement, and safety and health should be a top priority. So if keeping criminals off the streets of the United States shouldn't be a top priority—as per the order from the Office of Management and Budget—I don't know what should be. So I want an accounting for it, and that is what my amendment does—requests a simple accounting for why they were released and what it was all about. What is even more disturbing is the fact that the Department had billions of unobligated funds from the past 2 years that could have been put into protecting the American people.

On February 27 I sent a request to Secretary Napolitano questioning the decisions of the Department. The letter, cosigned by Chairman GOODLATTE of the House Judiciary Committee, was an attempt to better understand—just a simple understanding—how the Department will better confront sequestration and reduce operational challenges that could affect the life, safety, and health of the American people—the same life, health, and safety of the American people evidenced by this very administration's directive going out from the Office of Management and Budget of the priorities that ought to be established during sequestration.

Now, you know what. So often what we find from this administration—and have even found in previous Republican administrations—is that letters that are embarrassing go unanswered. Unfortunately, this is not unusual. About a dozen of my letters to the Secretary of Homeland Security on just the immigration issue have gone unanswered. There is no respect for congressional oversight. It is very frustrating.

We are on the cusp of undertaking a massive reform of our immigration system. Yet getting answers to the most basic questions seems to be an impossible operation. Time and again, we have seen this administration refuse to be held accountable, and what we want is just information. It is not as though we are saying that what the administration has done—even if we disagree with it—can't be done or shouldn't be done. But shouldn't the people know about who is being turned out in the streets when they have been held in confinement for a long period of time? I fear what will become of the President's promise of transparency if and when we do pass an immigration bill. And this is an example of things to fear in the future. Enacting a bill is one part of the process, and implementing the law is another part of the process. If we don't have faith in this administration now, what about trust for the future?

So my amendment would require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to submit weekly reports—just submit reports—to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Judiciary. The reports will be required to contain detailed budgets on how ICE will maintain the 34,000 detention bed occupancy levels authorized by Congress. It also requires ICE to provide the number of aliens released from detention as well as the following information on aliens released for budget-related purposes: the conviction or charge for which they were detained, fugitive status, existence of a prior deportation order, and the terms of release.

My amendment happens to be cosponsored by Senators INHOFE, VITTER, BOOZMAN, ROBERTS, COATS, MCCONNELL, and COLLINS.

Within the last few days, we have had the Director of ICE, Mr. Morton, testify—well, it was just yesterday in the House. Chairman GOODLATTE said his testimony raised more questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release that expresses the testimony of Director Morton.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2013.

DIRECTOR MORTON'S TESTIMONY DOESN'T ADD UP

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Today, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) Director John Morton testified before the House Judiciary Committee regarding criminal and illegal immigrants who are priorities for removal but were released by the agency, which claimed release was necessary due to sequestration. However, several of the claims made by Director Morton do not match the facts and here's why:

At today's hearing, Director Morton blamed the release of criminal and illegal immigrants on the lack of funding in the Continuing Resolution (CR) and the sequester. But the CR funded ICE above their budgetary request and provided the required funding to maintain detention beds at their average daily requirement of 34,000 through the end of March. Meanwhile, an internal ICE document shows that the agency began releasing detainees on February 15 and had already released thousands of criminal and illegal immigrants ahead of sequestration.

In addition, while the sequester cuts the agency's funding by 5%, the savings resulting from the decision to mass release criminal and illegal immigrants into the population goes well above 5%. A 5% reduction of 34,000 detention beds is about 1,700, but ICE has already released over 2,200 criminal and illegal immigrants and the plan was to reduce the daily population by 5,000.

Furthermore, Director Morton today acknowledged that he could have made a reprogramming request to Congress or could have used other funds to keep criminals off of our streets. However, he did not provide any reasoning as to why he did not make such a request.

House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R–Va.) released the statement below regarding these inconsistencies.

Chairman Goodlatte: ''Director Morton's testimony given to the House Judiciary Committee today doesn't add up. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement had more than enough money to continue detaining criminal and illegal immigrants that are priorities for removal and could have made a reprogramming request to Congress if the money ran out. But Director Morton never made such a request nor provided any rationale as to what is more important than keeping criminal immigrants off of our streets.

''In addition, the sequester mandated a 5% cut at ICE but the agency released more than 5% of detained criminal and illegal immigrants. These facts make it appear that the decision to release more than 600 convicted criminals and others facing charges into our communities was more of a political calculation than a budgetary necessity. This decision not only undermines ICE's credibility but also undercuts the American people's trust in this Administration's ability to enforce our immigration laws.''

Mr. GRASSLEY. Last week Mr. Morton said they released 10 level 1 offenders. These are people convicted of violent crimes. They are repeat drunk drivers, as an example. Yesterday he said they only released eight, but he also said they were trying to relocate them and bring them back in. Well, if you have these dangerous people out on the streets, the public ought to know about it.

So I suspect that when I ask unanimous consent now, the other side will object to my amendment. And I don't know why they want to go to such lengths to protect this administration when all we want is simple information—just simple information. We aren't saying that the decisions made—even though we disagree with them—ought to be changed. We are just saying that the public ought to know when we put violent people out on the streets, and when we put people out on the streets who shouldn't be out on the streets, we ought to know where they are, why they were put out there, and what it is all about.

I think the objection to allowing this amendment to have a vote—as I presume it will be objected to—is indefensible, but at this point I call up for consideration my amendment No. 76, and I ask for just 10 minutes of debate and a vote on my amendment. I ask unanimous consent to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I understand how the Senator feels. Over the years I have served with him, he has always made his opinions very clear. We had his amendment in the list of amendments we were going to do before, with some modifications that my friend wouldn't agree to. So I understand his feelings about this, but the good news is that within the very near, foreseeable future—hopefully, I can start it in the next work period—we are going to start immigration legislation here on the floor. We are finally going to be able to move to something that will include issues people have wanted to deal with for a long time.

So I say to my friend, I object, but I understand how he feels about the issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding cloture having been invoked, the following amendments be in order to the Mikulski-Shelby substitute: Coburn No. 69; Coburn No. 93; Coburn No. 65, as modified; Coburn No. 70, as modified; Inhofe-Hagan No. 72, as modified; Mikulski-Shelby No. 98, as modified with changes that are at the desk; Leahy No. 129, as modified with changes that are at the desk; and Pryor-Blunt No. 82; that no other first-degree amendments to the substitute or the underlying bill be in order; that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments listed above prior to the votes; that the time until 2:15 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with 30 minutes of Republican time under the control of Senator MORAN prior to votes in relation to the amendments in the order listed; that upon disposition of the Pryor-Blunt amendment No. 82, the Durbin second-degree amendment to the Toomey amendment No. 115 be withdrawn; that it be in order for the Toomey amendment to be modified with the changes that are at the desk; that the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Toomey amendment No. 115, as modified; that upon disposition of the Toomey amendment, the Senate proceed to vote on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment, as amended; that all amendments, with the exception of the Mikulski-Shelby substitute, be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; that upon disposition of the substitute amendment, as amended, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the underlying bill; that if cloture is invoked on H.R. 933, as amended, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of H.R. 933, as amended; and, finally, that all votes after the first vote be 10-minute votes and there be 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form between the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate everyone's understanding on both sides. This is going to allow us to get to the issue at hand very soon, and that is the budget, with Senators MURRAY and SESSIONS leading us on that issue.

Also, we were able to get a number of these amendments that people have been wanting very badly to get. So I appreciate everything people have done to this point.

AMENDMENT NO. 72

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support an amendment to H.R. 933 requiring the military services to resume their tuition assistance programs, which are so vital to our military's professional and educational development.

On March 5, 2013, the Department of Defense Comptroller Robert Hale sent a letter to the services to provide ''additional guidance for handling budgetary uncertainty in fiscal year 2013.'' In his letter, Secretary Hale said that ''all services should consider significant reductions in funding new tuition assistance applications.''

Three days later, on March 8, the Army suspended tuition assistance for all its soldiers—Guard and Reserve—and as a result, more than one million Army soldiers immediately lost this important education benefit. There was not a single exception, not one, not even for troops wounded in combat.

The Air Force, Coast Guard, and Marines also suspended their tuition assistance programs.

This matter concerns me greatly, and I hope it does my colleagues as well. I understand the difficult fiscal decisions facing our military as a result of the sequester, but I object to the way they are handling tuition assistance with what amounts to blunt force policy making.

I want to reexamine the exact wording of Secretary Hale's letter. He stated that the military services ''should consider significant reductions in the tuition program.'' I want to repeat, he said to ''consider significant reductions.'' Although his guidance was nonspecific in terms of what amounts to ''significant,'' four of our five military services followed with the most extreme reduction possible—they suspended all tuition assistance, indefinitely.

This decision affects lives, real lives of one of our nation's greatest treasures—the less than 1 percent of our fellow citizens who are willing to volunteer and serve in our Armed Forces, regardless of the dangers they are likely to face in the defense of freedom.

I want to highlight one example of the thousands of lives now affected—a young soldier who recently enlisted in the National Guard. His personal story reflects the negative impact the tuition assistance cuts are going to have on our Armed Forces.

I saw him interviewed by a news station. He is 19, but with his new buzz cut, he looked much younger. His military mannerisms were unmistakable he gave short responses, always beginning with a ''Sir'' or ''Ma'am.''

When asked how the decision to suspend tuition assistance affected him, he said, politely, ''I was really counting'' on tuition assistance for college.

You see, this young man does not have any comparable education benefits to fall back on. He is only 19, as I said, and just back from training. As a Guardsman, he would need to deploy at least once to receive some of the new GI Bill benefits.

What do you think he will tell his friends about the military as a result of this experience? What will his family say? And how much warning did we give this young man that he could no longer count on $4,500 per year in tuition assistance?

As I said, this young man was 19 years old. Last month the veterans' unemployment rate for those ages 18 to 24 rose again. It is now a very troubling 36.2 percent. We are in the midst of a grave unemployment crisis and now is the time to invest—not divest—in continuing education for our military.

This is not the way we should treat our service men and women. We should keep our commitments, especially those we have made to those who are willing to sacrifice everything for their fellow Americans and the Nation.

I urge my friends and colleagues to support our amendment to require the services to resume tuition assistance the minute this bill passes. It is sponsored by Senators INHOFE and HAGAN, and it is a necessary response to an unnecessarily harsh and short-sighted policy decision.

The sequester is not a thoughtful or balanced approach to cutting spending, and we should find an alternative. But, until that moment occurs, everyone, especially the military services, must reject the impulse to ''grab low hanging fruit,'' and cut it down, in its entirety, simply because it is more convenient.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I commend the chairwoman and vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senators MIKULSKI and SHELBY, on crafting a strong bill to close out the remaining 6 months of the fiscal year. This bill was developed under difficult circumstances and time constraints, and I really feel they have done a good job of returning some semblance of regular order to this process. I am hopeful this progress will continue in the coming fiscal year.

One of my disappointments with this legislation, however, is that we are not able to fund any new Army Corps of Engineers projects.

The lack of new starts in the Corps is of particular concern to my State, as it impedes progress on the flood control project in Hamilton City, CA. It is a project that could potentially serve as a model for Corp projects throughout the Nation. More importantly, the construction of a new levee is critical for the protection of Hamilton City and Glenn County from catastrophic flooding. The project has been ready for construction for several years now but has been entangled in the new starts prohibition.

It is my hope and intention that for fiscal year 2014 we will have regular order in appropriations, and I will work to support this project moving forward.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I met with FAA Administrator Michael Huerta last week to discuss sequestration and how it will affect our national aviation network. Sequestration will reduce the FAA's budget by approximately $600 million in the middle of this fiscal year. The Administrator told me this swift and sudden reduction in funding will have serious consequences to the efficiency of our national aviation system, especially in Illinois. Airport managers throughout the State of Illinois have also registered their serious concerns about the sequestration impact on commercial and general aviation.

The FAA will have to severely reduce service or completely close approximately 180 air traffic control towers across the country. Nine air traffic control towers in Illinois will have their service either eliminated or severely reduced: Alton, Aurora, Bloomington-Normal, Decatur, DuPage, Carbondale, Marion, Springfield and Waukegan. The FAA has also said that overnight air traffic control service at Peoria and Midway airports could be eliminated. These are serious steps that will increase delays, reduce capacity and potentially compromise the safety of the airspace in the areas surrounding these airports.

I will continue to monitor this situation and will work with the FAA and airport managers throughout the State of Illinois to address aviation safety and air traffic delays.

However, the aviation system is not the only harm sequestration will have on this country. The White House estimates sequestration will reduce the readiness of our troops; put up to 10,000 veterans at substantial risk of becoming homeless; drop 70,000 children from Head Start, including 2,700 from Illinois; take nutritional assistance away from 600,000 families because of cuts to WIC; and reduce foreclosure prevention and other counseling to 75,000 fewer households.

Many Republicans have said they are comfortable with allowing sequestration to continue. They think no one will notice what sequestration does to the country. I disagree. These sequestration cuts will have real impact on real people in Illinois. We need to stop sequestration with a balanced solution of budget cuts and revenue. I am pleased we will soon start debating the budget resolution. Budget Chairwoman PATTY MURRAY has produced a budget that will stop sequestration and the negative impacts it will have on our economy, our troops and working families across America.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will vote for the bill before us because it ensures the continued operation of government. The overall spending in the bill conforms to the Budget Control Act yet provides needed flexibility for agencies to operate as best they can while under sequestration.

I will continue to seek a comprehensive, bipartisan approach to avoid the harmful effects of sequestration. Any compromise to do so will require both prudent spending cuts and additional revenues. Considering that revenues are necessary as part of the way to alleviate the negative effects of the sequester, this bill is not the appropriate vehicle to address our current budgetary situation. I am hopeful that by passing this bill and ensuring no government shutdown occurs, we can work in a bipartisan and responsible manner to undo sequestration.

This bill does contain important funding for Michigan, including $210.5 million for Army research on combat vehicle and automotive technologies through the Army Tank and Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center, TARDEC, in Warren. TARDEC is the Department of Defense's leading laboratory for research and development of advanced military vehicle technologies, including efforts to protect Army vehicles against rocket propelled grenades, improvised explosive devices and explosively formed projectiles; advanced materials for tactical vehicle armor; more efficient engines; fuel cell and hybrid electric vehicles; unmanned ground vehicles; computer simulations for vehicle design and training of Army personnel; and technology partnerships with the automotive industry.

The bill also includes funding for the programs of the Army's TACOM Life Cycle Management Command, LCMC, in Warren. TACOM LCMC is the Army's lead organization for the development and acquisition of ground vehicle combat, automotive and armaments technologies and systems. TACOM LCMC-managed systems include the Abrams main battle tank, Bradley Fighting Vehicle, Stryker Armored Vehicle, Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle, and all Army tactical vehicles, such as the HMMWV and Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles.

The bill provides full funding for transportation programs authorized under MAP–21, the 2-year transportation bill signed into law in July that provides critically needed funding for our Nation's roads and bridges. This is a victory because the CR for the first half of the year, and the House-passed CR, do not include the full funding levels authorized in MAP 21.

The bill also provides needed support for American manufacturing. The Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, MEP, receives level funding at $128.5 million. It is the only Federal program dedicated to providing technical support and services to small and medium-sized manufacturers. MEP is a nationwide network of proven resources that enables manufacturers to compete globally, supports greater supply chain integration, and provides access to information, training and technologies that improve efficiency, productivity, and profitability.

This program has been used extensively in my home State by the Michigan Manufacturing Technology Center, which operates the Michigan's Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program. MMTC works with manufacturers around the State of Michigan to innovate so they can become more efficient and profitable in order to grow and create jobs.

The bill protects the life and safety of boaters on the Great Lakes by including a provision that denies the administration request to close the U.S. Coast Guard Seasonal Air Facilities in Muskegon. Closing the station would put at risk the large number of boaters on Lake Michigan during the summer. The Muskegon facility has been in place since 1997 and provides an important safety presence during the boating season on Lake Michigan.

During the course of consideration of the Continuing Resolution, the Senate adopted by voice vote an amendment offered by Senators COBURN and MCCAIN that will limit the use of funds of the National Science Foundation for political science research. The amendment was modified before it was adopted under an agreement between the sponsors and Chairman MIKULSKI and represented a significant improvement over the original amendment. The amendment as modified allows for political science research projects to be conducted when the Director of the National Science Foundation certifies those projects as promoting the economic interests or national security of the United States. I am concerned that this amendment will restrict high quality research in critical areas beyond our national security and economic interests and creates a threshold for certifying eligible political science research projects that could eliminate very worthy projects, if it is not applied wisely and thoughtfully. I hope that a broad interpretation will avoid unnecessary restrictions of legitimate research.

I am disappointed that the continuing resolution does not provide for adequate funding for our financial markets regulators, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. I worked with a number of my colleagues on an amendment to improve their funding to ensure they have the resources they need to police the markets. Unfortunately that was not adopted.

On balance, while the bill does not contain sufficient funding for many programs, it also contains funding important to Michigan and ensures the continued operation of government. For this reason, I will vote for it.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and amendment No. 69 be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], for himself and Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 69 to amendment No. 26.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit Urban Area Security Initiative grant recipients from funding projects that do not improve homeland security)

On page 392, line 25, strike "training." and insert the following: "training: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under paragraph (2) may be used for employee overtime or backfill pay, for security measures at sports facilities used for Major League Baseball spring training, to pay for attendance at conferences, or to purchase computers or televisions."

AMENDMENT NO. 93 TO AMENDMENT 26

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside and amendment No. 93 be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 93 to amendment No. 26.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To transfer appropriations from the National Heritage Partnership Program to fund the resumption of public tours of the White House and visitor services and maintenance at national parks and monuments)

On page 542, strike lines 3 through 21 and insert the following:

REOPENING THE WHITE HOUSE FOR PUBLIC TOURS AND PRESERVING OUR NATIONAL TREASURES

SEC. 1404. Notwithstanding section 1101—

(1) the amount appropriated for the National Recreation and Preservation account shall be reduced by $8,100,000, which shall be taken from the National Heritage Partnership Program; and

(2) the amount appropriated under section 1401(e) for "National Park Service, Operation of the National Park System" shall be increased by $6,000,000, which shall be used for expenses related to visitor services and maintenance of national parks, monuments, sites, national memorials, and battlefields, including the White House, Grand Canyon National Park, the Washington Monument, Yellowstone National Park, and the Flight 93 National Memorial.

AMENDMENT NO. 65, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside and amendment No. 65, with modifications, at the desk be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], for himself and Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 65, as modified, to amendment No. 26.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to carry out the functions of the Political Science Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences of the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences of the National Science Foundation, except for research projects that the Director of the National Science Foundation certifies as promoting national security or the economic interests of the United States)

On page 193, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the functions of the Political Science Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences of the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences of the National Science Foundation, except for research projects that the Director of the National Science Foundation certifies as promoting national security or the economic interests of the United States.

(b) The Director of the National Science Foundation shall publish a statement of the reason for each certification made pursuant to subsection (a) on the public website of the National Science Foundation.

(c) Any unobligated balances for the Political Science Program described in subsection (a) may be provided for other scientific research and studies that do not duplicate those being funded by other Federal agencies.

AMENDMENT NO. 70, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside, and amendment No. 70, as modified, be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], for himself and Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 70, as modified, to amendment No. 26.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

After section 573 of title V of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 574. Fourteen days after the Secretary of Homeland Security submits a report required under this division to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Secretary shall submit a copy of that report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I want to comment a minute, before I talk about the individual amendments, on the process we have seen.

We are going to have several amendments, and this is well in excess of $1 trillion in spending. We have had four amendments voted on, and I think unanimous consent will give us seven or eight more. So we are going to have a total of 12 amendments. All but the first one were not tabled, but we are at 60-vote margins, which is fine. But for a bill that spends $1 trillion, to choke down the Senate in a way that does not allow either side the appropriate opportunity to impact $1 trillion worth of spending doesn't fit with either the culture or the history of the Senate, and certainly doesn't fit with the agreement going forward and the rules changes we had this year.

On a bill that has $1 trillion worth of spending, in past history—if you look at the 104th, the 105th, the 103rd Congress—bills of that size would have 70 or 80 amendments, and we are going to choke down to 11 or 12 amendments on this. The question is, Why would we do that? Why would we limit the discussion and the division of thought, manifested through votes, for the American people to actually see what we are doing? There are only two reasons why this is happening. One is—and from a phone call with the President, in his own words, he wants sequester to hurt.

Now, think about that for a minute. And he is my friend. I challenged him on that when he said it to me. But there is a philosophical divide in this country. The Federal Government over the last 10 years has grown 89 percent, while the average median income has declined 5 percent. The reason my colleagues want sequester to hurt and be painful is they want to rationalize that bigger government is better, that we cannot afford to cut a penny out of the Federal budget. So what we do is the Federal Government is doing less with more money while every American is doing more with less money. That goes against the greatest tradition of our country. It is also a prescription for failure for our country when we are willing to sacrifice, in the short term, direct benefits to major segments of our population for a political point.

Nobody has done more oversight on the Federal Government than I have in the last 8 years, and I will tell you, conservatively, out of the discretionary budget, $250 billion a year is spent that does not positively impact this country in any way. Yet we cannot get up amendments to demonstrate that.

Not only can we not have an amendment up, we cannot even spend the time on it to have a real debate about it. That is because they really do not want to debate these issues of waste, duplication, fraud, and inefficiency.

Then the second reason we are not having amendments, or we are having amendments at 60 votes, is to provide the political cover. Our country is in so much trouble it should not matter what party you are in. What should matter is if we are fixing the long-term problems of our country in such a way as to secure the future of our country.

What we have seen through this process last week and this week is a focus on the short term, a focus on the politically expedient, a focus on the parochial—and from both sides of the aisle. This is not just Democrats, this is Republicans too. Senator AYOTTE can't even get an amendment to eliminate spending for a missile program that is never going to be built. It is never going to be built, but we are going to spend $360 million on it next year because it is a parochial prize to a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Washington is not sick because it is partisan. Washington is sick because it is political, and it is short term in its thinking. Nobody in their right mind, no matter how much it benefits their State, would say they want to spend $380 million or $360 million—I am not sure of the exact amount of money—on a program that is never going to come into fruition unless they are thinking about them and not our country and not the families of our country and not the programs that have to be reformed to save them. Nobody would do that. Yet we have 60 votes on all these amendments we are going to offer because they are going to offer protection for people to vote on them to know that they will not even pass, but they can still get the cover for a vote. They can say: I voted for it but it didn't pass because it has to have 60 votes.

That is the smallest part of the problem. To have to go through what we have gone through over the last 5 or 6 days and only have had four votes says something about this place. I would just proffer that I bet had we had an open amendment process we would have been finished with this bill yesterday.

When I came here, for the first 2 years you could offer an amendment for anything at any time at a 51-vote threshold. So all this time we have wasted in quorum calls or on speaking on issues that have nothing to do with the bill in front of us is because we really do not want to govern. What we want is we do not want the body to do its work and have the input of both sides into a bill—other than in the committee. What we want is a fixed outcome that will allow the administration to make sequester as painful as it can be.

So when you shut down packing plants, when the USDA says they cannot have food inspectors there at the same time the USDA is advertising for social service workers and event planners—which, if you did not hire them, could at least give you 52 people not being furloughed for a week. What is happening to America today is we are focused inward on the politics rather than our country. We are focused on gaming the system rather than governing. We are focused on all the wrong things because it is all about the next election.

We have our eyes so far off the ball that now every bill that comes to the floor has to have essentially a rules committee of one, which is the majority leader, deciding whether he wants his members to vote on a bill. That doesn't have anything to connect with the history of the Senate. This is no longer the greatest deliberative body in the world because we do not deliberate; we do not have an open amendment process; we are too afraid of our own shadows to cast a vote and think we might have to defend it.

If you cannot defend any and every vote in this body, you do not have any business being here. To stifle debate and to limit amendments in the way this bill has done certainly will not breed any goodwill going forward and certainly does not do service that the American citizens are due.

Mr. President, I will now take some time to talk about the various amendments I have called up. Amendment No. 69 is the first amendment I called up. As the ranking member on Homeland Security and the ranking member on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, what we know is Homeland Security, in its grants program, through what is called the Urban Area Security Initiative, is out of control. They have not prioritized their funding. They have not put metrics on their funding. They have not controlled their funding.

We put out a report in December 2012 called Safety At Any Price, and we highlighted the problems with this particular grant program. No clear goals, DHS has not established any clear goals for how the funds should be used to improve national security. The 9/11 Commission warned against DHS spending becoming pork spending. UASI, this Urban Area Security Initiative, has become another porkbarrel program providing public safety subsidies to cities such as in my home State, Tulsa.

No. 3, what we found is a tremendous amount of waste in these grants. The lack of clear goals has led States and cities to use this funding on wasteful projects, including paying for overtime for employees; purchasing computers, printers, televisions, underwater robots, bearcats—all the things that do not really connect to national security and the prevention of terrorism.

This amendment prohibits $500 million allocated for the UASI grant program that has been wasted on items that do not relate to homeland security. It prohibits the use of funds on overtime, backpay—backfill pay, security at Major League baseball parks, spring training camps, attendance at conferences, and the purchase of flat-screen TVs.

The other thing we found in our report is the Department of Homeland

Security doesn't know what this money was spent on. Not only do they not have goals and metrics for what the money is supposed to be spent on, they cannot tell us what the money was spent on because they don't actually have any record of it. We have spent $35 billion in total on all DH grant programs since 2003. We have spent $7.1 billion on this program.

What I can tell you is it has helped some communities, I don't doubt that, especially during our tough times. It has filled in. But if we are ever going to get out of the problem we are in as a country in terms of our debt and deficits, we have to have programs that have metrics on them that have to be followed up. The grants have to be followed, and they need to be held to account.

My colleagues, I have no hopes of this passing because most of my colleagues will not look at the research done on this, will not look at the ineffectiveness of it, will not look at the waste, and will vote a party-line vote to defeat this amendment. We will get 45 or 50 votes or 51 or 52, but it will go down. So, consequently, real problems that have been oversighted by the Permanent Committee on Investigations—really oversighted by the Department of Homeland Security—the real solutions to problems will not happen because of the way this place is being run.

Next, I would like to talk about amendment No. 93. Amendment No. 93 follows a recommendation of the President. It is not my recommendation, it is the President's recommendation. What this amendment would do is actually take money that has been directed for expired heritage area authorizations that were not any recommendations of the President—actually the President's recommendation was to cut this money in half—and we are going to do exactly that with this amendment. We are going to cut it by $8.1 million.

What heritage areas are, when we started them—the 12 heritage areas this is about are at least 16 years old. One of them is 25 years old. The whole idea behind heritage areas was to fund them with a grant program to get them started and then let them run on their own with State and local funds. They have become a dependency program.

The OMB and the President's budget said we ought to eliminate the dependency of these by trimming back the amount of money. Instead of becoming temporary programs directed toward self-sufficiency as originally intended, these national heritage areas have turned into permanent entities that continue to grow in number and funding amount—totally opposite the original authorization intent. In other words, they are parochial based.

As a matter of fact, one of them, the John Chaffee Blackstone River National Heritage, has existed for more than 25 years. They actually thought the funding might get cut, so they created another way to pay for it, just as the government had intended for them to do, and they raised the money for it this year. But we are going to fund them anyway in this appropriations package, this Omnibus appropriations package. It is not really a CR, it is an Omnibus appropriations. Of these, 12 have already received $112 million, more than half the total ever spent on national heritage areas.

So they have been in existence at least 16 years. They should have become self-sufficient. They need to become self-sufficient, and we should not be spending the money. What will we do with the money that will amount to about $16 million? We will turn that money into opening the tours at the White House, opening Yellowstone National Park and the rest of the parks. In terms of the way that money is spent out, we will be able to take $6 million or $7 million of that money and the national parks will open on time.

Most of you haven't heard about this, but in Jackson Hole, WY, and Cody, WY, the citizens of that State are raising private money to plow the snow so Yellowstone National Park can open on time. I want you to see the contrast because it is important to their livelihood and their commerce. They are going to sacrifice personally to get that park open on time. At the same time we are going to send money to 12 national heritage areas that have been dependent on the Federal Government for 16 years.

Tell me what is wrong with that picture. We are going to create a dependency, and then we are going to indirectly tax the people of Wyoming—one of their great areas of commerce, a place where visitors come to Wyoming to see Yellowstone Park—and have them use their own post-tax money to pay for that. That cannot fit with the vision of America that almost everybody else in this country believes in. It doesn't fit.

Other national parks have reported campgrounds that are going to be closed to reduce maintenance. So we are going to take this $6 million, and we are going to use it to help open these parks and allow the Park Service to have the parks open on time. In the original authorization, it was not supposed to get any money. They should not have been getting money for the last 10 years. Instead of creating a dependency in the program, we are going to take that money and do something for the American people.

The next amendment is amendment No. 65, as modified. And this is one that really gets my goat. The National Science Foundation funds lots of great scientific endeavors in this country. As a matter of fact, they have about four times as many applications for grants as they have money to give out. But they spend a considerable amount of money doing such things as funding "research in political science." In 2008 they spent $8.6 million funding research in political science, $10.9 million in 2009, $11 million in 2010, $10.8 million in 2011, and $10.1 million in 2012. What this amendment does is prohibit the National Science Foundation from wasting Federal resources on political science projects and redirects that to other areas within NSF that are going to give the American people a much greater return on their investment.

Let me give some examples of what they fund: campaigns and elections, citizen support, and emerging and established democracies, bargaining processes, electoral choice, democratization, political change in regimes, transitions. Those are all important things if we were not in a budget and spending crisis. Tell me whether it would be better to have the next new computer chip generation developed through a grant at the National Science Foundation or if the actions of a filibuster in the Senate are more important to the American people. Which one is a greater priority? Which one is more important to the further advancement of this country? I guarantee it is the former and not the latter.

In the years hence, we are going to be making a lot of choices about priorities, and every amendment I am putting out here today is about priorities. Do we fund things that do not adequately or accurately help us in the short term in creating jobs, in being wise and prudent spenders of taxpayers' money, or do we fund things that are a low priority and let things that are high priority suffer? That is basically what this amendment does. It says: Until we get out of this pinch, we should not be spending money to—for example, the $251,000 used to study Americans' attitudes toward the Senate. We spent a quarter of a million dollars last year studying Americans' attitude toward the Senate; $106,000 was spent to study the rise of candidate-centered elections over those dominated by political parties; $47,000 was spent to study the President's level of cooperation with Congress when they utilize Executive orders; $28,000 was spent to examine the prohibition movement. It has been a long time since we had prohibition in this country. That has to be a priority for us. How about a quarter of a million dollars to investigate how people perceive the political attitudes of others? That has to be important right now. It has to be a priority right now for our country. We spent $144,000 to track how politicians change their Web sites over time. Who cares? That money—$144,000—will keep a whole bunch of meat inspectors at meat plants. There will not be any furloughs if we get rid of this kind of stuff. I could go on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD what I consider nonpriority studies that the NFS has funded.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Taxpayers would have realized a better return on their investment in biomedical research than in political science.

While political sciences studies may be interesting to the investigators, as investment in this studies will not yield the same return on investment or benefit to Americans as biomedical research.

Consider what grants NIH may have been able to award in lieu of these ongoing political science investigations:

$251,525 used to study Americans' attitudes towards the U.S. Senate filibuster from survey results

$106,868 to study the rise of candidate-centered elections over those dominated by political parties

$47,783 to study American Presidents' level of cooperation with Congress when they utilize executive orders

$28,356 to examine the Prohibition movement, in part to help lobbying organizations better understand how to influence policy debates

$250,000 to investigate how people perceive the political attitudes of others and operate with group-centered mentalities

$144,609 to track how politicians change their websites over time

$20,862 to answer the question, ''What makes politics interesting?'' and to analyze how individuals process messages distributed by mass media

$259,231 to execute a national survey on ''the role of optimism and pessimism in shaping the political beliefs and behavior of Americans''

$91,016 to study which legislation gets roll call votes and to guess the outcome when bills do

$23,233 to administer an Internet survey of 1000 people about ''how citizens react to public political disagreements''

$236,422 to study how lobbying campaigns, logrolling and other trades affect bill development over time

These surveys and models are receiving millions of NSF dollars every year, while groundbreaking biomedical science falls to the ground. Why should taxpayers have to contribute to studies of questionable value when so many worthwhile biomedical research projects go unfunded? NCI received 4,143 applications in 2012 for major R01 grants, and only funded 618 of them, leaving thousands of promising ideas unfunded.

Much of political science's studies have not even generated useful data. Political science often involves finding a situation for which researchers can develop a clean model to predict future outcomes. However, yet one Northwestern University political scientist famously noted in the New York Times these models are typically inaccurate.

''It's an open secret in my discipline,'' wrote Jacqueline Stevens, ''in terms of accurate political predictions (the field's benchmark for what counts as science), my colleagues have failed spectacularly and waste colossal amounts of time and money.''

Increasing funding for the National Science Foundation has been promoted as a way to bolster our economy, preserve national security, protect the environment, and educate our youth. As a result, the agency has enjoyed strong bipartisan support.

By no longer funding political science and increasing NCI's budget, Congress has an opportunity to continue improving the nation's health and to steward more wisely federal resources.

Mr. COBURN. This is where we should be doing our work. We should be making choices for the American people. We should be making the hard choices that say this is more important than this. We don't have enough money. We are borrowing $40 million a second, and we are going to fund these kinds of political studies that have no benefit except to the politicians and the political science professors because they are the ones who will read them. The average American doesn't care. But they do care whether their meat is going to be safe and whether they are going to get meat.

Mark my words, this amendment will go down. It won't be passed because we don't have the courage to make priority choices in the Senate. We don't have the courage to allow the number of amendments, such as this—there should have been 30 or 40 such as this—on the floor to make those choices.

Finally, I will talk about amendment No. 70. This amendment has been modified. The appropriators have requested that Homeland Security-related reports—which are demanded in this bill—come to them. They do appropriate for Homeland Security, but there is an authorizing committee. It happens to be the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee. What this amendment says is: If you are going to give information from the administration to appropriations, you might want to think about giving it to the actual committee that has the authority to authorize and change the program.

I hope this will be accepted. We are going to get it 14 days after the appropriators. I don't know what that is all about, but I am willing to concede. I think Senator CARPER and myself ought to see what the administration is saying to the appropriators about programs that are run through the Department of Homeland Security. So of all the amendments we have, I think this is the only one that has any possibility.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, when I was on the floor this morning, I outlined the merits of an amendment I tried to have to this continuing resolution. It is amendment No. 55. It is an amendment that deals with the air traffic Control Tower Program that the Obama administration has indicated will be terminated on April 7. I don't want to go over all the things I talked about this morning, but I do want to talk about how we got to the point we are today in which apparently this amendment is not going to be considered by the Senate.

This morning I indicated how, in my view, important this amendment is. I read from an AP story from Chicago about how air safety was in jeopardy. There were indications that a plane crash which occurred previously would not have occurred if there had been an air traffic control tower present. The complaint by Americans is that our aviation sector is so frustrated by the political brinkmanship which goes on in Washington, DC.

Again, this is an important amendment that is about the safety and security of the American people—particularly those who fly. It is amazing to me that despite the continued efforts to bring this amendment to the floor for consideration—not that I expect any guarantee. There is no such thing as a guarantee that this amendment would pass. But the inability to have it even considered is very troubling and surprising to me.

Last week when we started on the continuing resolution, I was pleased to hear what the majority leader said about the process on the CR. This was not stated years ago or months ago, it was just last week. The majority leader said, when he was talking about the continuing resolution: There will be amendments offered. We are working on a process to consider those amendments. This week we will be off to another opportunity for the Senate to return to regular order, an opportunity for this body to legislate through cooperation, through compromise, as we used to do. This legislation will be a test of the Senate's goodwill. We are anxious to move forward and start doing some legislating. We are going to take all amendments and try to work through them as quickly as we can. I hope we can move forward and set up votes on every one of them.

That is the announcement that was made as we started the continuing resolution. As the majority leader indicated, this legislation will be a test of the Senate's goodwill. I think the Senate has clearly failed the test of goodwill. But more than goodwill, we are failing the American people in taking the steps necessary to secure their safety.

This is not an amendment about me or an amendment about Kansas. Certainly, I am talking about my home State. There is nothing wrong with representing our home State which is affected by the loss of these control towers. There are 43 States—almost all of us—that have control towers. On April 7, they no longer will be operating.

I indicated this previously, that one of the reasons why I thought this amendment, perhaps above others, should be considered is because the Control Tower Program will be eliminated April 7. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation. I will work to see that these programs are continued once we get to the regular appropriation process when the CR is behind us. My colleagues and I will never have the chance to do that because in a matter of just a few short days the control towers will be gone. They will be closed. The lights will be turned off.

So my role as an appropriator and as a Member of the Senate—which I share with 99 other Senators—and the idea that we would then come back and restart a program that has disappeared is not going to happen. In the absence of this amendment passing—in the absence of this amendment being considered and passing—the ability for me to do my job on behalf of a program that I think matters to the American people disappears.

I have never tried to be a difficult Member. I believe in collegiality. I believe in the goodwill the majority leader talks about. But I cannot imagine what I was supposed to have done. It is an amendment that is germane. I am not here trying to offer an amendment that doesn't matter to the bill at hand. I am not trying to score political points, I am not trying to put Democrats on the line for casting a vote that the voters might object to. There is nothing here that is political or partisan in nature. I did what I thought I was supposed to do.

There are 26 cosponsors of this amendment. More than half are Democrats. The Senators include INHOFE, ROBERTS, BLUMENTHAL, BLUNT, JOHANNS, KIRK, MANCHIN, HAGAN, KLOBUCHAR, BAUCUS, TESTER, ENZI, VITTER, BOOZMAN, PRYOR, MERKLEY, WYDEN, KAINE, WARNER, AYOTTE, SHAHEEN, RISCH, CRAPO, MURPHY, ROCKEFELLER, and WICKER. If 26 of us in that group can agree upon the value of an amendment, why is it the Senate cannot even take a vote on a germane amendment that is broadly supported? It is broadly supported outside the Chamber of this Senate. The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, the National Business Aviation Association, National Air Transport Association, Association of Air Medical Services—they believe this is important for the ability of LifeWatch patients—NATCA, the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, and the American Association of Airport Executives.

This is not a provincial issue that MORAN is all about trying to take care of something for himself, nor is it about trying to create political difficulties for anybody. We broadly agree on a bipartisan basis that this amendment should be made in order.

I have been in the Senate for a little more than 2 years. I served for a number of years in the House of Representatives. One of the things I thought was true and why I sought the opportunity to serve in the Senate is that it would be different from the House. Any Member of the Senate ought to be here—whether Republican or Democrat—on behalf of their ability to offer amendments.

We had a debate about changing the rules and the proffer was made that if we would agree to change the rules, amendments would be made in order. I thought that was a positive development.

Now, it seems to me, while I left the House in hopes of having the opportunity to represent my constituents as best as I know how and to represent America as best I know how, somebody stands in my way. I can't find out who that is. I have not talked to a Senator who is not supportive of my amendment. Every conversation I have is, well, I think it is a good idea. I don't know why it is not being made in order. There is no good explanation.

Who sits down and develops the list and decides which amendment is important and which one isn't? This ought to be something that is not turned over to a one-person Rules Committee.

Again, the House and Senate are structured differently. This is a historic body with a legacy of allowing debate, discussion, and amendment. And, again, not for purposes outside even the nature of the bill we are talking about, how can it be controversial to transfer $50 million in a bill that has more than $1 trillion of funding, of spending? How can it be so difficult to transfer $50 million from two accounts—unencumbered balances and a research account—to save air traffic control towers, leave them in place until I at least get the opportunity to work with my colleagues to extend their life through the appropriations and legislative process into the future.

So for a Senator such as myself—I lay awake last night from, I don't know, 3:15 to 4:30 trying to figure out what I could say that would convince my colleagues to support this amendment or to allow whoever is making the decision that it can't even be debated and heard and voted on—I don't know that there are any magic words. It does concern me. It bothers me greatly.

We ought to all be here protecting the rights of each and every other Senator. This is important to us as a legislative body, not to us and our egos as Senators. It is not the sense that we have the right to say everything—we are Senators, we are important and powerful people—it is that on behalf of the American people, a person such as myself who represents 2½ million Kansans ought to have the ability to bring a germane amendment to a bill on the Senate floor.

Had we brought these amendments forward, had we agreed to debate and pass my amendment, we wouldn't be here today still stalled on moving forward to conclude this business and move to the budget. We could have debated the amendments and voted on the germane amendments days ago. But for some reason we once again get bogged down in somebody deciding that this amendment qualifies to be considered and this one doesn't.

So this is another example of where—again, I guess if we were to tell the story to the American people, it would be that today we are going to pass a bill that spends $1.1 trillion, and we have had four or five amendments offered and perhaps approved, maybe a couple more today.

This bill has not worked its way through the Appropriations Committee. It comes from the House. We take it up immediately. It is written so perfectly that only three or four individual Senators have the opportunity to alter the bill—not the guarantee to change the bill but the opportunity to suggest to our colleagues whether it makes sense and then cast a vote, yes or no, based upon whether what I am saying has merit. We can't get to the point at which I am given the opportunity to explain on the Senate floor why this amendment is something that is important.

I came to the Senate from the U.S. House of Representatives in hopes that the Senate was different, where individual Members have value unrelated to their relationship with the Speaker or the minority leader of the House, unrelated to my relationship with the members of the Rules Committee. I have not always been the most perfect follower of my political party. I have tried to do what I think is right, and therefore I have not always developed the relationship I needed in the House to be able to get my amendments considered on the House floor.

The Rules Committee is there for a purpose. It is a very unwieldy body, the U.S. House of Representatives, of 435 Members. Here we have 100. Surely, based upon the history, the legacy, the rules of the Senate, we have the ability as Senators, whether we are in favor or disfavor and whether our amendment meets with a person's satisfaction on behalf of the American people, we have the right to represent their interests and have votes taken.

The majority leader said the other day that I am an obstructionist. I lay awake last night thinking, I am not an obstructionist. I am following the rules. The majority leader said this morning that we need to show that sequestration is damaging to the country. I didn't even vote for sequestration, and yet I can't fix a problem that is caused by somebody else's vote. Again, it is so baffling to me how this works.

I finally found somebody who would tell me they oppose my amendment. Today I talked to the Secretary of Transportation, who said: The administration opposes your amendment. So maybe that is the explanation. I have asked my colleagues on both sides of the aisle why I can't—a person who followed the rules, who did what one would think one should do to get an amendment made in order—why can't this amendment be heard?

The only explanation that I guess makes sense is that there are those in Washington, DC, who want to prove we cannot cut spending without consequences that are dramatic. OK, prove that point. Come to the floor. Have the debate about spending, about budgets, about taxes. Have this conversation about whether we can afford to cut spending. Prove it to us. Take the votes. Demonstrate that it can't be done. But to use sequestration as the example for why we can never cut any money from any program, particularly on the amendment I am offering, is dangerous. What it says is, we want to make a political point, as compared to worrying about the lives of the American people who fly.

So this circumstance in which I find myself—again this morning I lay in bed realizing that the radicalization of Senator MORAN is occurring. The only way, apparently, to get an amendment heard is to be difficult. It is not my personality. It is not my nature. But on behalf of Kansans and Americans, if what it takes is for me to become more difficult to deal with so my amendments are considered—it is not about me personally—so amendments that matter to my constituents and, at least in my view, to America can be heard—you have to make yourself a pain around here if that is what is required in the Senate. I hope that is not the case.

I hope the majority leader is right that this is the path by which we are going to get back to regular order. I want to be a member of the Appropriations Committee that works, debates, and discusses, we listen to witnesses and figure out that we can spend more here, but we have to spend less money here; this program matters, and this one is inefficient.

I voted against sequestration because I don't believe across-the-board cuts are responsible. What that means is that everything deserves the same reduction. There are things that we do well and that are appropriate for the government to be involved in, and there are things that we do poorly and that the government shouldn't be involved in. Yet we treat them all the same. I want to be a member of the Appropriations Committee that says: We are going to evaluate each one of these programs and make decisions about spending, and we are going to choose to spend money here and not here, or the decision will be made by the Senate and the House and the President that we are going to raise revenues so we can spend more money.

But that is not a reason to block this amendment. It is not a reason to say that those people who are going to be traveling out of 179 airports that have control towers—that their lives are going to be less safe and secure and run the potential of loss of life and injury as a result of us trying to prove the point that we apparently can't cut budgets around here because we want to show there is damage to be done when that occurs. That is a very dangerous political point.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. INHOFE. First of all, as a cosponsor of the amendment, I am glad the Senator is getting around to the merits. Yes, it is a great injustice the Senator is going through right now, not getting his amendment heard. I have to say, though, as probably the only active commercial pilot in here, I jumped on this bill because a lot of people don't realize that the contract towers are just as in need of control as the noncontract towers.

The Senator is aware that the University of Oklahoma in northern Oklahoma is contracted out. I have gone in there before where they are using all three runways at the same time. It is a huge issue.

But what I want to ask the Senator is, why is it that when the bureaucracy is opposed to something they, No. 1, won't tell you about it; No. 2, they go whispering to the President; No. 3, they go whispering to other people around here?

I went through this same thing, I suggest to my friend from Kansas, when I passed the Pilot's Bill of Rights. I had 67 cosponsors in the Senate, and they wouldn't bring it up. For an entire year they never would bring it up, and we had to rule XIV it on the floor. That is what is wrong. When we have something everybody is for, it is a good thing, but somehow—in this case, I know what it is: the same thing that happened to me. I got mine passed. It took me a year to do it.

Best of luck to the Senator from Kansas. I would only say to him that this is a time to stay in there and fight for this because this is a great example to use. Everything that is being cut in government right now—all of these people who had to wait in line to get in here, there is no reason to do that. Everything people really want and the things that are popular, this is what they cut. So the Senator from Kansas is a victim of that. Just hang in there and try to make it happen.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I know he has great expertise on the topic of aviation and airports and airplanes.

Again, I am here to decry a system that is failing. And while it is personally troublesome to me—it bothers me—it is embarrassing not to be able to accomplish what seems so straightforward and simple. We all like to have victories, but it is not really about me. Every Member of the Senate ought to have the opportunity to present germane amendments and let the will of the Senate—let those 99 other people, as well as me, make a decision based upon the merits, however we all make decisions around here or whether we vote for or against something. This is not about my right as an individual Senator as much as it is about the rights of all of us on behalf of the American people, on behalf of our home State and constituencies, to be able to do our jobs.

If there is a political game afloat that is preventing this amendment from being considered, then I would suggest we have transversed that plane in which we no longer are caring for Americans but we are caring about our own political skills, our own political reelection as compared to what we are here to do.

This place is way too political. This is not a political amendment. It ought to be made in order. Yet, despite all the efforts, it has not occurred.

I hope, in the few minutes that remains, there is still a chance that my unanimous consent request will be agreed to. I appreciate that others were able—a handful of folks were able to offer their amendments. I think we ought to have more of that, not less. It is about the Senate doing its job; it is not just about Senator MORAN not being able to accomplish his on this particular day.

I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues.

I yield for the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 115

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss briefly an amendment I have that is going to be voted on later today, but I wish to begin by completely agreeing with the Senator from Kansas. It is extremely unfortunate, to say the very least, that the majority party is so afraid of casting votes, they are now disallowing the most ordinary, sensible, germane amendments that transfer modest sums of money from one account to another account. I am not suggesting that everybody needs to agree with it. I am not sure I agree with the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. But the idea that an amendment such as that shouldn't even have an opportunity to be debated on the Senate floor is amazing.

Let me address the amendment I have introduced. I will start by observing that the bill under consideration today significantly underfunds the Defense Department's operations and maintenance accounts. The Army's subset of this category of funding is underfunded by $2 billion. That is just the Army alone. This has implications for the safety and readiness of our troops. I am not suggesting that my amendment solves that whole problem—it doesn't, but it makes a modest step in the right direction.

Just quickly, some of the things the operations and maintenance account funds—it is a lot. It is maintenance of ships and tanks and aircrafts. It is avionics and engines and navigation systems. It is artillery. It is all kinds of things our service men and women use to fight and to win and to protect themselves. It gets funded through the operations and maintenance account, and it is not only maintenance of this important equipment, it is also training—training such as unit training when an Army battalion, for instance, trains in an exercise against an opposition force that is modeled after a real-world potential enemy. That kind of training is very important. It gets funded out of this account, the operations and maintenance account, and that account is underfunded. So I would suggest that this is a very important account, and I think there is almost universal acknowledgment that it is being underfunded.

Meanwhile, in the same bill, while we are underfunding our operations and maintenance account, we have a bill that would spend $60 million forcing the Defense Department to build biofuels refineries. This forces our Defense Department to build these expensive refineries to make very expensive fuel. How do we know it will be very expensive fuel? How many of us fill up our gas tanks with biofuels? The component we are forced to buy—the ethanol—is part of what drives up the cost of gasoline. The fact is that conventional fuel is much cheaper than these biofuels, but we are going to force the Defense Department to spend a whole lot of money building a refinery, the purpose of which is to produce extremely expensive and inefficient fuel. I would suggest that is a waste of precious resources we can't afford to waste.

Now, the House Defense appropriations bill did not include this, and the Senate Armed Services Committee—these are our experts who analyze this—opposed wasting money this way when they reported the bill out of committee. Unfortunately, when it got to the floor, it got put in, and this is our opportunity to correct it.

Now, some have suggested these biofuel refineries are somehow a solution to the expensive cost of moving fuel to combat zones. The only problem is this item is going to fund the construction of refineries in the United States. They are not going to be in combat zones. So that is just not true.

I would suggest if anyone thinks this is a good idea—to force taxpayers to build expensive, inefficient refineries to produce very expensive fuel—shouldn't it at least happen through the Department of Energy or some other experimental research-oriented institution?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOOMEY. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I know something about this being the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. We went through this.

Is the Senator aware that in one purchase the administration—now, I am talking about the White House—forced the Navy to buy 450,000 gallons of fuel at $29 a gallon? You can buy it on the open market for $3 a gallon.

Secondly, I think the Senator does know this because I heard him mention the Department of Energy, when we formed the Department of Energy, they were supposed to do all this stuff.

But I would have to make one observation. We have a President, an administration, that has been cutting dramatically, and we are all concerned about what has happened to our military, our ability to defend ourselves. They do it in three ways. No. 1, they cut; No. 2, they delay; but, No. 3—and this is what we are getting to now—they take the agenda, and in this case this green agenda, and put it not where it should be but under the defense budget. So for every dollar that goes to the green energy programs, the Senator and I would like—since I am cosponsoring the Senator's amendment—every dollar is something we cannot spend for our fighters in the field.

Mr. TOOMEY. Well, reclaiming my time, I completely agree with the Senator from Oklahoma. We already force our Defense Department to waste enormous amounts of money purchasing fuel that is much more expensive than readily available alternatives. I think that is a very bad idea. And I think it is a bad idea to do even more of that in the form of building these biofuel refinery plants that would further propagate this ill-conceived process.

If you think it is somehow a good idea to do this then, as the Senator from Oklahoma suggests, wouldn't it make sense to at least do this in the Department of Energy rather than wasting precious Defense Department resources at a time when we know we are underfunding the operations and maintenance account? This is the reason for my amendment.

My amendment transfers $60 million out of the biofuel refinery account in the Defense Department appropriations bill and moves money—the amount permissible under the budget rules—into the operations and maintenance account. This is not a complete solution, I understand that, but it is a modest step in the right direction of providing a little bit more resources to an area that is badly underfunded.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I just would briefly say that I believe Senator MORAN, Senator AYOTTE, and maybe others have good amendments on which they are seeking to vote. I am aware that Senator MORAN's amendment, I believe, has 28 cosponsors—a large number of Democratic cosponsors. Virtually no one seems to be opposed to it, but somehow a decision has been made by the majority leader to not let him have a vote.

I believe we need to understand something very fundamental in the Senate, and we are heading to a crisis on this issue; that is, a duly elected Senator who serves in this body should be able to bring up an amendment that is reasonable, that is germane, and get a vote on it. It is amazing to me that it seems to be now accepted that the majority leader picks and chooses the people who get their amendments.

I think the Moran amendment, from what I have seen and heard about it, would pass. So it is not going to pass. It is going to fail because someone, presumably the leader, has decided they will not get a vote, and it has been killed in that fashion. That is not the tradition of the Senate. I am worried about that. We cannot continue that way.

To our new Senators—Republicans and Democrats—you need to understand that as a Senator, you have a right to have votes that are legitimate on bills that are legitimately amended. That is where we are, and I am disappointed those votes have not been allowed.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise today in vigorous opposition, and with very deep concern, to an amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma that would prohibit Urban Areas Security Initiative, or UASI, funds from being used to be able to pay local public safety employees overtime and backfill pay.

I share the Senator's commitment to ensuring that homeland security funds are spent wisely. I believe his efforts are in good faith, and I am eager to work with him toward this goal. However, as the threat from al-Qaida has metastasized to the Arabian Peninsula and elsewhere, there are still terrorists whose objective is to inflict wide-scale harm to Americans on our homeland.

New York City remains the No. 1 target for terrorists around the world who want to do us harm. Therefore, we must remain vigilant and continue to provide local law enforcement with all the tools necessary to keep us safe. So as well-intentioned as this amendment may be, law enforcement organizations across the country have been loud and clear: This is simply the wrong prescription at the wrong time.

This amendment is opposed by a range of law enforcement and first responder organizations, including the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the International Association of Firefighters, Major Cities Chiefs Association, Major County Sheriffs' Association, the National Fusion Center Association, the National Homeland Security Coalition, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

In fact, I have a letter from our Commissioner Kelly that I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD, along with another letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLICE COMMISSIONER,
New York, NY, March 15, 2013.

Hon. THOMAS COBURN,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COBURN: I am writing to express my concern about an element of your proposed amendment, Number 69, to the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act for FY 2013. This amendment would prohibit Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant funds from being used to pay local public safety employees overtime and backfill. Such a restriction would jeopardize our collective efforts to safeguard New York City, which has been the target of 16 publicized terrorist plots since September 11, 2001.

The New York City Police Department (NYPD) uses UASI funding to pay for, among other things: overtime expenses associated with members of the Joint Terrorist Task Force working on major terrorism investigations with the FBI; and backfill expenses incurred by sending members of the service to critical counterterrorism training courses, including a course on active shooter response, which they cannot attend during their normal shifts because of regular job responsibilities.

At times of fiscal constraint, it is essential to direct the limited homeland security grant funds available to the programs that are most effective. Without a doubt, the overtime and backfill funding that the NYPD uses to support investigations, training, and deployments are essential to the NYPD's layered approach to security. I appreciate your attention to this matter and the Homeland Security Committee's ongoing efforts to ensure that New York City will continue to benefit from the most robust counterterrorism program possible.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND W. KELLY,
Police Commissioner.

MARCH 14, 2013.

Hon. BARBARA MIKULSKI,
Chairwoman,
Hon. RICHARD SHELBY,
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MARY LANDRIEU,
Chairwoman,
Hon. DAN COATS,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MIKULSKI, SHELBY, LANDRIEU, AND COATS: We are writing on behalf of local elected officials, major city police chiefs, sheriffs, intelligence professionals, and major fire service organizations to express our strong opposition to the Coburn amendment to the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act for FY 2013. This amendment would prohibit, among other things, Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant funds from being used to pay local public safety employee overtime or backfill. Such a restriction would overturn over a decade's worth of policy and inhibit local security operations at high risk critical infrastructure sites, major events, and along the border. The amendment would also prevent first responders from training and exercising to prevent or respond to terrorist attacks and other major disasters.

Urban areas use UASI grants to pay overtime to local personnel to be operationally ready to respond to a potential terrorist incident and to provide extra security in a heightened threat environment, often based on federal intelligence and at the request of federal officials. This includes protecting critical infrastructure such as nuclear power plants, chemical facilities, public arenas, and water treatment plants during high threat periods.

In addition to protecting critical infrastructure, UASI funded overtime is often used to help pay local responders to secure major events, including National Special Security Events such as the G–8 summit, as well as border security operations at both the northern and southern border. In these high threat environments, additional local responders coordinate with and support the Department of Homeland Security, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other federal agency officials. This amendment would hamper this federal, state and local coordination that is vitally important to protecting our homeland.

Prohibiting the use of UASI funds for employee overtime or backfill pay would eliminate critical training and exercises for many urban area first responders. The UASI grants enable first responders, intelligence analysts, and emergency managers to receive the latest training and test their capabilities in exercises by paying for overtime and backfill costs associated with attending the training and exercises. Personnel who would be negatively impacted by a change to this policy include fire fighters, public safety bomb squad members, urban search and rescue team members, intelligence analysts, special weapons and tactics (SWAT) team members, and hazardous materials response team members, among others. With so many public safety agencies short staffed, sending personnel to training and exercises during overtime is often the only option. Ending this ability will directly undermine the Nation's readiness to prevent and respond to the next major terrorist attack, hurricane, or cyber attack.

If we can provide any further information, please contact us through the National Homeland Security Coalition Chair Bob Nations at (901) 222–6702 or bob.nations@shelbycountytn.gov.

Sincerely,

Congressional Fire Services Institute; International Association of Fire Chiefs; International Association of Fire Fighters; Major Cities Chiefs Association; Major County Sheriffs' Association; National Fusion Center Association; National Homeland Security Coalition; The United States Conference of Mayors.

AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Under the leadership of New York City Police Commissioner Raymond Kelly, 16 publicly known terrorist attacks on our city have been thwarted since 9/11. Our local law enforcement must continue to have every tool available to them to remain one step ahead of terrorists at every single turn. Even at a time of fiscal restraint in Washington, protecting our families from the unimaginable should not be a place where we make cuts.

According to Police Commissioner Kelly, this amendment would ''jeopardize our collective efforts to safeguard New York City . . . '' and that ''without a doubt, the overtime and backfill funding that the NYPD uses to support investigations, training and deployments is essential to the NYPD's layered approach to security.''

I ask my colleagues to stand with local law enforcement officials, to stand with the American public who have given us the duty to protect them. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment because, if passed, this amendment will put the training and security deployments needed to keep us safe in jeopardy. These are not esoteric programs. We are talking about programs that include counterterrorism training, region-wide planning exercises designed to prepare emergency responses to large and catastrophic events, and boots-on-the-ground security measures, including heavy weapons training and intelligence sharing.

These overtime funds actually reduce costs. If the NYPD needed to hire full-time officers or assign current full-time efforts to the specialized patrol and intelligence duties described, they could not afford to do so.

So while I commend my colleagues for attempting to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money, these are cuts that our families cannot afford. We have a solemn duty to protect the American people. That should be our first priority in this body. I ask each and every Member of this body to ask themselves how history will judge them if we fail to live up to that duty.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Coburn amendment No. 26 which deals——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes to address this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Coburn amendment No. 26. What it does is prevent certain types of funding to be given to UASI, which is the lifeblood of New York's antiterror programs. It has gotten rave reviews from people. The person in charge is Ray Kelly, who is very much in the mainstream, right in the center of our fight against terrorism, not only in New York but in the country.

As you know, New York City has more than 100 police officers devoted exclusively to antiterrorism. They work very closely with FBI taskforces and others. Some of this amendment is befuddling. To say that UASI, our antiterror division of the New York City Police Department, could not buy computers, flat screens makes no sense.

The Lower Manhattan Security Initiative is an antiterrorism computer system. It is one of the mainstays of preventing terror. How do we fight modern 21st century terrorism and say they cannot use computers. That makes no since whatsoever. Make no mistake, if this amendment passes, New York City training and security deployments would be in jeopardy.

Another aspect is we often need to use overtime in our antiterrorism units. For instance, we have to guard bridges and tunnels, particularly when there are threats against them. To have officers constantly changing because of time commitments and time limitations makes no sense whatsoever.

The bottom line is simply New York had a terrible tragedy on 9/11/2001. America rallied to New York's side, of which we are very appreciative. One of the ways, one of the most material and important ways was this U.S. grant. It has been used well. It has received plaudits from around the country. To tie the hands of the very people who are leading the fight on terror and saying they can do this but not this, they can do this but not this, this is the kind of micromanaging for which I think most people in America resent Washington.

I urge that this amendment be roundly defeated.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 69

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to Amendment No. 69 offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 39 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Ayotte	Feinstein	McConnell
Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Baucus	Flake	Murkowski
Blunt	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Harkin	Risch
Chambliss	Hatch	Roberts
Coats	Heller	Rubio
Coburn	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johanns	Thune
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Vitter
Donnelly	Manchin	Wicker

NAYS—51

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Kirk	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Landrieu	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Levin	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Cowan	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 51. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 93

Under the previous order, there is 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 93 offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to speak on the amendment, but I see the sponsor is here. If he has no objection, I will speak, then ask for a vote.

The Coburn amendment proposes to reduce funding for 49 national heritage areas by $8 million and redirect $6 million to park operations. It also strikes the reauthorization of 12 areas located across the country, including one in my State of Rhode Island but also in Tennessee, South Carolina, and Georgia, among other States.

The amendment doesn't provide a real fix for the problems with respect to national park funding. Moving $6 million is not going to make up for the $134 million cut we have had to impose upon the Park Service.

In addition, there has been some suggestion this would help restore White House tours. Those tours are governed by the Secret Service budget, which is not part of this amendment. So that would not be affected.

These heritage areas are private-public partnerships. They are not national parks. They provide huge economic development. They are located across the country. It is something we should restore, maintain, and not cut.

With that, I would simply add the National Park Conservation Association opposes the amendment, and I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, the average age of the heritage areas in this bill is 16 years. If you look at the original authorization, none of them was supposed to get any Federal money now. As a matter of fact, the Senator's heritage area has planned and raised the money for his area and had an alternative plan to do it.

The fact is, the national parks will open with this amount of money on time this year, so it will make a big difference in Yellowstone and all the rest of the national parks. The National Park Service does have something to do with the White House tours because they can take this money and allocate that. It is not a Secret Service problem, it is a national park problem.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The Acting PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	Cruz	McCain
Ayotte	Enzi	McConnell
Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Baucus	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	King	Toomey
Cornyn	Kirk	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker

NAYS—54

Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kaine	Sanders
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schatz
Carper	Landrieu	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Shaheen
Coons	Levin	Stabenow
Cowan	Manchin	Tester
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Durbin	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Grassley	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 45 the nays are 54. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what is the next regular order?

AMENDMENT NO. 65 TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment is Coburn amendment No. 65.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we have some good news. The good news is that the Senator and I have reached an agreement.

There is an acceptable modification. I didn't know if the Senator wanted to speak on this amendment. May I continue.

This amendment ensures that the NSF funding for political science research is widely used focusing on national security and economic interests. I, therefore, believe we can agree to this amendment with a voice vote.

I ask unanimous consent that the 60-vote threshold be waived for this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further debate?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I request a voice vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 65) was agreed to.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider that vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 70, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment is Coburn amendment No. 70, as modified.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am happy to tell our colleagues we have also worked this out and can take this by voice vote.

I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Oklahoma. We have no objection to providing the reports to the committee which he has requested, reports to Homeland Security. However, many of these reports are expenditure plans, and all we ask is that the Appropriations Committee receive them 2 weeks in advance. The Senator has agreed to that, and we have no objection to taking this by voice vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I believe we can agree to this amendment with a voice vote, so I ask unanimous consent that the 60-vote threshold be waived for the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 70) was agreed to.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 72 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], for himself and Mrs. HAGAN, proposes an amendment numbered 72, as modified, to amendment No. 26.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading of the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the continuation of tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces for the remainder of fiscal year 2013)

At the end of title VIII of division C, add the following:

SEC. 8131. (a) REQUIREMENT TO CONTINUE PROVISION OF TUITION ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall carry out tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces during the remainder of fiscal year 2013 using amounts specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS.—The minimum amount used by the Secretary of a military department for tuition assistance for members of an Armed Force under the jurisdiction of that Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall be not less than—

(1) the amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for tuition assistance programs for members of that Armed Force, minus

(2) an amount that is not more than the percentage of the reduction required to the Operation and Maintenance account for that Armed Force for fiscal year 2013 by the budget sequester required by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing and I know some of the Democratic sponsors of the bill, Senator HAGAN and others, would be in agreement to go ahead and accept this by voice vote.

What this does is reverse the decision from the Department of Defense that took away some of the abilities our troops, when they are brought into service, have in terms of subsidizing their tuition. So this would return it to the way it was before.

I have to say quickly and briefly, this is something I have talked about to our troops in the field. Many of them were so alarmed that it was even suggested they would take away the very thing that caused them to enlist in the first place.

I think this is one that is going to enjoy wide bipartisan support for a voice vote, and I ask for its adoption.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. HAGAN. I would like to speak on this amendment. I think it is a very good amendment. We have 100,000 servicemembers in our Active-Duty military who actually utilized this last year, and 50,000 of them received diplomas, certificates, and licenses. It truly does help prepare our servicemembers for a successful transition into the civilian workforce when they choose to leave the military.

This is good news for a recruitment tool and it is good news as a retention tool and I think it is imperative that we continue to offer this tuition assistance benefit to our members.

I certainly want to thank Senator INHOFE for working with me on this issue. I think it is a very good amendment. I also want to thank Senators MIKULSKI, SHELBY, DURBIN, and COCHRAN for helping us reach an agreement and move this amendment forward.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, thanks to the excellent work of both Senators INHOFE and HAGAN, who reached an agreement on this, I believe we can agree to this amendment with another voice vote.

I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back and that a 60-vote threshold be waived for this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 72), as modified was agreed to.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 98, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I now call up the Mikulski-Shelby amendment No. 98, as modified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], for herself and Mr. SHELBY, proposes an amendment numbered 98, as modified, to amendment No. 26.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 378, line 3, strike ‘‘a grant for’’.

On page 580, line 22, strike ‘‘0.092 percent’’ and insert ‘‘0.1 percent’’.

On page 585, line 11, strike ‘‘through C’’ and insert ‘‘through F’’.

On page 586, line 16, strike ‘‘division C’’ and insert ‘‘division F’’.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this amendment makes technical changes to citations, bill language related to the Department of Homeland Security and an adjustment resulting from a CBO scoring.

I believe we can agree to this amendment with a voice vote, so I ask unanimous consent that the 60-vote threshold be waived for the amendment. I want to thank Senator SHELBY for the excellent work he and his staff have done in cleaning up this bill for the technical aspects.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 98), as modified, was agreed to.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 129, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 129, as modified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI and Mr. SHELBY, proposes an amendment numbered 129, as modified.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following: ''Notwithstanding section 1101, section 7054(b) in division I of Public Law 112–74 shall be applied for purposes of this division by inserting before the period in paragraph (2) '; or (3) such assistance, license, sale, or transfer is for the purpose of demilitarizing or disposing of such cluster munitions'.''.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is a technical correction amendment. Current law prohibits transfers of U.S. cluster munitions that do not meet certain reliability requirements.

Years ago Japan purchased U.S. cluster munitions that do not meet such requirements, and that Japan now wants to dispose of. Japan has contracted with a company in Germany to do this. But transferring the cluster munitions to Germany violates the law.

Section 1706(c) of the continuing resolution provides an exception to the prohibition on transfers if the purpose is to dispose of the cluster munitions.

The Leahy amendment #129, which is supported by Senator GRAHAM, fixes a minor drafting error. It is a purely technical amendment which does not affect the substance of section 1706(c).

Mr. President, I suggest we dispose of this amendment by voice vote. It should not be controversial.

I yield back all time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this too is an amendment I believe we can agree to with a voice vote. Again, I wish to thank Senator LEAHY for the excellent job he did.

I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back and the 60-vote threshold be waived for this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment (No. 129), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore.

The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 TO AMENDMENT NO. 26

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 82.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] proposes an amendment numbered 82 to amendment No. 26.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 84, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 74____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) the amount made available for buildings operations and maintenance expenses in the matter before the first proviso under the heading ''AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS'' under the heading ''AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS'' in title I shall be $52,169,000;

(2) the amount made available for necessary expenses to carry out services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act in the matter before the first proviso under the heading ''FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE'' under the heading ''AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS'' in title I shall be $1,056,427,000; and

(3) the amount made available to provide competitive grants to State agencies in the second proviso under the heading ''CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS'' under the heading ''FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE'' under the heading ''DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS'' in title IV shall be $10,000,000.

Mr. PRYOR. I believe this has been basically agreed to by both sides. I do not think we will require a rollcall vote. I believe we can go by voice vote. I thank my cosponsors. We have had several Senators working on this: Senator COONS, Senator CARPER, Senator HOEVEN—I appreciate his great leadership—Senator MORAN, who relented earlier and said he would not object to this, and also Senator BLUNT. He has done a fantastic job of moving this through.

This is about the Food Safety Inspection Service. Basically this has a very direct impact on the private sector. When these Food Safety Inspection Service employees are furloughed, that means basically the processing plant is furloughed. They have to close for the day because they have to have a food safety inspector there when they are producing.

I think it is agreeable, and I ask unanimous consent, that we do it by voice vote. I thank all of my cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 82) was agreed to.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 115, AS MODIFIED, WITHDRAWN

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Durbin second-degree amendment to the Toomey amendment is withdrawn.

There will be 2 minutes of debate on the Toomey amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase by $25,000,000 the amount appropriated for Operation and Maintenance for the Department of Defense for programs, projects, and activities in the continental United States, and to provide an offset)

At the end of title VIII of division C, insert the following:

SEC. 8131. (a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR O&M FOR ACTIVITIES IN CONUS.—The aggregate amount appropriated by title II of this division for operation and maintenance is hereby increased by $25,000,000, with the amount to be available, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, for operation and maintenance expenses of the Department of Defense in connection with programs, projects, and activities in the continental United States.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount appropriated by title III of this division under the heading ''DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES'' is hereby decreased by $60,000,000, with the amount of the reduction to be allocated to amounts available under that heading for Advanced Drop in Biofuel Production.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to make the case for this amendment. I think we all know that this bill funds the Defense Operations and Maintenance Account to a very large degree. This is a very important account from which we fund the maintenance of all kinds of military equipment, from trains to tanks to avionics—you name it, it gets funded from this account. So too does a whole lot of training come from this account.

Meanwhile, we have $60 million going to build a biorefinery that would force the Defense Department to pay too much for fuel. This is about priorities, and it is my suggestion and my amendment to take $60 million out of this account that would force us to build an inefficient, expensive refinery to make too-expensive fuel and transfer it into this Operations and Maintenance Account that we need.

I appreciate the support of the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee for this amendment, Senator INHOFE, and I urge my colleagues to vote in its favor.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I know Senator UDALL wanted to speak against the Toomey amendment. In his absence, I will comment on the Toomey amendment. I believe the Senator proposes to cut $60 million from the Advanced Drop-In Biofuels Production Program. He would move $25 million from these funds to the Operations and Maintenance Account. The Department of Defense recognizes that its dependence on foreign oil supplies presents a real risk to its ability to operate around the world. I agree. As the largest single customer of oil in the world, DOD spent $17 billion in fiscal 2011 on oil. DOD estimates that for every 25-cent increase in the price of a gallon of oil we incur over $1 billion in fuel costs. Every time oil prices go up, so does the cost of running the Department of Defense. Imagine if our military were cut off from these supplies.

The Senate has made it clear that there is support for biofuels. The Senate has voted twice in support of the Department of Defense biofuels program during floor consideration of the Armed Services Committee Defense bill. The funds appropriated for this project are available until expended. When the Departments of Energy and Agriculture are able to meet their obligations to fund this program, as required by the National Defense Act, the Department of Defense will have their funds ready. The Toomey amendment would cut a modest investment to provide security alternatives to petroleum dependence.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this amendment could have a profound impact on our Nation's energy security by reducing funding for efforts that support finding clean energy replacements for oil.

High oil prices and tensions in the Middle East could not present a better national security case for moving quickly away from our military's overwhelming dependence on oil, especially as currently supplied to critical operations and facilities in the Middle East, the Pacific, the Indian Ocean, and elsewhere. The military's dependence on oil is one of its most significant vulnerabilities; as a recent Army release noted, our Nation loses one soldier for every 20 convoys transiting through Afghanistan; fuel comprises 50 percent of the load carried by these convoys.

Last year, the Department of Defense used 4.3 billion gallons of petroleum, and spent about $20 billion on fuel. I encourage the Department of Defense to continue to support efforts that will lower the risks and future costs to our armed forces by supporting technologies like solar energy at forward operating bases, the production and procurement of advanced biofuels and other clean alternative fuels, and improved energy performance of materials to lighten and improve the capability, load, and endurance of our troops.

I will continue to do everything that I can to help move the Nation toward a safer, cleaner, and more secure energy future.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 115, as modified.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 59, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Alexander	Enzi	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Casey	Hoeven	Scott
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cochran	Kirk	Toomey
Corker	Lee	Vitter
Cornyn	McCain	Wicker
Crapo	McConnell	
Cruz	Moran	

NAYS—59

Baldwin	Grassley	Murphy
Baucus	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Blunt	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Johanns	Rockefeller
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Cantwell	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Collins	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cowan	Levin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Fischer	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 26

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, before I speak and have time counted against me, the Senate is not in order.

We are now coming to the last three votes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we have three more votes. The first vote is on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment. This is the bill we have been working on now for 8 days. After that, we will have a vote on cloture, and then we will go to final passage. If we could just have the Senators' attention and if they could stay nearby, we can finish this expeditiously.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I now speak on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute amendment, which is pending.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan continuing resolution. It accomplishes many things. First, when we pass this, we will avoid a government shutdown, but we do better than that—we will protect our national security needs, meet compelling human needs, and lay the groundwork for investing in science and technology. Second, we complied with the Budget Control Act—costing no more than $1 trillion—and it is bipartisan.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baucus	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Boozman	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Coons	Levin	Udall (NM)
Corker	Manchin	Warner
Cornyn	McCaskill	Warren
Cowan	McConnell	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Menendez	Wyden
Durbin	Merkley	
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—29

Ayotte	Graham	Risch
Barrasso	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Crapo	Kirk	Tester
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McCain	Vitter
Fischer	Moran	Wicker
Flake	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 26), as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.R. 933.

The senior Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, we have just voted, as everybody knows, on the Mikulski-Shelby substitute. Our next vote is a cloture vote. Then, assuming cloture is invoked, we will have final passage. It is my understanding that the House is waiting on this bill. I hope we can get it to them as quickly as we can.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I just want to echo the comments by my vice chairman, Senator SHELBY. It is time to bring this bill to closure, and I would hope we could pass it. I really want to thank Senator SHELBY for the bipartisan tradition in which we have been able to operate, and I hope we get a 60-vote majority and move this bill and this country forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 933 a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Sherrod Brown, Barbara Boxer, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar, Debbie Stabenow, Max Baucus, Tim Johnson, Benjamin L. Cardin, Johb D. Rockefeller IV, Charles E. Schumer, Carl Levin, Thomas R. Carper, Richard J. Durbin, Maria Cantwell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 933, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 43 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Alexander	Franken	Mikulski
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baucus	Hagan	Murphy
Begich	Harkin	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blunt	Hirono	Reed
Boozman	Hoeven	Reid
Boxer	Isakson	Rockefeller
Brown	Johanns	Sanders
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Landrieu	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Coons	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cowan	Manchin	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—36

Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Chambliss	Hatch	Roberts
Coats	Heller	Rubio
Coburn	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cornyn	Kirk	Tester
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Vitter
Fischer	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 63, the nays are 36. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is yielded back. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on passage of H.R. 933, as amended.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Following the statements of Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY, I would ask to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, we are now coming to a vote on final passage of the bill. I am going to thank all of our colleagues who supported cloture to bring the debate to an end. This is indeed a very important moment, because as we moved the bill, we have shown that we have done something pretty terrific in that we have continued a bipartisan tradition of the Appropriations Committee.

I cannot thank my vice chairman, Senator SHELBY, and his staff enough for their cooperation, as well as the Republican leader and the Democratic leader, often giving very wise counsel. We had three principles in this Senate continuing resolution: The House sent us a bill which we felt was skimpy and spartan. We wanted to not only avoid a government shutdown—remember, the full funding of the U.S. Government expires on March 27; we did not want brinkmanship politics; we did not want ultimatum politics. We wanted to be able to move our bill forward protecting national security needs and meeting compelling human needs and complying with the Budget Control Act. This bill will cost no more than 1.3 trillion, the same as the House continuing resolution. It does meet the needs of our constituents.

This bill is co-sponsored by my Vice Chairman, Senator SHELBY, and I am so glad he is my partner. We have worked across the aisle and across the dome to improve the House bill, while at the same time we have kept poison pills out of the bill, in order to prevent a government shutdown.

When we began this process, I had three principles for the Senate CR. First, avoid a government shutdown, while protecting national security needs and also meeting compelling human needs, such as investing in human infrastructure like early childhood education and in research and innovation, so that we can create jobs today and jobs tomorrow. Not shutting down the government allows us to protect the middle class and our fragile economic recovery. Second, comply with the Budget Control Act. The Senate CR provides $1.043 trillion, the same as the House CR. Third, establish a path to return to regular order for our fiscal year 2014 bills.

This bill meets all three of these principles. We will avoid a shutdown. We are at $1.043 trillion in total budget authority, as required by the Budget Control Act. We have shown that we can work in a bipartisan manner, to move this bill to final passage.

The bill we will vote on today is five full appropriations bills: Agriculture; Commerce, Justice, Science; Homeland Security; Defense; and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs.

The remaining seven bills are in the CR: Energy and Water; Financial Services; Interior and Environment; Labor-HHS; State-Foreign Operations; Transportation-HUD; and the Legislative Branch. This means they are provided current funding levels and policies, with some limited changes to fix pressing problems.

This bill has been on the Senate floor for a week. The Senate has debated and voted on amendments to eliminate funding for the Affordable Care Act, cut defense funding for projects in Guam, and cut funding for defense biofuels programs, among others. This afternoon, we accepted a number of amendments by voice vote, again, in a very bipartisan fashion.

I will be the first to admit that this bill is not perfect, but it is the bill that we need right now. I wanted an omnibus to provide complete bills for all the departments and agencies of the government, and not just some. I regret that the bill could not include a ½ percent pay raise for Federal workers, who now face a third year without a pay increase.

This bipartisan bill keeps Americans safe in their communities. The Senate bill provides more than the House CR for State and local first responder grants, providing a $208 million increase above the House CR, and for fire grants, providing a $33 million increase above the House CR. The Senate provides more for COPS grants, an $18 million increase above the House CR, to put a total of 1,400 new police officers on the beat.

When it comes to infrastructure, this bipartisan bill fully funds highways, transit, and road safety programs at the authorized levels, a difference of almost $700 million above the House CR.

This bipartisan bill also supports the innovation needed to grow the economy and to create jobs today and tomorrow. The Senate bill includes $174 million more than the House CR for National Science Foundation basic research. That means 400 more grants supporting 5,000 scientists, teachers, students, all of them focused on making new discoveries leading to new products, new companies, and new jobs. For the National Institutes of Health, the Senate contains $75 million more than the House CR for research on cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes, and other devastating diseases

The Senate bill meets compelling human needs. It includes $33.5 million more than the House CR for Head Start, to help them to implement reforms and improve quality. The Senate bill includes $250 million more than the House CR for the Women, Infants and Children, a program that provides basic nutrition support for low-income mothers and their children. For homeless assistance grants, the Senate bill contains $147 million more than the House CR for shelter and housing support for 28,000 more homeless people.

This legislation will put us on the road to a return to regular order for our appropriations bills. I am so proud that we have reached across the aisle and across the dome to come to a bipartisan solution to funding the government for the next 6 months. I thank my Vice Chairman, Senator SHELBY, for his support, in making this possible.

As we start our work on fiscal year 2014 bills, this process should serve as a model, showing that the Congress can get its work done, and can exercise the power of the purse in a bipartisan way.

My vice chairman and I have worked very hard to get to this point to provide a bill that Democrats and Republicans can support. I hope they will join with us to vote for final passage of the Senate CR, and return it to the House, so it can be considered and sent to the President for his signature.

I urge adoption of this bill and thank everyone for their cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. We know we are ready to vote. I urge everyone to support this bill. It needs to go to the House. The House, I think, is ready to act on it. This will fund the government through September 30. It is the first big step toward regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the week before last, the House of Representatives sent us this important bill to prevent a government shutdown, to fund the government for the next 6 months. I have said it before, I say it again: I commend Speaker BOEHNER for giving this bill to us at a time where we could do some constructive work on it. The House did their work on time. We are going to do our work on time.

I applaud and commend my counterpart, Senator MCCONNELL. When that bill came from the House, he sat down with me and the two managers of this bill. He said: The House did their work, now we need to do ours. We could not do all the remaining 10 appropriations bills, but we added three. That was good. It would not have happened but for Senator MCCONNELL acknowledging that we needed to get some of this work done. It could not have happened even though Senator MCCONNELL and I thought it was a good idea but for the work of Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY. They are veteran legislators. They are people who believe in this institution. They know this institution needs to get back where we are doing things the way we used to. The way we used to do things was fund the government in a timely fashion. We have the opportunity to do that now. We are taking care of the next 6 months.

During this 6 months, the government will be functioning because of what we have done here. They will work on having 12 appropriations bills that we will bring to the floor. Everyone should know we are not going to be able to spend a week on every appropriations bill, but we need to do all 12 appropriations bills. That is our goal. It is the goal of the two managers of this bill, it is the goal of the Republican leader, and it is my goal. We need to do this.

I so appreciate—I say it again—the work done by the two managers of this bill. They worked in good faith. They both gave up things they believed in for the greater good. They produced a substitute amendment. We had added a few things to it. I know people are disappointed because they wanted to rearrange things differently. I would like to have rearranged things differently. There are things that are happening in Nevada because of the sequester that I would like to have taken out of this bill. They are not good things that are happening either.

I hope this practical, commonsense leadership will be a good sign for our regular appropriations bills and other work in the future. The work done by these two managers should be and is exemplary for what needs to follow. And what is going to follow immediately is our budget. We are going to have a budget debate. It is going to be a good debate.

We have two differently opposed views as to what should happen to this country economically. But that is what the Senate is all about, to allow us to do that. So I say to Senator MURRAY—everyone has heard me talk about how good she is, and I really do believe that—I hope she and Senator SESSIONS are looking at what was done by these two Senators. Senator MIKULSKI and Senator SHELBY have totally different views about how government should operate, but they also have views as to how the legislative process should operate. Legislation is the art of compromise. Everybody here has to understand, you are not going to get everything you want. You cannot throw a monkey wrench into everything just because you do not get what you want on one issue.

We are going to move to the budget. There will be no votes tonight. We have a lot of debate time on this bill, and the two managers are going to determine when the votes will start.

Again, this is a very good day for the Senate. I am very happy we reached this point.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Alexander	Feinstein	Murkowski
Baldwin	Franken	Murphy
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Hatch	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reid
Blunt	Heitkamp	Rockefeller
Boozman	Hirono	Sanders
Boxer	Hoeven	Schatz
Brown	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johanns	Sessions
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Shelby
Casey	King	Stabenow
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Thune
Coats	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Collins	Levin	Warner
Coons	Manchin	Warren
Corker	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Cornyn	McConnell	Wicker
Cowan	Menendez	Wyden
Donnelly	Merkley	
Durbin	Mikulski	

NAYS—26

Ayotte	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Heller	Risch
Coburn	Inhofe	Roberts
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Rubio
Cruz	Kirk	Scott
Enzi	Lee	Tester
Fischer	McCain	Toomey
Flake	Moran	Vitter
Graham	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The bill (H.R. 933), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD).

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SHELBY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this is an enormous victory—that we just passed this bill and are now sending it to the House. Again, I wish to thank everyone.

I also wish to say that today is exactly 90 days since I took over the full Committee on Appropriations. During these 90 days, with Senator SHELBY and his staff and the help and support of many people on both sides of the aisle, we were able to pass the Sandy urgent supplemental and we were able to pass the continuing funding resolution. This is pretty good. It shows we can work on a bipartisan basis; that we can actually govern and that we can conduct ourselves with decorum.

I think for all, as they watched the debate that occurred during this last week, they saw civility, they saw sensibility, they saw, yes, differing ideas, but at the end of the day, I think we all agreed on our goal—we want to keep America moving. So I am glad we have moved this bill to the House and we are going to keep our government functioning and keep America moving forward.

Again, I wish to thank everyone for what they have done, and I look forward to moving the other 12 appropriations bills on a regular basis, working, again, on a bipartisan basis across the aisle and across the dome.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2014

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, S. Con. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any time spent in quorum calls during consideration of S. Con. Res. 8 be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no amendments be in order for the remainder of today's consideration of S. Con. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that staff be permitted to make technical and conforming changes to the resolution, if necessary, consistent with amendments adopted during Senate consideration, including calculating the associated change in the net interest function under section 104, and incorporating the effect of such adopted amendments on the budgetary aggregates under section 101 for Federal revenues, the amount by which Federal revenues should be changed, new budget authority, budget outlays, deficits, public debt, and debt held by the public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the period of debate for economic goals and policy under section 305(b) of the Congressional Budget Act occur on Thursday, March 21, at a time to be determined by the two managers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are now on the floor of the Senate with the budget, and I wish to start by thanking my counterpart, Senator SESSIONS, for all his work and his staff's work—and all our staff—to get us to this point this evening that we are debating this bill and this amendment. Senator SESSIONS has been very gracious in working with us. We have gotten to this. We obviously have differences of opinion, but I wish to commend him for the tremendous amount of work he has put into this. It is going to be great to be working with him on the floor.

When I go back home to Washington State, my constituents tell me they are sick and tired of the gridlock and dysfunction in Washington, DC. They can see that our economy is slowly getting back on its feet and businesses are beginning to hire more workers, but my constituents—and people across the country—are very frustrated that the constant political crises are holding our recovery back right when we need to be doing everything possible to support it.

After 2 years of debate about fiscal and economic policy and an election in which voters spoke loudly and clearly, the American people want their elected representatives to stop arguing and reach some solutions. I come to the floor to discuss a budget plan that meets this challenge.

The Senate budget that passed through the Budget Committee last week, with the strong support of all 10 Democrats and 2 Independents, is a responsible and balanced plan that puts the economy first and tackles our deficit and debt responsibly and credibly. I am hopeful that after it passes the Senate, the House of Representatives stands ready to compromise as well, and we can come together around a balanced and bipartisan deal that the American people expect and deserve.

The budget debate is too often discussed in terms of abstract numbers and political winners and losers. But the truth is that budgets are about far more than that. They are about our values and our priorities. They are about our visions for how government should be serving its citizens today and for generations to come, and, most of all, they are about the people across the country whose lives are impacted by the decisions we make.

The budget we will be debating on the floor this week puts those people first. It reflects the progrowth, pro-middle-class agenda that the American people went to the polls in support of last election. I believe it is a strong and responsible vision for building a foundation for growth and restoring the promise of American opportunity.

Our budget is built on three principles. No. 1, we need to protect our fragile economic recovery. We need to create jobs and invest in long-term growth. No. 2, we need to tackle our deficit and our debt fairly and responsibly. No. 3, we need to keep the promises we have made as a nation to our seniors and our families and our communities.

The highest priority of our budget is to create the conditions for job creation, economic growth, and prosperity built from the middle out, not the top down. We believe that with the unemployment rate that remains stubbornly high and a middle class that has seen their wages stagnate for far too long, we simply cannot afford any threats to our fragile recovery. So this budget fully replaces the cuts from sequestration that threatens 750,000 jobs this year alone and economic growth for years to come, as well as our national security, and the programs families and communities depend on. It replaces those automatic cuts in a fair and responsible way following the precedent that was set in the year-end deal.

Half of the new deficit reduction to replace sequestration comes from responsible spending cuts across the Federal budget and half comes from new savings found through closing loopholes and cutting wasteful spending in the Tax Code that benefits the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations.

In addition to replacing sequestration with deficit reduction that is far more responsible, our budget follows the advice of experts and economists across the political spectrum who say it makes sense to invest in job creation in the short term while putting ourselves on a strong path to responsible and sustainable deficit and debt reduction over the medium and long term.

We believe that in order to truly tackle our economic and fiscal challenges in the real world and not just make them disappear on paper, we need a strong foundation for growth built from the middle out. So this budget invests in a $100 billion economic recovery protection plan to put workers back on the job repairing our Nation's highest priority deteriorating infrastructure and fixing our crumbling schools and installing critical educational technology such as broadband that our students need to succeed.

This plan creates an infrastructure bank to leverage public funds with private investment. It invests in our workers by making sure they have the skills and training they need to move into the 3.6 million jobs businesses across the country are trying to fill, and it is fully paid for by closing loopholes and cutting unfair spending in the Tax Code that mainly benefit the well-off and well-connected.

Our budget also makes sure we are not reducing our fiscal deficit while increasing our deficits in education and skills and infrastructure and innovation. While cutting spending responsibly overall, it protects our investments in national, middle-class, and economic priorities, such as our schools and our roads and bridges and our clean energy and manufacturing industries.

This budget puts jobs first and our economy first and foremost, but it also builds on the work we have done over the last 2 years to tackle our deficit and debt responsibly.

In 2010, President Obama established the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform—commonly referred to as Simpson-Bowles. That bipartisan group came back with a report recommending approximately $4 trillion in deficit reduction over 10 years from a balanced combination of spending cuts and new revenue. The report pointed out that this level of deficit reduction is more than any effort in our Nation's history. Other bipartisan groups, including Domenici-Rivlin and the Senate's Gang of 6, as well as economists across the political spectrum, agreed that $4 trillion over 10 years was a reasonable and responsible goal. Since that time, Congress and the administration have worked together to reduce the deficit by $2.4 trillion—$1.8 trillion coming from spending cuts, $600 billion from allowing tax rates to rise on the wealthiest Americans in the year-end deal.

The Senate budget takes us the rest of the way to the $4 trillion goal and beyond. It builds on that $2.4 trillion in deficit reduction already done with an additional $1.85 trillion in new deficit reduction, for a total of $4.25 trillion in deficit reduction since the Simpson-Bowles report. It reduces the deficit to below 3 percent of GDP by 2015 and keeps it well below that level for the rest of the 10-year window in a responsible way and it pushes our debt as a percentage of the economy down, moving it in the right direction.

Our budget tackles this issue the way the American people have consistently said they want it done—with an equal mix of responsible spending cuts made across the Federal budget and new revenue raised by closing loopholes and cutting wasteful breaks that primarily benefit the rich.

This budget cuts spending responsibly by $975 billion, and we make some tough choices to get there. We think every program—including the ones we know are important—need to be wringing out waste, trimming fat, and reducing costs to taxpayers. So $500 billion of our deficit reduction comes from responsible savings on the domestic spending side, including $275 billion in health care savings made in a way that doesn't harm our seniors or our families. We believe everything should be put on the table, but we do it in a responsible way that preserves, protects, and strengthens programs such as Medicare and Medicaid that the American people strongly support.

This budget saves $240 billion by carefully and responsibly reducing defense spending while giving the Pentagon enough time to plan and align those savings. We all know this involves some tough decisions, but it is a responsible path that is nothing like the across-the-board cuts from sequestration which would be devastating to defense programs and jobs if they weren't replaced.

This budget takes a balanced approach to deficit reduction, and it matches the responsible cuts with $975 billion in new revenue which is raised by closing loopholes and cutting wasteful spending in the Tax Code for those who need it the least, while locking in tax cuts for the middle class and low-income working families and protecting them from paying a penny more.

This shouldn't be controversial. There is bipartisan support for making the Tax Code more fair and more efficient. We just think that instead of that savings going toward more tax cuts for the rich, that savings ought to be used to reduce the deficit and invest in our middle class.

If this budget were to be enacted, the total deficit reduction since the Simpson-Bowles report would consist of 64 percent spending cuts, 14 percent tax rate increases on the rich, and 22 percent new revenue raised by closing loopholes and cutting wasteful spending in the Tax Code for the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. That is a responsible approach. It is a balanced and fair approach. It is the one that is endorsed by bipartisan groups and experts, and it is the one supported by the vast majority of the American people.

In addition to investing in jobs and economic growth and tackling our deficit and debt responsibly, this budget also keeps the promises we have made to our seniors, to our families, to our veterans, and to our communities. We think Medicare should be protected and preserved for our children and our grandchildren, and we absolutely reject calls to dismantle or privatize Medicare by voucherizing it.

The House Republican budget being considered this week could also repeal the health care law and increase the cost of care to our seniors, throw students off their parents' plans, cause tens of millions more Americans to be uninsured, and put the insurance companies back in charge of patients' care. Our budget rejects that approach, and it builds on the health care law to continue reducing costs responsibly, increasing efficiencies, and improving care.

Our budget also maintains the key principle that every other bipartisan group has maintained but that has been rejected by the House Republicans. We don't think the burden of deficit reduction should be unfairly borne by the most vulnerable children and families who have already sacrificed so much. Everyone in America needs to be a part of this solution, but the House Republican approach would shred the safety net that has offered a hand up to millions of families across America, including my own when we needed it, and we reject that approach.

The budget we are considering this week also makes the investments we need to keep our military strong, to protect our communities and environment, and uphold the sacred commitment we have made to our veterans. I believe our budget reflects the values and priorities of the vast majority of families across our country. It is a responsible and credible approach, and it offers a clear path to a balanced and bipartisan deal.

House Republicans are debating a very different approach this week. The proposal that passed through their Budget Committee would be devastating for our economic recovery and threaten millions of jobs. It would make extreme cuts to the investments in infrastructure and education and innovation that we need right now to lay down a strong foundation for broad-based economic growth. It would dismantle Medicare and would cut off programs that support the middle class and the most vulnerable families. It would do all that while refusing to ask the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations to even contribute their fair share.

The American people are going to have an opportunity to examine these budgets side by side over the coming weeks. They are going to be able to decide which approach is best for our economy, best for jobs, and best for the middle class. They are also going to have a chance to weigh in.

After the Senate passes our budget and the House passes theirs, I am hopeful we can work together, listen to the American people, and come to the balanced and bipartisan deal this country desperately needs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank Chairman MURRAY for her good work. It has been 4 years since we have had a budget in the Senate. This is her first year as chair of the committee, and we have gotten a budget moved forward to the Senate floor. I congratulate her on that.

I note Senator Conrad, her predecessor, would have loved to have moved a budget forward, but the leadership somehow decided that was not the right thing to do. Indeed, they said it would be foolish to have a budget. So this is progress, and although we would have liked to have had more time in committee, Chairman MURRAY set up this system in a way that she was clear about, and gave us full time all day Thursday of last week to debate and make the points we believed were important, and so did our Democratic colleagues. They got to speak out. I thank her for having an open hearing and being respectful of those of us who had different views and were anxious to share them.

My colleague uses the phrase ''responsible and balanced.'' But what you have to know, I say to colleagues and friends and Americans, is that this budget is anything but balanced. It never comes close to balancing. It never balances over the entire lifetime. It does not put us on a trajectory that would ever balance. It is not a budget that in any sense balances the amount of money coming in with the amount of money going out. It just does not. And we need to talk about that.

I think the American people want a balanced budget. I believe they asked for that. I think they expect that of us, and will be disappointed to find out that the leadership in the Senate, unlike the leadership in the House, does not produce a budget that is balanced.

Today we begin debate on the budget resolution. This is the first budget resolution on the Senate floor in 4 years, crafted by our Democratic majority. We are required to produce a budget, but over the last 4 years, in violation of plain statutory law in the United States Code that requires the passage of a budget by April 15—by April 1 it should be produced in committee, we have not acted. It has been disappointing. I have had many of my constituents say: How can they not produce a budget when the law says you should have one?

Senator REID said it would be foolish to have a budget. That was his excuse or reason for not bringing up one—foolish to have a budget when we have the largest deficit this Nation has ever seen, and we face the greatest systemic debt threat we have ever seen.

I do not think we can have a greater symbol of an arrogance of power than the refusal to produce a budget resolution over the last 4 years. It was a decision to place—as I have said before, and I have been clear on this—political ideas and values over the American interests.

Our friends in the majority speak of their deep concern for struggling Americans. Yet year after year there has been no plan produced that will actually help them. America has never been in a more perilous fiscal condition, never needed a sound budget plan more than today. So what has changed? Why are we moving forward? The answer is a simple one. The House of Representatives passed legislation. It said: No budget, no pay. So now we have a budget. Hopefully, we would have had one anyway, but I am glad that one is moving. Our colleagues probably like to get paid.

Today we know the Senate majority resisted offering a plan for these years. The budget before us today is a bankrupt vision that will bankrupt the country. It is a jaded tax-and-spend budget that surges the Nation's debt and achieves no reduction in our annual deficits. It is a budget that never balances—never.

I think this quote sums it up well:

> In short, this document gives the voters no reason to believe that the Democrats have a viable plan for or even a responsible public assessment of the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

That is not my analysis but I agree with it. That comes from an editorial of the Washington Post after this budget was produced.

Senate Democrats have made no attempt to make the government leaner or more productive. Their proposal goes to extraordinary lengths to shield failing government programs from reform. Just add more money. It grows the government at the expense of growing the economy. It enriches the bureaucracy at the expense of the people. It has no plan to help discouraged workers move from dependency on the government to independence. Its surging debt and taxes will crush American workers, close American factories, and depress American wages.

I ask the American people to answer this question: Do you believe the government is wasteful; that it needs to do a better job of saving your money? If your answer to that question is yes, then consider this: The Democratic budget does not achieve a single penny in net savings. After 4 years they have failed to identify any way to save money through real reform of government spending, not a solitary cent.

So any Senator who votes for this budget apparently believes the budget is perfect and needs no reform. Any Senator who votes for this budget is saying to the American people: Washington is not the problem, you are the problem. They are saying: We have managed your money well, we have done it all right, we did nothing wrong. The problem, see, is you. You have not sent us enough money. In fact, this budget says: Send us another $1.5 trillion in more taxes. Send more money.

They also say: But don't worry, you will not have to pay those taxes. We are just closing loopholes. But closing loopholes does not come close to getting this many taxpayer dollars—it just does not. When they talk about the closing of loopholes, what that really means is it is slashing popular deductions to pay for more Washington spending—charitable deductions, home mortgage, or other exemptions. That is where the money is in the deductions. You will not raise much money with loopholes.

Let's take a moment to look at the numbers in this budget and what it claims to do. First, I would like to examine the claim that this budget reduces the deficit by $1.85 trillion. That is a significant sum of money. It is not nearly enough to balance our budget, but it is a significant sum of money—over 10 years, the claim is. When many Americans hear this they might think it means the budget authors are proposing to reduce America's debt by $1.85 trillion. Not so.

According to their own budget tables our Nation's debt will climb another $7.3 trillion over 10 years, passing the $24 trillion in total Federal gross debt that our Nation has accumulated. It does not reduce the debt, not even close. The Nation's debt grows by $7.3 trillion.

Their promotional materials, however, claim $1.85 trillion in deficit reduction—they claim that. This claim refers to an alleged reduction in the size of the projected debt increase. So the debt is going to increase, but we are going to reduce the increased rate of the debt—that is what we are going to do—by almost $2 trillion. But even that $1.85 trillion claim is totally false. It just is. It is a fabrication. It is not so. Several accounting tricks are used to create this number.

The biggest of these tricks is that their budget completely eliminates the savings that have been placed in law by the sequester, but it fails to count the elimination of the reduction in spending in the sequester as a spending increase. We voted 20 months ago—Congress did, August 2011—to reduce the growth of spending $2.1 trillion in order to obtain a raising of the debt limit by $2.1 trillion over 10 years. That is what it would be. And 60 percent of that $2.1 trillion—$1.2 trillion—is the sequester. They would eliminate the sequester but not count the fact that they have increased spending of the current law that is in place, and it is not going to be changed except to be modified so it is more rational in where the cuts fall. But they would wipe it out and not count that as increasing spending.

This is how the country goes broke. This is how America confuses what it is doing—I would say deliberately—to try to convince the American people they are acting responsibly when we are acting irresponsibly.

I asked Chairman MURRAY's fine staff about this at the hearing. They didn't want to talk about it, I have to say. But when pressed, like good staff people do, and the question was put to them plainly, they gave an answer—the correct answer, I think.

> Sessions: Relative to current law, under your plan if it is enacted, how much deficit reduction will occur?

The staff answer:

> Again, if you want to go straight to CBO baseline that we started when I was talking to Mr. Johnson it would be about $1.75 trillion. If you want to make the adjustments and take out the sequester—

And of course we should—and the disaster, yes, obviously it's much less. I think the total deficit reduction is about $700 billion in the plan.

Mr. President, $1.85 trillion claimed in reduction. If you count the sequester you are at $700 billion. $1.2 from $1.9 leaves $700 billion. But there are more gimmicks than that which take us down to zero deficit reduction, really.

So I asked this question again to the staff of the majority in the committee:

> Can you honestly say that under this budget you can achieve $1.85 trillion in deficit reduction and eliminate the sequester with only $975 billion [you claim] in new taxes?

And the answer was, "No."

Of course you cannot, but that is basically what they were saying. That is what they said in their promotion of this budget, that it achieves $1.85 trillion in deficit reduction. Any American who heard that would assume it means we are going to reduce the amount of deficit being added by $1.85 trillion, relative to current law.

Once again, we have this obsession, it seems, in Congress. We are trying to maneuver numbers around so we can spend more money while claiming we are not. They claim they are reducing the growth in our debt by almost $2 trillion, but it is not so. It does not happen under this budget. If anyone wishes to know more details, we will share those as time goes by.

There are other gimmicks in this budget too. The budget fails to account for the cost of continuing the stimulus tax credits and fails to offset the doc fix, as well as the physician payment fix, which we have to do just like we do every year. It should be scored. We know we are going to have to make that expenditure.

Chairman MURRAY's budget, which the committee voted on and passed, only includes $75 billion to fund the war on terror for 10 years. How much did President Obama say the War on Terror, when he submitted his last budget, would cost over 10 years? He said it would cost $494 billion. So they just waltz in and say: We will spend $75 billion in the first 2 years and zero on the War on Terror over the next 10 years.

The Ambassador was in my office this week. He negotiated an agreement for a reduction of forces in Afghanistan. We are planning to be there for years. We have drone attacks going on. We have special forces around the world fighting al-Qaida, with whom we are at war, and that is what has been funding that—this account—and they assume it is going to end. It is not going to end. But if we assume it is going to end, we save, according to the President's projection, some $400 billion. They can claim to save $400 billion by assuming we are not going to spend money that we are going to spend.

So if we add up all of these items—not scoring the sequester, the doc fix, the new stimulus money, the manipulation of the war costs—then there is zero deficit reduction. We raise $1.5 trillion in new taxes, and there is a zero-deficit reduction because spending has increased. So this budget also means there is a net spending increase above the projected growth of spending. We are on track to increase spending every year even with the Budget Control Act and the sequester—that is going up every year—but they want to spend even more than that. They want to increase the unsustainable debt course we are on now more than the current law calls for.

This budget breaks the spending limits we just signed into law with the Budget Control Act. We told the American people, who were reluctant to raise the debt ceiling—and a lot of Members of Congress were reluctant to raise the debt ceiling—because we were so irresponsible around this place. But an agreement was reached recognizing that it would be disruptive, to a significant degree, to raise the debt ceiling $2.1 trillion, that we would reduce spending over 10 years by $2.1 trillion.

We have already run up another $2.1 trillion in debt. We already hit that. In his budget last January, the President—less than 6 months after he signed the Budget Control Act and eliminated a little bit of the growth in spending—is proposing to eliminate the sequester part of it, which is $1.2 trillion, or 60 percent.

Here are some other figures the American people should know about this budget. It has a 60-percent spending increase over 10 years, which would increase spending by over 60 percent. It has over a $162 billion increase in spending next year—another stimulus bill. There will be $7.3 trillion in new Federal debt that will be added under this budget over the next 10 years; a $1.5 trillion tax increase; an 80-percent increase in Federal welfare and means-tested poverty spending. All the poverty programs—means-tested programs—would increase 80 percent. There is no reform for those programs, but a big increase.

So the question of whether to balance the budget is one of the central features of this debate that we are having now. If the American people take nothing else away from this debate, it should be that the party running the Senate—the Democratic Party—is spending taxpayers' dollars and refusing to ever balance the Federal budget.

By contrast, the Republican-led House, with Senator PAUL RYAN and his team, has a plan that they will vote on today which will balance the budget. They have passed a budget every year. Our colleagues in the Senate, while refusing to pass a budget, have delighted in complaining about the leadership and the responsible action of the House by blaming everything they can think of, and more, on unkind PAUL RYAN who wants to push the old folks off the cliff, and that is not true. He has good plans; he has growth plans. What I would say to everyone is: This Senate has done nothing by being critical of everyone else. We have had several budgets come up, and I voted for several of them. My Democratic colleagues have voted for not one. They voted against the Ryan budget, they voted against the President's budget, they voted against the Toomey budget, and they voted against the RAND PAUL budget. They voted against them all. Yet, they don't seem to be the least bit hesitant to attack everybody else.

I think we have a moral duty to balance the budget. It is not right to continue to spend and enjoy borrowed money today that someone else will have to repay tomorrow. We also have an economic duty to balance the budget, and I wish to talk about that. We need to balance the budget to prevent a future financial crisis, as Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson told the Budget Committee a couple of years ago. We are facing the most predictable financial crisis in our Nation's history if we don't get off this debt path. We need to act now to deal with the present danger that is occurring to our economy.

Our massive public gross debt is hurting growth today. Our economy today is being damaged by it. It is destroying jobs today. Massive Federal debt is creating poverty and joblessness right now. The debt is pulling down economic growth right now—not tomorrow, now. People are not getting jobs today because of this debt. People are not getting promotions, bonuses, and wage increases as a result of this debt that is hanging over the country.

Well, some might say: How do you prove that? The famed economists Rogoff and Reinhart testified before the Budget Committee a year or two ago. They released a paper last April that concludes when gross debt—not public debt, which is somewhat less—the $16-plus trillion that we see on the debt clock in public—reaches 90 percent of GDP, then the economy slows between 1 percent and 2 percent. The economy begins to slow. Our gross debt is now 103 percent of GDP. Some may not be aware—and my colleagues need to know this—that the International Monetary Fund, the Bank for International Settlements, and the European Central Bank have all independently done studies of this kind and reached very similar conclusions.

The other studies with different approaches all find that our current debt load in the United States—which is now almost $17 trillion—is causing a drag on our economy. A 1-percent decline in growth costs 1 million jobs, according to Christina Romer, who worked in the Obama White House as a top economic adviser.

We know that for the past 3 years, growth in America has fallen well below what our experts, the Congressional Budget Office, have predicted. These studies show our debt is hurting the economy now and that increased spending and more debt must end now. It cannot be contended any longer that it is good for America to borrow more and spend more. We cannot borrow more to spend more. Somebody compared that to taking a bucket in the deep end of the swimming pool, filling it up, and going to the shallow end and pouring it in. If truth be known, when you borrow to spend, you drop some along the way. We must grow the economy, not keep growing the government, and certainly not keep growing the debt.

I believe we all know this. I think the American people know it, and we in Congress have a responsibility to honestly confront this challenge and put our country on the right path. As we learned, we actually don't have to cut spending. All we really need to do is allow the spending to increase, but allow it to increase each year at 3.4 percent and not 5.4 percent. If we increase it at 3.4 percent, as Congressman RYAN has done in his budget, the budget balances in 10 years. We don't have to slash spending. We can even allow spending to increase, but we have to manage the growth of it. We can do this.

The recovery we are seeing from the 2007 recession is the slowest since the end of World War II and slow growth is expected to continue. The Commerce Department reported last month that the economy barely grew in the fourth quarter of 2012. We had virtually zero growth in the fourth quarter. That was a surprise. CBO expects the U.S. economy to limp along in 2013 at about 1.4 percent after inflation is taken out. That is a muddled, slow-growth, economy well below what they were predicting 2 years ago, which was a growth of about 4.6 percent, as I recall, for 2013. So no one disputes that this is the slowest recovery since 1945.

Why is it so slow? It certainly is not because the government has spent too little of the taxpayers' money. It is certainly not because we borrowed too little and spent too little. Total Federal spending has gone up 30 percent since 2007, and our annual deficit today is 7 times greater than the annual deficit was just 5 years ago. So as a consequence of huge annual deficits, our debt has grown by 73 percent since the beginning of the recession, over which time we added $6.6 trillion in new debt.

It seems quite clear that a substantial reason our recovery is slow is because of the depressing effect of high debt, big spending, a burdensome tax code, and regulations that are unnecessary. But every time Republicans have tried to reform the government, they meet the same response from our Democratic leaders—from the President to Senator REID to Chairman MURRAY—attack the reformers.

Majority Leader REID said of one Republican reform effort that it was ''a mean-spirited bill that would cut the heart out of the recovery we have in America today . . . it goes after little children, poor little boys and girls.''

I think that is an unkind thing to say. I don't think anybody proposed any legislation that would have that effect or ability or intent to do anything like that.

Chairman MURRAY said:

I will not agree to a deal that throws middle-class families under the bus . . .

Well, we are not throwing middle-class families under the bus. We want economic growth. We want prosperity. The real truth is that the debt increases borrowing, and spending has not worked. The debt is already so high and we have irresponsibly run up so much that it is pulling down the economy because it is over 100 percent of GDP. We don't need to be attacking people who disagree over solutions in harsh personal terms, but we do need people to focus honestly on the disagreements and the challenges we face.

The real victims we are seeing here today are the millions of people trapped in poverty by failed government programs. The real victims are Americans who are being denied help by those who would defend the Washington establishment at all costs and won't reform. The real victims of the left's rhetorical assaults are the communities out there that are thirsting for growth and opportunity but denied any policies that would create more jobs and actually create better and rising wages. The real victims are the millions who lost or can't get jobs, and they are out there—we have fewer working today than we had in 2000—or those who didn't get a pay raise because the debt has pulled down economic growth.

So I think this budget shows no really effective concern for Americans living in poverty, struggling to work, trapped in a stale bureaucratic welfare state. There is no reform that will actually work to help them. That is what I am concerned about.

Look at a city such as Detroit, governed by liberal policies for decades—a city once rich with business and commerce and opportunity. More than half of all Detroit children now live in poverty. Look at our Nation's Capital, another major city locally governed for decades by very liberal policies, a city filled with finance and deep-pocketed businesses. Washington, DC, is flowing with Federal funds. No city gets more from the Federal Government than Washington. Yet, despite this cash, one in three youths in our Nation's Capital lives in poverty. Two in three live in single-parent homes—two in three.

So this budget perpetuates the misguided policies that are causing social and economic harm in every State, in every region, in every part of this country. That is my view. Others may disagree, but I am prepared to defend it, and I think that empirical data and observations show it is correct. Compassion, if we care about people who are hurting, demands that we change, does it not?

We need to grow the economy, not the government, and do it for all Americans in every State and city.

We need to create rising wages and better jobs without just borrowing money and handing it out through some government check. That is not working. It is over. We need to understand that. We need an economic policy that provides our children with more jobs, not more debt. We need jobs. We don't need to be burdening our children for the rest of their lives with an unconscionable debt so we can live high today.

We need to reform and improve ineffective government programs so they help more Americans actually achieve their financial goals. How can we do this without running up the debt? Is there something we can do? Don't we have to have government investments? Don't we have to borrow more money? We don't have any. Any new money we spend is all borrowed. We are in debt. Aren't there some things we can do? Absolutely there is, and they are things that do not cost money. How about this: create a new tax reform system that creates growth, revenue-neutral but simpler, more pro growth-oriented and fairer. Can we do that? Yes.

What about more domestic American energy production? Produce more energy here instead of sending our money abroad, creating jobs here, creating tax revenue for our States, cities, and counties.

Let's make the welfare office—which gets from the Federal Government today hundreds of billions of dollars in spending—a place that restarts lives, that helps people rejoin the workforce, not trapping them in government benefit programs year after year.

Let's defend American workers from unfair foreign trade practices—and there are a lot of them. It is time we stood up to it.

Let's make government leaner and more productive. A leaner government, a more productive government is good for America. I don't see any reform effort there.

Let's eliminate every burdensome Federal regulation that isn't needed. Those are job-killers. If a regulation promotes safety and is economically viable, that is OK, but if it is not—and many are not—let's eliminate it. It is a drag on growth and prosperity.

Let's enforce Federal immigration laws, and let's protect American workers and legal immigrants from those who care only about importing more and more cheap labor.

Let's balance the Federal budget. As I said, balancing the budget and reducing the debt of America over time will get our debt down so it won't be a drag on the economy.

The American people have heard a lot of rhetoric from their elected officials and a lot of buzzwords about financial discipline this week. Rhetoric will be matched against reality. Every Senator will have to stand and be counted. I encourage the American people to tune in to C–SPAN and see where their Senator stands on the great issues of our time: Do we balance the Federal budget? Do we reform the bureaucracy or just keep spending more money? Do we keep sending even more money to Washington through more taxes? Do we embrace our great constitutional inheritance of freedom or do we let it slip away? These are questions of our time.

The budgets reflect where we stand on these issues. I would say the Democratic budget represents more government and less commitment to efficiency—not the kind of change and progress we need. We need to have a budget that balances, that is oriented toward growth and prosperity.

I look forward to the debate today. It will be an interesting challenge throughout the next couple of days. I have been very passionate here today, very frank here today, but I know we have great colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

In our debate in the Budget Committee, we had some great Senators on both sides of the aisle who have different views and expressed them ably. Chairman MURRAY is so articulate and wonderful to work with, but we do disagree.

It is time for change in this country. It is time to understand that our goal must be to promote prosperity and job creation and higher wages, not more government. That is what the debate is about. I urge my colleagues to be engaged in it, and let's begin to change the direction of our country and put it on the road to prosperity.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I thank Senator SESSIONS for his leadership.

I come here today as a new member of the Budget Committee, fresh from the committee process with some observations and some disappointments, but principally today I come to the floor to talk about the urgent need for budget reform and a lasting budget that will put us on a path to fiscal responsibility.

I suppose we should be delighted at least to be on the floor with a budget. After 4 years of trillion-dollar deficits and after 4 years without a budget, at least we have an opportunity as representatives of the American people to debate the financial future of this country and an opportunity to discuss putting our Nation on a trajectory away from constant debt and uncertainty and on a path toward security and prosperity, on a path that is designed to create better job opportunities for the people we represent.

Unfortunately, the budget our friends on the other side of the aisle unveiled last week ignores the spending problem that continues to drive the Federal debt skyward. Don't take the word of one Senator from Mississippi on that. Let's listen to the words of the Washington Post editorial board. Not exactly what one would call a center-right entity, they observed on March 14—and I quote the Washington Post:

> This document gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan for—or even a responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

Those are the words of the Washington Post in utter disappointment about the product we will be debating on the floor for the next several days.

Being a member of the Budget Committee and being part of the budget markup process has certainly been revealing to me as a new member of the committee. We were given an opportunity before amendments were offered to ask technical questions—not really to debate but just to ask technical questions of the staff members about exactly what this budget does. We learned from these professionals—when we just asked them the questions, we learned these facts about the Democratic proposal for a budget for the next 10 years: It does not balance at any point during the next decade. Never in the next 10 years would this document bring the Federal budget into balance. Not only that, in propounding further technical questions to the staff, we learned that this budget puts our country on a spending path that never comes into balance. There is no plan for decades and decades to come, as far as the eye can see, for this budget ever to get the Federal Government into balance. Yet it was supported by friends of mine on the other side of the aisle who have certainly given lipservice to the idea not only of a balanced budget but of a balanced budget constitutional amendment.

I am going to predict that Democratic Members of this body who come in here and vote for this document will have coauthored a balanced budget constitutional amendment, who have actually voted for or cosponsored a balanced budget constitutional amendment. Yet they will be voting for a document that not only doesn't balance within 10 years but that never, ever comes into balance. Indeed, the document that we will be asked to support and that we are trying to amend grows the Federal Government at 5 percent each year for the entire decade. It raises taxes to the tune of $1.5 trillion over the decade. And this is important for us to realize: It doesn't raise taxes on that rich guy behind the tree who we think can afford it, it raises taxes on the middle class. There is no question about it. We can't get $1.5 trillion out of the American economy without raising taxes on the middle class, and that is exactly what this budget does. So it never comes into balance, but it does raise a ton of taxes right out of the middle-class economy of this country.

Now, we will have an amendment process, and there will be a number of amendments, but it will, in essence, give us an opportunity to slow the trajectory of growth of Federal spending.

Members of the Senate will be offered an amendment in this process to balance our Federal budget by the year 2023. We will be given an opportunity to debate that and to visit on a plan that would get us there. How does it get us there? By slashing and burning? By tough austerity in the budget? Absolutely not. I think it would surprise many people within the sound of my voice in this city and elsewhere to know that we can grow the size of Federal spending by 3.4 percent each year over the next 10 years and still balance the Federal budget by the year 2023. Let me repeat that. Federal spending is not going to be actually cut under the Republican proposal we will present as an alternative. Federal spending will go up each year by an average of 3.4 percent per year, and still we will be able to balance the budget by the year 2023. So we need not let anyone say that we are having to slash and burn in order to balance the budget.

There will be adequate funds to perform the functions of government and still we will be able to balance the budget.

I say what so many of my colleagues have said and what our distinguished ranking member from Alabama has said repeatedly: We are not in this business simply to say we balanced the budget. It is not some artificial goal like winning a game. We are in this process of trying to save our country from a mountain of debt in order to create jobs for the American people, in order to grow the economy, rather than growing the size of the Federal Government. We have an opportunity to avoid the fate that is occurring to our allies in Western Europe, even as we speak.

I have heard it said recently that: Well, we don't have a debt crisis yet. There are some people who would dispute that. But there are people in this Federal Government, the President included, who say: We don't have a debt crisis at this moment in the Federal Government. I ask this in response: Must we wait for an absolute crisis before we act? We see it coming. We see what has happened to our friends who have overspent in Greece, in Spain, in Portugal, what is happening to our allies, our NATO allies in France. We can avoid this fate. Must we wait until the absolute last moment when people are losing their jobs and we are unable to perform the necessary functions of government?

So I say this: We need to act now. We need to act to avoid that crisis which is not that far down the road, and we want to act to grow the economy and create jobs.

I wish to mention three issues briefly, and then I notice there are other people who want to speak on this important issue. There is hardly a more important issue that we could be talking about, and thank goodness, for the first time in 4 years, we are going to get that opportunity. Let me mention Social Security, let me mention Medicaid, and then Medicare.

Social Security is a wonderful program. My dad relies on Social Security. We are going to keep the commitment that we have made to our senior citizens in the form of Social Security. But everyone agrees the numbers simply do not add up long term. They agree with that much, as President Ronald Reagan and Speaker Tip O'Neill agreed to the very same notion back in 1982 and 1983. The numbers were not adding up long term for Social Security and something had to be done and some painful decisions had to be made in the early 1980s. To this day, we thank God for President Ronald Reagan and Speaker Tip O'Neill for having the bipartisan courage to do the tough things, to make the tough decisions, and adjust an important program so that Social Security has been saved for the past three decades.

We need that kind of statesmanship out of the White House today. Frankly, we need that kind of leadership out of the White House. We are calling for bipartisan action. I think it is worth noting—and it pains me to say this—for the first time in 92 years, we are considering a budget without seeing a plan from the President of the United States, and he announced just last week that he was going to wait in sending us his budget plan. It will be 2 months late by the time it arrives, according to the President's own timetable. In fact, this is the fourth time in 5 years that our President, that my President, has missed this deadline. But we need the same leadership out of this White House that we had out of the Reagan White House three decades ago. We can save Social Security, but it will have to be a little different.

We can save Medicaid and make it better. We are going to have an opportunity, as legislators, as policymakers, to give the States an opportunity to design their own Medicaid Program to serve their individual States better.

Let's give one State or let's give five volunteer States the opportunity to take a Medicaid block grant and see if they cannot provide better health care to their underserved population with a Medicaid block grant. Let's give them an opportunity to do that. The program does not work very well now.

Then the statement was made—and correctly—by some of my Democratic colleagues in the Budget Committee that Medicare is a promise we have made and we ought to keep that promise. I could not agree more. There is not a soul in this Senate who does not want to keep the promise we have made to American workers and to American retired people with regard to Medicare.

But the fact remains—and every Senator in this body understands this—Medicare, as it is currently written, cannot last for many more years. The numbers simply do not add up. I am glad the point is being made, and it is being picked up by the mainstream media now. An American worker pays $1 into Medicare and gets $3 back in benefits. A system like that simply cannot be sustained long term. The numbers do not add up. The math does not. It is not that flexible.

So we need to—as Reagan and O'Neill did—as responsible custodians of our Federal Government, as responsible trustees of the future of this country, make changes to a program that has served us well.

Americans are calling for leadership and bipartisan action now. There are hopeful signs: the National Commission on Social Security Reform, the Gang of 6, the Simpson-Bowles Commission, various bipartisan groups that are trying to forge an honest long-term deal to deal not only with our debt but these three important entitlement programs.

I do not see that sort of realism in the document the Democratic majority has provided to us through the Budget Committee. I hope we can amend it. Perhaps we will not in the next few days, but we are going to have to in order to be the trustees of the future, to be the responsible leaders that our voters demand and that the people who come after us would hope we could be.

I look forward to the process. I look forward, cheerfully and realistically, to making the case for our position that we could grow the government by just a little less and balance the budget within 10 years, and in so doing we can make a better life, a better future, a better ability for our people to earn a living and support their families.

Thank you very much. I look forward to the debate. At this point I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I will be brief because I know we have other speakers on the floor.

This is all we need to know about the budget that was voted out of the Budget Committee, along party lines, with Democrats carrying the day: It would raise spending by about 60 percent, it would raise taxes by $1.5 trillion, it would increase our national debt by $7.3 trillion, and—this is the most important part—it would never ever, ever balance.

That is the exact opposite of what America needs to get our economy moving again and get a handle on our long-term finances. We have already reached a point where the Federal spending levels are unsustainable. We all know that. We have already reached a point where our national debt is exerting a drag on our economy.

I read the other day the President said there is no risk of an immediate debt crisis. We can debate that. But what we cannot debate is that our national debt is so big that it is dragging down economic growth, crushing job creation, and resulting in a loss of hope and certainly a loss of opportunity for 23 million Americans who are out of work or who are working part time and who want to get back to work and provide for their families.

We also know, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, that an unprecedented—or at least in the last 30 years—number of Americans have just simply given up looking for work. They have been so discouraged that the labor participation rate is at a 32-year low.

When our colleagues across the aisle say all we need is just a little bit more revenue; in other words, more taxes, we have already seen taxes go up by more than $1.6 trillion since President Obama became President.

Simply put, we cannot act as if the laws of fiscal gravity do not apply to the Congress or the Federal Government. That is why every single Senator on this side of the aisle has cosponsored a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which would require the Federal Government to live within its means and require a congressional supermajority to raise taxes or raise the debt ceiling.

I have heard colleagues across the aisle say: We can't pass a balanced budget amendment. That would tie Congress's hands.

That is the point. It would tie Congress's hands in spending money we do not have, running up these dangerous debts, and being a wet blanket on economic growth and job creation.

How do we know that government can live within its means? Virtually every State has some type of balanced budget requirement. Why should the rules in Washington be any different?

Some across the aisle argue—I think they actually believe this—that embracing fiscal discipline will jeopardize the safety net. In fact, the opposite is true. If we do not embrace sensible fiscal discipline, our safety net programs will eventually collapse because we will not have the money to provide for the national security and we will not have the money to provide the safety net programs we all agree are necessary for the most vulnerable of our citizens.

As I have said before, if we reform some of these programs gradually—as the Senator from Mississippi was referring to, Medicare and Social Security—we could minimize the impact and protect our most vulnerable citizens. But if we do nothing to reform and preserve Social Security and Medicare and we experience a Greek- or Spanish-style debt crisis, these programs will be slashed abruptly. The very people our colleagues say they want to protect the most will be hurt the most because the cuts will be much harsher and they will be disproportionately impacted.

One last point. By reducing the growth of Federal spending—and that is all we are talking about doing; we are not talking about cuts in the sense that anybody else in America talks about cuts; we are talking about just reducing the rate of increase in Federal spending ever so slightly—but by reducing the growth of Federal spending, we would prevent the need for tax hikes in the future. Indeed, that is what I hear from so many people in the private sector. When we ask them: Why are you sitting on the sidelines with cash in the bank, and why aren't you investing in either new physical structure or jobs, they say: Because the debt is so high and Congress has shown a lack of willingness to deal with it, all we can do is expect that taxes are going to be a whole lot higher and greater burdens placed on job creators, and so we think the more prudent thing is to sit on it and not invest it in new job creation.

But new tax hikes would increase long-term economic uncertainty, and they would discourage job creation. Conversely, if we work hard to keep taxes within reason and certainly not raise them any more than have already been raised, this would increase long-term economic certainty and encourage job creation. After all, investors and business owners and job creators are not stupid. They understand that without real spending restraint and real entitlement reform, we are ultimately headed for another massive tax increase.

Indeed, that is what this budget, voted out by our Democratic colleagues along party lines, promises: higher taxes and more spending. That is exactly what this economy does not need for us to get back on track, to create the jobs and to create the opportunities for people to provide for their families and live the American dream.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington. State.

Mrs. MURRAY. The Senator from Michigan is here. I would like to ask her how much time she would like me to yield to her.

Ms. STABENOW. I believe we have other colleagues coming as well. We were hoping to have 30 minutes and possibly more.

Mrs. MURRAY. I will yield to the Senator from Michigan and her colleagues 30 minutes. I am happy to yield more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I look forward to colleagues who will be joining me to express strong support for the budget that has been reported out of the Senate Budget Committee. I first want to thank our chair, who has done a yeoman's job in putting this together. She has had so many different assignments dealing with the budget and efforts to come to responsible reform and put our country back on the right track in order to bring down the deficit and grow the economy. One more time she has stepped up to the job. So I want to thank our chair for all of her efforts.

Let me start, first of all, by saying this is very simple when we look at what we are talking about in this budget. As I said also, I want to thank the ranking member for his courtesy throughout the budget process. While we have very different views, this was done in a very professional and courteous way on all sides. I really appreciate that.

But this is a very different view, both in what we debate and how we view this budget, which is a values document for the country, and the budget that is being debated in the House of Representatives. It comes down to something very simple. Our budget strengthens the middle class. We believe it is critically important that we grow the economy from the middle out. That means making sure folks who are struggling to stay in the middle class have a fair shot, people trying to get in the middle class have a fair shot, and that we grow the economy by understanding the economic engine of America comes from having a strong middle class.

On the other side, the Republican budget just plain simply protects the special interests, special interest deals in the Tax Code and other special interests in other kinds of policies. It is just very different and does not grow or support the middle class.

I also think it is very important that we not just talk in theory but talk about what has happened in the past and what has worked and what has not. We should do more of what works and less of what does not work. We need to start by looking at what happened as we came into 2001.

I was fortunate to be a new Member of the House of Representatives in 1997 when, under President Clinton, we all worked together and balanced the budget for the first time in 30 years.

I came to the Senate in 2001. We were debating the largest budget surplus projected in the history of the country. That is where we were. The question was, What kind of economic policies, what kinds of approaches will be put in place to be able to manage that fact, that we had the largest budget surplus projected in the history of the country?

There were two proposals put forward at that time. When you look at the way the debt was going from 2001, it is amazing. If we had only taken a different track than what happened. I remember as a new Member, a new Democrat, that our leader on our side of the aisle, Senator Conrad, came forward with a proposal that I believed was eminently reasonable. He said: Why do we not take that budget surplus and divide it into thirds: one-third of it for strategic tax cuts to grow the economy; one-third of it for strategic investments in education, science, R&D, moving the economy; and one-third to prefund the liabilities for Social Security for the next 75 years.

Imagine if we had done that. Instead, what happened was the surplus was put into a huge supply side tax cut, benefiting, as we know now, the wealthiest in the country, adding to a situation where the wealthy have gotten wealthier and wealthier in the last decade, the middle class has shrunk and shrunk, and more and more people are struggling today. So it was all put into a large tax cut, and then we proceeded to go into two wars that were not paid for, a Medicare prescription drug plan not paid for, and nothing else paid for for a decade. We ended up with the largest deficit in the history of the country. That is what this President walked into. That is what we have been faced with.

Now, when we look at where the debt has come from, and why it is important that we focus on the economy, we know the biggest piece of where the debt came from was the tax cut geared to the wealthiest Americans, which has been famously called trickle down economics. The folks in Michigan are still waiting for it to trickle down.

Then we saw the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. We are so appreciative of the President leading us out of the war in Iraq. We are closing down the war in Afghanistan. So that piece is being addressed. We have addressed the tax cuts at the end of the year, to ask those at the top to do more of their fair share. So that is being addressed. We go on down to the Recovery Act, which was so important to be able to try to focus on the middle class and get things going again. We did have some success with this. Then the other piece, the 30 percent of what is happening right now is the economic downturn.

So as we go forward today, even though we have addressed the high-end tax cuts, the wars ending, we no longer see the rescue-and-recovery measures. The economy is still 30 percent of our deficit. Frankly, we will never get out of debt with 12 million people out of work, which is why we, as Democrats, have made sure we are front and center focused on jobs and the economy in this budget.

We have to create opportunities for jobs for small businesses, for manufacturers, for the private sector, for entrepreneurs to be able to be successful so we have strong economic growth while we are putting forward a balanced budget. That is what we are attempting to do. That impacts what we do in this budget.

In fact, the efforts we put together— we know what happened when the President came in: 700,000 jobs a month being lost, the banks and financial markets in big trouble. We all know the story of what happened and what the President walked into on day one. But we have been focused on supporting an economic growth structure that would create jobs, create jobs. We are seeing that turnaround from the lost decade of jobs. We saw certainly in manufacturing huge job losses from 2001 on up to 2008. We know what happened with the automobile industry, which, by the way, because of our rescue efforts and support for them, is roaring back now and creating jobs. By the way, tremendous private sector investment is coming into the city of Detroit. The private sector is helping us turn that around. We are very proud of that. We are also seeing now jobs being created. As fast as we want? No. But we understand we have to focus on these numbers, which is creating jobs, if we are going to, in fact, get out of the deficit hole.

We have to reduce the deficit if our country is going to be more competitive, and we have to grow more jobs. We have to create opportunities for middle-class families. We know we need progrowth policies such as the ones in our budget that focus on innovation, education, rebuilding America through infrastructure, whether it is our courts, whether it is our roads or rails or water and sewer projects or what we do on technology. To compete we have to build, and we have to focus on what will create jobs.

We are now at a spot where we know if we focus, as we are in our budget, on growing the economy from the middle out rather than the top down, based on what was done in the 1990s when we did that, when we balanced the budget in the right way by investing in the future, investing in education, investing in innovation, and then also making smart cuts to balance that out, we balanced the budget. We had 22 million jobs that were created.

That is what this budget does again. It is focused on those policies that worked, not just debate back and forth in theory, but policies that actually worked in the 1990s to balance the budget, to grow the economy. We saw the policies being advocated by our friends on the other side. We did that already. We did that 2001 to 2008.

I do not know about anybody else, but I know people in Michigan do not want to relive that. That was not our idea of economic growth. It certainly did not balance the budget. It put us in the largest deficit in the history of the country.

So the budget in the House says: Boy, if you liked 2001 to 2008, you are going to love this. Two million jobs next year alone are lost in the Ryan Republican budget. And similar policies are being advocated by colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Let me just take a moment; I see my colleague, Senator REED from Rhode Island, is here, who I know wants to be a part of this and is such an important voice. But let me just say a couple of things. We understand we need to make smart spending reductions in order to balance the budget. In fact, we have already started doing that. One of the things which is so frustrating to me is to hear colleagues talk about spending cuts without acknowledging what we have done for the last 2 years. So we already know we have put ourselves on a path for $2.4 trillion in deficit reduction. And 70 percent of that has come out of services for the middle class, the most vulnerable. It has been cuts in spending for things that would actually grow the economy, innovation and research.

I am desperately concerned as chair of the Agriculture Committee because we have seen agricultural research decimated around issues of food safety and pest and disease management and other critical things, on invasive species, that we may not feel right away but are things that will affect our future. So we have already seen major cuts.

At the end of the year a small amount of money, 30 percent of the deficit reduction, was done. We have actually been asking those at the very top, who have the most benefits from the tax cuts, the most benefits from the efforts to rescue Wall Street, the most benefits in general, just to do a little bit more—30 percent of what we have already done. So what we have said is that going forward, the final amount we need to do, between the $2.4 and $4 trillion, we are insisting that be done in a balanced way and not one more time to come back on the middle class who have already had the brunt of the sacrifice, the brunt of the cuts. It is not fair.

So we have replaced across-the-board cuts. We have had colleagues in the last few days complaining about the sequester cuts. Please vote for this budget. It stops those across-the-board cuts and puts something in that is much more common sense.

Those across-the-board cuts would cut 750,000 jobs this year alone. When you add what the Ryan Republican budget would do in the House, that is another 2 million jobs next year. It is a jobs killer.

What we are saying is replace it with a responsible, balanced approach. That is what we need to do, but it does it in a way that sets priorities.

The House says spending cuts again. This is predominantly education, innovation, construction. They also include eliminating Medicare. There is no way our majority will support this policy.

There is a whole range of things that hit the middle class, seniors, veterans, and vulnerable citizens. We say our cuts will be different. We are willing to make priorities and smart cuts on the direct spending side, but there is a whole range of things we can do in the special interest deals and Tax Code for the other half.

I totally reject the idea which has been put forward here so far today that our budget somehow raises taxes on the middle class. That is absolutely false. We have report after report after report which indicate by closing loopholes which are sending jobs overseas, cutting subsidies that aren't needed anymore, such as the top five wealthiest companies in the world, the top five oil companies—there are trillions of dollars in savings. Do this by cutting things that aren't necessary and are special deals in the Tax Code. We say half of the amount needed, yes, should come from there.

On the other side of the building, what we see is a very different picture. The Ryan Republican budget, when they look at their tax cuts, 55 percent of what we are doing in tax cuts goes to the top 1 percent. I feel this is Groundhog Day over and over. It is the same thing we have heard over and over. Give it to the top, it will trickle down. We did that. It did not trickle down. At least it didn't hit Michigan.

This budget does it over and over. Two-thirds of what they do in the House goes to the top 5 percent of taxpayers. What is left for middle-class families? We say something very different to grow the economy. We say we need in a global economy to outeducate, outinnovate, and outbuild. The President has said that over and over and our budget invests in those things that allow us to compete, grow the middle class, and create jobs while doing what we need to do to make smart, commonsense decisions on spending in the Federal Government.

Here is what I am worried about. Right now, when we look at U.S. investing in research and development, compared to what is happening around the world, the greatest country in the world, the United States of America, is down. We are losing ground on investments while everybody else races to be like America—everybody else. China wants to be like us and have a middle class. They are investing in innovation. We see proposal after proposal after proposal to cut our ability to compete for the future. This is why the Senate budget prioritizes research and development by replacing the devastating across-the-board cuts with a balanced and responsible approach which preserves $10 billion in R&D funding every year and for the future.

We continue support for medical research, one of the areas where we are the leader. We strengthen the National Institutes of Health. We have increased investments in renewable energy technology. There are so many opportunities for us. I am very proud today Michigan is No. 1 in new clean energy patents, and new ideas are coming. It is part of the economic engine which is bringing jobs back to Michigan.

Investing in our 21st century manufacturing sector is also here. Senator BALDWIN put forward a proposal on manufacturing hubs which I strongly support. Other colleagues, Senator COONS and others, have supported the manufacturing extension partnership to help small manufacturers as well.

We are also investing in exports and opening markets abroad. We know when American companies are able to increase their exports by $1 billion, they create 5,000 new jobs.

In infrastructure, we need roads and bridges. The chair of our committee is a strong advocate for ports as well in the global economy, being able to export and import. That investment in rebuilding America is in this budget. The American Society of Civil Engineers just released their report card, and they gave America a D-plus. We are not going to outcompete the world with a D-plus on infrastructure.

This budget makes historic investments in our workforce. We know from hearing from CEOs that workforce development education is absolutely key to our future.

Before asking my colleague from Rhode Island to join in this discussion as well on jobs—I speak as the chair of the Agriculture Committee—I thank the chair for including in our efforts creating a 5-year farm bill, which not only participates in deficit reduction of $23 billion but is twice what we would be required to do under sequestration.

The farm bill is a jobs bill. I don't know of any other bill that has an impact on 16 million jobs in this country. The farm bill does. It supports agriculture and rural America. The farm bill is a part of this effort.

My colleague from Rhode Island is deeply involved in efforts to create jobs, balance the budget, and reduce the deficit. I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to join in a colloquy with Senator REED at this point. He has been a champion in job creation, and I am very grateful he came tonight to join us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. I want to thank the Senator from Michigan for allowing me to participate in this colloquy. I also commend her for a thoughtful, insightful, and extremely compelling argument about creating jobs as a way not only to give people a chance to rise in the middle class but also to accomplish our other objective, which is ultimately to reduce the deficit.

As the Senator pointed out, when I was here with her in the late 1990s, we reached the point where we had a projected surplus of perhaps $5 trillion over 10 years. She has catalogued the way in which that surplus has been eroded. What we need to do is focus, as she suggests, on the urgent need to create jobs and ensure our Nation's budget makes investments in growing and strengthening the middle class. We are all here as beneficiaries of the programs and policies of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, which consciously built the middle class and invested in us. Our parents invested in us. We need to do the same thing. She is absolutely correct, the investments we are proposing in this Democratic budget will be critical not only to individual success but to our success as an economy, and as a global competitor. I thank her for her words.

I am here to join her to address this pressing need to create jobs, to strengthen the economic recovery, and to underscore the vast differences between the proposal we are making, and the budget proposed by the House of Representatives, by our Republican colleagues.

Let me state what is a very disturbing figure. There are 12 million unemployed Americans, with 4.8 million of these individuals unemployed for more than 6 months. We are seeing unprecedented levels of long-term unemployment. Americans are struggling to stay in their homes, put their children through school and put food on their table.

In my State we are unfortunately among the top States in a category no one wants to be leading, and that is unemployment. The harsh reality of what we are facing in Rhode Island was brought home with a stunning article in last Sunday's Washington Post. It noted some 180,000 Rhode Islanders, over 15 percent of our population, receive SNAP benefits, supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits. Some are receiving SNAP because they don't have jobs, although they have looked from month to month to month. Some have jobs, but the pay is so little they qualify under the income limits of the SNAP program.

I want to particularly thank the Senator from Michigan for her valiant efforts to increase SNAP funding. Literally we are talking about putting food on people's tables. Fifteen percent of my State of Rhode Island depends on food support to have a healthy diet for them and particularly for their children.

When we talk about what we want to do with the budget, it is about getting people back to work. That is what they want. They don't want a SNAP benefit. They want good jobs. They want the same opportunities, from which we benefited, which helped build a strong middle class. What is their greatest fear? Not just falling out of the middle class, but that their children won't even have a remote chance of middle-class income or a middle-class lifestyle, those opportunities which we in our day took almost for granted. We must turn things around.

As the Senator pointed out, the Republican policy is focused on cutting taxes for the very wealthy. This policy has been demonstrated over the last decade to not produce good-paying jobs for middle-income Americans. However, it does produce very substantial benefits for the wealthiest of Americans.

That is not the way to grow a country. That is not what many people today and through our history have sacrificed their lives for. They are not out there serving in Afghanistan and other places so those who have much could have more. It is so those who have very little would have a chance, at least a chance. This is what we are talking about behind all the numbers. We are talking about investing in America. We need to make that investment.

The other side of the aisle indulges in what I believe is a fallacy: The only way of fixing the economy is cutting the deficit. But, instead of focusing exclusively on deficit reduction in the near term, we need to pass legislation which will put people back to work, give them a job, give them hope, and give them an opportunity, give them a sense they can make their lives and their children's lives much better.

The Democrats have proposed a series of initiatives over the last several years to do just that, such as tax incentives for small business to hire people, repairing schools, roads, bridges, or tax breaks for low- and middle-income Americans so they may have a little bit more in their paychecks. We have tried to pass these measures but have been frustrated consistently, even though we have the majority, because of filibusters and procedural delays. The American people understand that we need to create jobs. They want us to act. They want us to act to their benefit, not for the very few but for the majority of Americans.

The other approach Republicans espouse is hand-in-hand with this notion of tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans is that austerity through spending cuts can grow the economy. That you can cut programs, cut everything, and that will grow the economy.

That is not reality. What we see and what history suggests, when you are cutting during an economic recovery, you are basically counteracting the recovery. You are contracting economic expansion. You are not adding to the momentum of growth, you are subtracting from the growth.

If you want a current example, look across the ocean to Europe and Great Britain. They embarked upon an austerity program several years ago. Most commentators suggest they are in worse shape today than they were 3 or 4 years ago when they started this austerity program. This is the result of cutting, cutting, cutting. If we proceed down that pathway, we will be in worse shape several years from now than we are today. We can be in better shape by investing in our future and by creating jobs.

Another aspect of this too is it is not only the question of filibustering our proposals to create jobs—but that we know in August 2011 there was a real threat to undermine the full faith and credit of the United States, to refuse for the first time in modern history to increase the debt ceiling, to pay the debts which we owed. And the majority of those debts, at least the much of the recent ones, resulted from the previous administration. And so the debt ceiling crisis triggered the whole process which has led us today to sequestration. Now Americans will have to suffer through sequestration. The Congressional Budget Office has already said if we don't reverse sequestration, we will lose 750,000 jobs. Those are the jobs middle-income Americans are expecting and hoping for. We are losing about .6 percent of growth. We will be headed where our friends across the ocean are headed, not expanding but contracting; not increasing employment but decreasing employment. We are worse off because of these austere policies, not better off.

What the Democratic budget does—and my colleague from Michigan has outlined it very well and with great articulation, that the way you should deal with these issues is through a balanced approach—a balance of revenue and spending cuts which will not harm our economy. That is what we did in 1993 and 1994 when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. President Clinton came to us and said: Here it is, we are going to cut spending and we are going to raise revenue. And we passed it by one vote in the House, one vote in the Senate—not one Republican vote, but still by one vote here and one vote in the House of Representatives. That set the stage for the later efforts that finally led not only to a balanced budget but to a surplus, and that is the approach we have to adopt today. It's an approach that works.

The Republican budget calls for a total of $4.6 trillion in cuts and would leave the sequester in place. So it would compound the damage of the sequester. The Republican budget has also been estimated to provide millionaires an average tax cut of $400,000. Once again, the big winners in this proposal are the wealthiest Americans, not those who are struggling to put food on the table, to get a job, to see their children have a better future. And, again, the Republican budget refuses to responsibly address the $1 trillion sequester. They provide nearly $6 trillion in tax cuts that, again, overwhelmingly benefit the wealthiest Americans, but don't address the $1 trillion sequester. So essentially their budget is compounding the difficulties we have in growing this economy and creating jobs.

Ms. STABENOW. I wonder if my colleague would allow me to ask a question.

Mr. REED. I will be happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Did I hear correctly that the Republican budget would give an average of $400,000 in additional tax cuts?

Mr. REED. Those are the estimates I have received, and I believe they are reliable. Many commentators have looked at the budget and concluded that this represents a remarkable reduction in taxes for the wealthiest Americans.

And once again, it shouldn't come as a surprise because, as we recall—and I was here in 2001, when I voted against the Bush tax cuts—the mantra back then was that they are the job creators; just cut those taxes and those jobs will grow. But we saw during the Bush administration one of the poorest private job creation records of any President since World War II. And here Republicans are repeating the same line, as they say, deja vu all over again: Cut the taxes, and magically the jobs will grow. But, you grow jobs by having a balanced approach and through investment in human capital and physical capital, such as roads and bridges, and also by having the revenue to be responsible so you pay your way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. When I think of him, I think of his advocacy for our men and women who make up our troops—and I know our budget chair as well—and his strong leadership on veterans issues.

I think about $400,000 being an average tax cut for a multimillionaire under this budget versus what will happen to our veterans or folks coming home from the war and now trying to get a job, trying to do what they need to do to get back into the community and society and so on, and I wonder—the Senator has been such a leader on this and, of course, has experience with his own distinguished career in the military—if he might speak about those issues, his own experience with people coming home. Are they getting the $400,000 tax cut?

Mr. REED. Well, no. In fact, there was a front page story today, I believe, in one of the major newspapers declaring the fact that they are home from the battlefront and are now in the unemployment line. So we are seeing a remarkable number of veterans who are unemployed. And these are men and women in their twenties. They certainly want to work. They worked very hard defending this country, yet now they are coming home and have significant levels of unemployment.

That is one of the real problems, as well as our need and our obligation to support veterans health care, particularly mental health care, to support the Veterans' Administration.

The irony, of course, is that we are seeing even higher levels of unemployment, in some cases, among young veterans than we are in the population at large. That is particularly bitter and ironic for those people who have served and sacrificed and are continuing to serve and sacrifice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan should be aware that her time has expired.

Ms. STABENOW. Might I ask through the Chair if we could have a few more moments.

Mrs. MURRAY. I am happy to yield more time, and I really appreciate both Senators talking about one of the really important aspects of our budget; that is, how critical it is to invest in jobs and the economy, which the American public knows and understands are the biggest challenges facing all of us today. And you don't do that with the promise of just tax cuts for the wealthy.

We know trickle-down doesn't work. We all saw what happened from 2001 to 2008 when we gave away the tax cuts. Here we are today, now having to deal with the deficit. We all remember what happened during the Clinton administration when we had a balanced package that had both investments and responsible revenue and what happened in that decade when our economy rebounded and we got to a surplus and people felt strong again.

So that is what our budget is based upon, and I would be happy to yield additional time to both Senators to talk about this critical aspect of our budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators from Michigan and Rhode Island are recognized.

Mr. REED. Senator.

Ms. STABENOW. I would simply, first of all, again thank our chair, who understands and gets this, not only about how to grow the economy and the middle class and in a commonsense way to balance the budget, but she has been such a leader on veterans issues and reminds us every day about those coming home and what they need, as does Senator REED as well, with his own service as well as his efforts with regard to our veterans.

I would be happy to defer to Senator REED, if he has additional comments. I didn't mean to interrupt him before. If he has additional comments to make, I would certainly allow for that, and then I would be happy to wrap up at some point.

Mr. REED. I would like to reemphasize the point the Senator from Michigan has made and Senator MURRAY has made, which is that we have been down this road before. We can't simply cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans to magically create jobs. What it produced in reality was a huge deficit, along with two unfunded wars. But that seems to be the message again from the other side—let's just cut taxes and then, of course, cut spending too. That is not the balanced approach we need in the Nation. That is not the balanced approach that in the 1990s, as my colleague pointed out, got us to a surplus, got us to a sense that we were really moving forward and that the middle class had a chance, that their children would have a better life. And that is what we have to do again.

When I look at my State of Rhode Island, I can cite a myriad of examples of the harm that would be caused by the Republican budget. The budget they are proposing, which leaves the sequester in place would result in about a $4.5 million cut in Federal support for our public schools. I can tell you that every city and town in Rhode Island is struggling just to keep the lights on. If they lose $4.5 million of Federal aid, that is going to make it even harder. And do you know what happens? Well, guess what happens to property taxes. They go up. And not just Rhode Island, all across the country because one of the ironies here is that every mayor understands that ultimately they have to balance their budgets, and so they will raise taxes and they will cut spending. But they will do it, hopefully, in a balanced way, similar to what we are espousing in our approach to the budget.

Now, we also have a situation where, if we look at the Republican budget, there are all sorts of abstract cuts—nondiscretionary domestic spending, et cetera—that translates into real harm, and that affects real lives. For example, there is an estimated $3.3 trillion in cuts to programs that benefit low- and middle-income Americans. Of that $3.3 trillion, $2.6 trillion are cuts to Medicaid and subsidies that help modest-income American families across the country to get health insurance. As I mentioned before, there is a projection—and the Senator is an authorizer for this program—of $135 billion being taken out of the SNAP program.

Again, let me go back to last Sunday's Washington Post story. Fifteen percent of the people in Rhode Island depend on this to help them get just adequate nutrition including children—and we are going to cut $135 billion out of this? And on the other side of the spectrum, we are giving a $400,000 tax cut or more to the wealthiest Americans? That is not fair, and it is not good economics. We can't have a generation of children who have been deprived of good nutrition, who have been deprived of good housing; if we do, we are not going to have the productive workers who will lead this Nation forward in this century and beyond. These spending cuts and tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans just do not make any sense. It doesn't balance the books, and it doesn't keep our obligation to the majority of Americans to give them a fighting chance.

Our budget, in contrast, has $100 billion in projects to put Americans to work and repair the worst of our crumbling bridges and roads. There is not one of our colleagues who can't find some 20 or even more bridges in their State that require repair right away, and that would put hundreds of people to work productively and would increase the economic efficiency of our Nation.

Let me give an example. We had a major portion of I–95, the north-south road in Rhode Island—north-south right past Providence-Pawtucket, RI. for several years being rebuilt. The good news is that it is being rebuilt, but before we could rebuild, we had to divert truck traffic, which meant they couldn't efficiently deliver their loads. We had to station State police 24 hours a day to prevent the trucks from going there. So we had to engage all those individual law enforcement officers because the bridge couldn't support basic travel. We are now close to completing the whole project so we should no longer have to have State troopers out there 24 hours a day, and truckers no longer have to take a 20-mile detour to deliver their loads. When we talk about infrastructure, we are talking about economic efficiency as well as putting people to work. The Democratic budget does this.

I think we have also made very difficult choices—tough choices—in making sure that we are paying our way, that we are paying down the deficit and doing it in a way that doesn't cost us the recovery and creating the jobs we need right away.

I commend Chairman MURRAY because she has done a remarkable job of shepherding this bill through, of balancing so many complicated issues and making sure we have kept faith with the Americans who sent us here. They just want a chance. They just want to be able to think that their child is going to have a better life than they have had. I think this budget goes much further than our colleagues' to give them that chance, to give them that hope, and to give them that opportunity.

With that, I yield back to the Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island again for his comments, his leadership, his advocacy for our military men and women and our veterans, and for the economy, for people who need help. As he said, there are a lot of people on the edge right now trying to just hold on, to stay in the middle class, or trying to get in the middle class, and our budget is for them. It is about growing the economy from the middle out.

What makes us different from other countries around the world is that we don't have just a few very rich people and a lot of poor people. We have had a robust middle class. People in Michigan feel that eroding every day, so we need to be laser-focused on making sure we keep that strong middle class that not only grows the economy but creates opportunity for young people to grow up and go to college, to dream big dreams and know that in America they can succeed and be whatever they want to be, that they have a shot. That is the American dream, and that is what we are fighting for.

Our budget, bottom line, strengthens the middle class. It creates opportunities for people to work hard no matter where they live, what their background is, so they have a shot at making it. We believe that to our core.

The Republican budget is represented by the House budget, and the proposals here on the floor on the Republican side are geared to the wealthy and the well-connected, the special interests of this country, to keep their special deals going. Let's try trickle-down economics one more time. It didn't work from 2001 to 2008. We lost 5 million manufacturing jobs. But, hey, why not try it again? Well, we say no, let's use something that has worked.

So let me in conclusion say again that the Republican tax cuts represented by the Ryan budget—55 percent of the benefit goes to the top 1 percent. As my friend the Senator from Rhode Island indicated, those at the very, very top are getting $400,000 in a tax cut, and $400,000 is more than the vast majority of Americans and certainly the vast majority of people in Michigan make in a year. Can we afford to do that? Is that the right priority?

I find it so interesting that we had a colleague speaking passionately for the past couple of days now about his concern about closing airports in rural areas. I have those concerns about closing rural airports. Well, our budget doesn't do that. Our budget invests in infrastructure and keeps those open, as opposed to the across-the-board cuts that have been objected to by the Senators trying to make changes in the budget this year and the Ryan Republican budget in the House.

We believe strongly that we should build a budget in the future on what has worked in America, and what has worked is strengthening America with investments so we can out-educate, out-innovate and out-build to win in a global economy. That is what this is about.

Our businesses tell us they are concerned about getting the right workers for the right jobs. It is a major issue right now. That is something we have a responsibility to be a part of.

The Democratic budget invests in education, invests in innovation, and invests in building for the future. I worry every day about this kind of a chart that shows that the United States of America—not a third world country—is investing less in research and development than competitors around the world. It makes no sense. The innovations are here. The smart scientists are here. The cutting-edge technology is here. And we need to keep it here. Our budget places a huge value on it.

Then, finally, it is all about jobs and making sure when we figure out and when we look at how to balance a budget, that we understand we will never balance a budget with more than 12 million people out of work. We have to focus on jobs and growing the economy. We have to.

Thirty percent of our deficit right now as we look at this going forward is in the slow economic recovery. We know it was bad prior to 2009 when President Obama was elected. It has gotten better, but it is not where it needs to be. And it won't be where it needs to be unless we invest in innovation, in education, and rebuilding America's infrastructure. That is what we do. This budget makes sense. This budget is for middle-class families all across America.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to be with our colleague, Senator STABENOW, who serves on the Budget Committee.

Just briefly, and then I would yield to Senator ROBERTS, President Obama, on March 13 of this year, said:

> And so—you know, my goal is not to chase a balanced budget for the sake of balance.

Now, my colleagues—and we have been counting—so far have used the word ''balanced'' at least 14, maybe 15 times already. They use the word ''balance,'' but their budget comes nowhere close to balancing. It never balances. It has no potential to balance. It is focused on spending and more taxes, not balancing the budget.

Senator REID said: We want to pay down the debt. There is no plan whatsoever to get our deficit to zero so we can begin to pay down debt.

I believe Senator STABENOW used the phrase, ''a commonsense way to balance a budget.'' There is no plan to balance the budget. Let's be honest. Those words can be said repeatedly, over and over, but I really can't hear them. What I hear is the budget document itself, and it says: I am not balanced, I will never balance, and that is a fact.

It is great to have Senator ROBERTS of Kansas here, and I yield to Senator ROBERTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the fully declared champion of fiscal responsibility, defender of hard-pressed taxpayers all across the country, doing a splendid job here as a Senator who actually asked to be on the Budget Committee to try to meet these challenges, and I credit him for his leadership and example.

I rise today to speak on my Democratic colleagues' proposed budget resolution upon which they have just been waxing poetic before the Senate. I have mixed feelings about this budget. I have mixed feelings even being here on the Senate floor in that I am bereft of charts. What on Earth am I going to do making comments about this budget without the appropriate charts? Everybody has charts. Look at these stands around here.

My colleagues across the aisle—who have now left the Chamber since I began speaking—have displayed charts. I wonder if the Parliamentarian could inform this speaker if we could turn off the lights and I have a PowerPoint and a laser pointer?

I will not ask that.

But I don't have a chart. I just have some remarks that I would like to put together about the challenge we all face. I am pleased, everybody is pleased, finally, that the Senate has again, finally, taken up its constitutional responsibility to consider a budget in regular order—or at least some framework of regular order. However, I have the temerity to suggest that after 4 years, this budget resolution does not cut the spending muster and, from a constitutional responsibility, I fear it has indeed been very irresponsible.

At the same time, I look at this budget and I ask: Is this all we waited for these past 4 years? In the words of the famous song, ''Is That All There Is?'' Or better put, is this more than all there is? And it certainly is more.

There is an old saying that if you want to be remembered by your children, leave a lot of debt. Well, if this budget is passed and it sticks, then there are going to be a whole lot of people who vote yes who will certainly be remembered.

The solution was, indeed, to return to regular order, return to the regular process: Examine the President's budget, pass a budget resolution, and provide clear directives to the authorizing and appropriations committees to develop legislation to reflect the tough decisions made in the budget. A lot of words. None of it is very easy, but that is called regular order. That is what we should have been doing the last 4 years. We have not been doing that. We haven't been doing that at all.

Everybody knows the process around here. What happens is we have a major bill to do, we have our obligations to do, we have our constitutional responsibilities to do. We try that. We ask for amendments; we don't get amendments. We file cloture, they don't get 60 votes, and the bill fails. Or we have a continuing resolution, some giant body of legislation that is the worst way to do business—or a sequester, the same kind of thing. And people back home scratch their heads. People on that side of the aisle perhaps have an issue—not a bill, but they might have an issue. Then the blame game starts. I think the American people are tired of it.

None of it is easy. I understand that. But it works much better, much better than lurching from crisis to crisis as we have done and experienced in the last 4 years.

So I am pleased that we are slowly returning to some aspects of regular order, but I remain deeply concerned about the daunting fiscal challenges we face and the fact that we are not answering these challenges. The Federal balance sheet is now truly frightening.

Today, almost 1,500 days since we last considered a budget resolution on this Senate floor, we are fast approaching $17 trillion in debt—and beyond. It is climbing. Our per-person share of that debt is now more than $53,000. This is why I am so frustrated, and many of our colleagues are frustrated and disappointed by the budget resolution we are about to consider.

Yes, again, we have brought this resolution through regular order. I appreciate that. But the recommendations fail. They fail to begin to meaningfully address the key fiscal issues that we are all generally agreed are sustainable.

I don't have a chart, but I think people can understand this. The numbers are startling.

Since 2009 we have added nearly $6 trillion to the national debt. Under the proposed budget resolution, despite a massive new tax hike proposal, new debt will rise—since I don't have a chart, just sort of imagine it here—$7 trillion over 10 years. I hasten to add, that is on a projection by the Congressional Budget Office, and I think it is probably low.

Spending will increase another $645 billion above the projected growth over 10 years, including $162 billion in the next year alone.

The deficit will increase in the next fiscal year by $95 billion above current forecasts.

I could have a chart with a big zero on it. It is not a soft drink. This is something pretty serious. Zero. That is right, zero—zero real deficit reduction through spending reductions. It would never and doesn't pretend to try to balance the budget—precisely what the Senator from Alabama has been pointing out. In my view, this resolution would further damage our fiscal condition over the long haul, exactly what we don't want to do.

We do not want to kick the can down the road any further. We can't do it. We have reached that point of no return. And here is the kicker for me. The budget resolution includes a proposed $1.5 trillion in new taxes. That is on top of the $600 billion tax hike that was just enacted in January. This would include a $923 billion reconciliation instruction to the Finance Committee. I am a member of that very prestigious committee. I look forward to trying to achieve tax reform, but I worry about a $923 billion reconciliation despite the negative impact this would have on critically needed progrowth tax reform.

The budget also includes about $500 billion in unspecified loophole closers to increase spending on infrastructure and to replace the current sequester.

Loopholes. Loophole closures. Boy, is that in the eyes of the beholder. I am concerned about it. No doubt the Gatling gun kind of criticisms we heard in the past campaign, singling out tax reform targets—and I always want to add, you always want to worry about what lurks under the banner of reform of whatever banner someone is waving.

Time after time I heard the President talk about fat cat corporate jets. Boy, am I tired of hearing about that. That is business aviation. That is 1 million jobs. That is a great number of aircraft that is adding to our exports. The President has said: Let's double our exports, and still we hear this pejorative of fat cat corporate jets. Also, oil and gas subsidies, two major industries of Kansas, even those are critical, successful industries with all the hallmarks we should want in an industry—good, high-tech paying jobs.

Sure I am for tax reform, and sure I want to reach the specified numbers that we could all agree on—if we could all agree on a specified number. But policy counts, and you don't want to do anything terribly counterproductive. The call for a gigantic tax hike to pay for more spending is misguided and will harm our chances for tax reform. It will do little to place our budget on any sustainable path. Not only that, this budget is a job killer.

The Tax Foundation analysis I just read today indicates the legislation in its current form will result in the loss of 800,000 jobs over 10 years. It is a job killer.

Why on Earth would we be considering a budget resolution that will result in the loss of 800,000 jobs? In Kansas, that hit would be about 10,000 jobs. That is low. I have no doubt this number understates that problem.

We all know the time is long past for us to reform our overly complex, costly, anticompetitive tax system. That is a given. We know that. I might add that the Finance Committee, under the chairmanship of MAX BAUCUS and the ranking member's leadership, ORRIN HATCH—all of us on the Finance Committee have been meeting as Republicans and Democrats together. We can do this job. Give us 6 months to do it right. Give us a flashing light at the end of the room saying ''Do No Harm,'' and we can get this done.

The current system is a drain on individual and business resources. It is one of the main causes of our sluggish economic growth.

We need to put in place a Tax Code for the 21st century, one that recognizes the nature of the international trade system in which we compete—and there is competition—and one that recognizes the changes to our domestic business environment. We also need to lower corporate rates so the United States no longer has the highest rate in the developed world.

It is critical that Congress encourage economic growth and private sector job creation by putting in place a tax system that is simpler and fairer to all taxpayers, a tax system that doesn't change every year or two, one that provides certainty. We need to provide certainty by establishing a permanent

Tax Code that will allow families to plan for their future and give businesses the confidence to expand and create jobs.

Adopting a fair and simple tax system that lowers marginal rates, encourages economic growth, promotes our competitiveness, and eases compliance—read regulatory reform, read a Katrina of regulations that now affects virtually every business endeavor in the country, read all that—that is the most powerful step we can take to improve our economy.

While I support considering a budget through regular order—thank goodness we are finally achieving that—we are presented with a profoundly disappointing document, a budget that includes a massive job-killing tax increase, increases spending, raises the deficit and debt, and all but kills prospects for tax reform—just what the doctor did not order.

After 4 years of deliberate inaction, my colleagues and I had hoped for better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator from Kansas. He is an excellent member of the Finance Committee and he is experienced on these issues. I appreciate his insight. I would like to ask him a question.

He has noted this budget never ever balances. It doesn't come close to balancing. It has no intention of balancing. But we have been counting, I say to Senator ROBERTS, and our Democratic colleagues who have been promoting this budget have, I said earlier, about 14 times used the word ''balanced.'' Actually, already tonight they have used the word ''balanced'' 23 times in reference to a budget that never balances and never intends to balance.

I wonder if you thought that might reflect a guilty conscience on the part of those promoting this budget?

I am glad you will not be arrested for that device on the floor.

But I think it is pretty sad that we have such a use of that word.

Mr. ROBERTS. Let me say, if I might, and I appreciate the question and I have talked to the Parliamentarian, when people inadvertently leave their cell phones on, but the call is from their wife, that is all right.

At any rate, balance? If I heard it once, I heard it at least 10 or 15 times since I have been here and the distinguished Senator from Alabama has been here. Balance—it never balances in regard to the goal of actually balance the budget. We are talking about balance. But we are actually talking about redistribution. We are talking about balance, but what we are actually talking about is a certain kind of class warfare. When we are talking about balance, we are talking about means testing. We are talking about somebody in Washington on this floor defining who is rich or who is not or who is just a little better off—maybe $250,000, maybe $200,000. Guess what. These taxes are going to hit the middle class, and they do not think it is balanced. I don't think it is balanced, and I think it is out of whack.

If you are going to get something in balance, you ought to take a look to see can we get the budget of the United States headed toward balance and not use ''balance'' as a synonym for the proposed goals of social reform or whatever it is that you would like to accomplish under the banner of tax reform.

We should use tax reform for taxes, not for any political purpose or favoring one particular segment of the industry over another or, for that matter, Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, food stamps, et cetera. Everything has to be considered, but everything has to be considered under the auspices of when are we going to live within our means? When are we going to achieve spending reductions, quit overtaxing people, try to spur job growth? That budget resolution they are talking about on that side of the aisle—and I know they are very sincere, apparently, in their belief—doesn't feed the bulldog. It doesn't answer the problem.

I got a little excited about that, but I think I am due that in regard to all the rhetoric we have heard from the other side. I appreciate the Senator's question.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator. I note again the President said to George Stephanopoulos, live, on March 13, ''And, so—you know, my goal is not to chase—a balanced budget just for the sake of balance.''

I am also pleased the distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee, senior, actually, member of the Budget Committee on the Republican side, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, who has been involved in these issues for many years and been a leader for many years, is with us.

I yield to Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I say to Senator SESSIONS, the distinguished ranking member, I am going to try to show him and other Members of the Senate that the numbers that they think they can raise revenue from, to $1 trillion, are not going to work. We can take different taxes and add them up and up and it will come out to $1 trillion. But I am going to show him, based upon votes that have been taken on the other side of the aisle, that it is not politically possible for them to do it unless they are willing to vote differently than they have ever voted before because they have to take on some of the most popular tax credits that are in the Tax Code. That is what I am going to do in the few minutes the Senator has devoted to me.

MR. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator and ask him to take as much time as he chooses. But I note, as ranking member on the Finance Committee and having been on it and having dealt with these issues for many years, the Senator knows what the political situation is and he has the staff to help him ascertain the correct numbers. I think this will be an important bit of information to share with us, and I look forward to it.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, over the 10 years that I was chairman or ranking member of the Finance Committee, I worked with several Budget Committee chairmen. They were Senator Domenici, Senator Nickles, Senator Gregg, Senator Conrad. We did not always agree on every issue, but by and large there was coordination between the Budget Committee and the Finance Committee. Basically, I had past chairmen, Republican or Democratic, come to me and say: Tell us what you can do or not do within the Finance Committee so we do not give you an impossible task when a budget resolution is adopted by the Senate. It worked very well because they respected the institutionalized knowledge within the staff of the Senate Finance Committee, both Republican and Democratic staffs, as well as the more important institutionalized information that comes from the Joint Committee on Taxation.

As I said, we did not always agree on every issue, but by and large there was that coordination. Unfortunately, the coordination receded somewhat, starting somewhat in the year 2007. Since 2010, we fell into this 4-year pattern of not even having a budget debate in the Senate, even though the law requires that the Senate adopt a budget every year.

Finally, getting back to abiding by the law—coordination provided the means then between the budget and Finance Committee that allowed the Finance Committee to realistically address the demands of the tax, trade, health and welfare policies that were intended by a budget resolution. This usually happened in a bipartisan way, but this year is different. This budget resolution does not realistically address the needs or the capabilities of the Finance Committee. By capabilities, I don't mean it is not there to get it done and people are willing to do it, but the possibility of doing it is very remote based upon the unrealistic assumptions in this document.

Despite claims to the contrary, this budget is not balanced unless one believes balance is more of the same fiscal behavior of the last 4 years of the Senate Democratic leadership fiscal policy. That policy has resulted in higher taxes, higher spending, and yet higher debt. Where there is fiscal pressure, it is placed on the Finance Committee by this document now before the Senate. The Finance Committee is called upon to do all the heavy lifting.

The principal lift is in the heavy tax increases. The Finance Committee has reconciled under this document with an almost $1 trillion tax increase. Reserve funds, in addition to that $1 trillion, reserve funds anticipate another $500 billion in tax hikes to pay for even more spending.

The task put on the Finance Committee is described as curtailing or eliminating what is called ''spending through the Tax Code,'' and ''loopholes.'' But if we look at the document, and particularly if we look at recent history, we will find a different story that says what they assume is not very realistic.

We will find tax increases. I wish to explain that. But first I will account for revenue raisers the majority party has specified and supported with votes in this Congress and the last one. What those votes show, unless there is a big change of heart on the other side of the aisle, is there is not going to be that revenue ever raised. So that makes the document on the other side, if it is not possible, blue smoke and great hope and good luck.

What this is going to tell us is that the unspecified and undefined tax increases the budget resolution is seeking, once we have the undefined tax increases—I am going to then define that. I will define it by taking the universe of tax base broadeners and working through the list to explain to all the unreality. I will be able to show one of two conclusions. The first conclusion I can show, the math doesn't work and there are not sufficient revenue raisers to fill the revenue goal of my friends on the other side of the aisle or, No. 2, the budget resolution would need to go much further down the income scale and do what we just heard Senator ROBERTS say, start taxing middle-income taxpayers. But it is going to be hard to get them to admit that on the other side because all we have to do is tax the wealthy 1 percent and we can solve all our problems.

But we cannot only tax that 1 percent. We could confiscate—not tax but confiscate the income over $200,000 and we are going to run the Government for just a very few months. But people tend to believe that. It is very difficult to preach the other side, how unrealistic it is, but that is a fact.

All of us should take a careful look at the claims of the Democratic leadership and see how the claims stack up to the cold, hard numbers that I will give you and the analysis by the tax-writing committee staff. So let's turn to those numbers. Over the 10-year budget window going out to the year 2023, the budget resolution demands revenue and related outlay savings of $975 billion. There are two reserve funds, as I already said, that total up to about $580 billion in tax increases if that is taxed. And around here, with the ability—the willingness—to spend what they want to spend, they wouldn't mind tapping it, but I think that is unrealistic as well.

I am going to show my colleagues this chart. The first chart is a water well. Here is the top of the well, and we can see it is a long well to the bottom, and there is a little bit of water in the bottom. But most of the well from this point to the top is dry right now, and that is what they have to fill by their budget resolution.

At the top of the well we will see this number, $1.503 trillion, plus money to raise money for the reserve fund. That is what it takes to go from here to here to fill it.

If we want to put this another way, this budget puts the burden on the Finance Committee to come up with $1.5 trillion in offsets over the next 10 years. This budget assumes the well of revenue raisers is full to the brim, but they are starting out at this point.

My colleagues know I am a farmer. I should say my son is a farmer; I am kind of like a hired man now. I think that gives me something to know about wells and the predictability of well water. We on the farm always hope we will get rain, and particularly now, as it is dry in the middle west. So now we get a decent level of water so we can fill up the well to the top so we have plenty of reserve.

As a former chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee, I think I can tell my colleagues something about revenue raisers. In the positions I held on the Finance Committee, I led efforts to identify and enact sensible revenue raisers aimed at closing the tax gap and shutting down tax shelters. And as a senior tax-writing committee member, I continued to look for ways to shut off the unintended tax benefits.

Given this experience, I know what is realistic when it comes to revenue raisers. From 2001 through 2006, Congress enacted over 100 offsets with a combined total of not necessarily a lot of money but still a lot of money compared to this stuff we are talking about here, but it still scored for $1.7 billion over 1 year; over 5 years, $51.5 billion; and over 10 years, $157.9 billion. That is from about 100 offsets.

What other revenue raisers have been identified and scored? The President's last budget, the one we got in February of 2012—and they are supposed to be out every February and we are not going to get it until April 8 now; why I don't know—but the President's budget in 2012 contained a package of a lot of revenue that the Joint Committee on Taxation said would raise $1.4 trillion over 10 years.

The majority party has largely left these revenue-raising proposals untouched over the last 4 years. So if we have a Democratic President of the United States suggesting $1.4 trillion of revenue in his budget, as the suggestion from the White House, and the other side here in the Senate wants to raise a tremendous amount of revenue and they haven't touched it in the last 4 years, what makes us think they are going to touch it now? Is it realistic to think all of these taxes will be raised if even the Democratic President asks for it and his friends on the other side of the aisle—our friends as well—ignored it?

The majority party has, however, identified and specified and voted for tax hikes that amount to $108.3 billion. That is $108.3 billion of identified and scored revenue raisers. That is only about 7.8 percent of the amount that is needed to make this budget work. So we see how unrealistic this budget resolution is.

Based on these facts, what is the likelihood the Finance Committee will be able to come up with revenue raisers of this magnitude? In my view, from my 10 years as chairman and ranking member, that chance is not very high. If that is the case, then what will happen? The revenue side of the budget will be ignored, but the spending side will be followed. The net effect will be a massive tax increase, a bigger deficit, or both.

Now back to the chart. So the revenue-raising well is about 7.8 percent full. We have heard a lot about tax expenditures. As I have said before, the people have been told there are trillions of dollars of spending through the Tax Code. I am going to look at the individual income tax expenditures because the administration and the Democratic leadership have said they want to leave the corporate tax expenditures for lowering rates.

Here is a little irony. The Congressional Budget Act defines refundable tax credits as spending. It makes all the sense in the world because the tax benefits go to individuals who don't pay income tax. These credits are actually paid out in the form of a check in excess of any income tax liability of that individual. However, we won't hear the majority advocate reducing, let alone eliminating, any of those refundable tax credits. In fact, the majority's budget would increase them further. They represent even more significant tax expenditures.

I have another chart here based on the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation data. Here are 10 tax expenditures. The chart shows the top 10 individual income tax expenditures from this year, 2013, through the year 2017. These top 10 expenditures represent 70 percent of the total individual tax expenditures.

No. 7 is the earned income tax credit. That is a refundable tax credit designed for low-income taxpayers.

No. 8 on the list—I won't bother to point to it—is the premium tax credit enacted by ObamaCare. By 2017, this credit will actually make its way into the top five. Like the earned income tax credit, the premium credit is fully refundable.

No. 9 on the chart is the child tax credit which is partially refundable.

For each of these credits, more than half of the value of the benefit is paid out in the form of a government check exceeding tax liabilities. That is direct spending through the Tax Code. Yet these credits are considered off limits by the majority.

So let's take a look at the tax expenditure No. 1. That is the tax-free treatment of employer-provided health care. Americans can look forward to $1 trillion of health care-related taxes coming due over the next 10 years. All of this tax increase is thanks to 21 tax increases contained in ObamaCare. My guess is the majority doesn't want to take on that group.

So No. 2 is tax-deferred retirement savings plans. It is defined benefit plans and section 401(k)-type plans. To be sure, some higher income taxpayers benefit. Defined benefit plans tend to dominate in the unionized world. Section 401(k)-type plans are more common now. Some high-income taxpayers do, in fact, benefit because they are owners of a business and we want them to set up and maintain the plans. About 4 percent of this tax expenditure goes to taxpayers at $1 million or more of income.

No. 3 on the list is the preferential rate for capital gains and dividends. It is true that higher income taxpayers tend to have more capital gains. But a few months ago the rate rose 59 percent with the ObamaCare and fiscal cliff deal tax hikes kicking in. Do we want to choke off more savings and investment?

No. 4 is the deduction for State and local income and real property taxes. The New York Times editorial page is usually very in tune with the majority. An editorial on December 6, 2012, has a title that says it all: ''Keep The State Tax Deduction.'' My guess is that with the heavy hit on heavily taxed blue State taxpayers, the majority will not want to visit that deduction.

No. 5 concerns the American dream of home ownership. It is the home mortgage interest deduction. It disproportionately goes to the middle-income taxpayer. Do we really want to tank the tepid housing recovery now underway?

So look at No. 6. It is the tax benefit from the Medicare benefits the Federal Government pays. We have heard a lot about the Medicare reforms contained in the Ryan budget from the majority. Does the majority want to cut the value of Medicare benefits by taxing them?

I have already discussed Nos. 7, 8, and 9 on the chart which are all refundable credits. They are the earned income tax credit, the premium tax credit, and the child tax credit. Significantly, the premium tax credit makes the list while only being in effect 4 out of the 5 years we have examined.

So how about the last one then, No. 10? It refers to the step-up in basis that occurs on death time transfers. Higher end taxpayers tend to pay the estate tax when they die. This policy ensures they don't pay a double tax on the transfer. Does the majority really want to reopen the estate tax debate that we all thought just ended on January 1?

If we were to expand on this list and look at the top 20 expenditures instead of just the top 10, we would account for 90 percent of the individual tax expenditures. They include such things as charitable deductions, tax incentives for college, and the exclusion of capital gains from the sale of a home. Does the majority want to raise taxes on the backs of college students or cause heartburn for middle-income homeowners when they sell their home?

Well, let's take a step back for a minute. Where does the budget take us? The terms of the budget documents tell us the majority Members say they want to eliminate or curtail spending through the Tax Code—$1 trillion plus another $500 billion if they decide how to spend it. Yet they themselves would vehemently oppose eliminating or reducing tax expenditures that are defined by our budget laws as spending.

I challenge the budget authors to tell me which tax benefits they want to curtail. Do they want to cut back the tax treatment of employer-provided health insurance? Do they want to cut back defined benefit plans or 401(k) plans? Do they want to increase capital gains and dividend rates even further than the 59 percent? Do they want to cut back on the State and local tax deduction? Do they want to cut back on the mortgage interest deduction? Do they want to tax Medicare benefits? Do they want to raise the tax level on death time transfers?

Well, I conclude: This budget represents a dramatic step backward for the American taxpayer. For the first time in 4 years, thank God, we are debating a budget. Yet it repeats the same fiscal pattern of the first term of this Presidency. It spends too much, it taxes too much, and it results in too much new debt.

As former chairman and ranking member—and I suppose this is the fourth or fifth time I have said this, so people get tired of me saying it—but in that former position, I am sorry to say the experience I have had is that this budget doesn't even attempt to match the demands of the Finance Committee with the numbers in this budget.

I hope deficit hawks on both sides of the aisle pay close attention. The only thing certain here is that new spending will occur.

The deficit impact of not realistically dealing with the tax, trade, and health policy spending priorities of the Finance Committee disguises the deficit built into this budget.

I have many other concerns about the budget proposed by the majority. Simply, today, I wanted to let the Senate know how the numbers on the revenue side do not work from the standpoint of the usual stands that people take on closing loopholes and not closing loopholes and based upon what is politically feasible out of the Finance Committee.

As we take up amendments, I am hopeful we can make the budget mesh with the Finance Committee's policy demands.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee. That was a very fine presentation. I believe he is absolutely accurate. It is easy to say we are going to close loopholes and we are going to raise a trillion dollars-plus from closing loopholes. But the Senator just showed, based on the votes of our Democratic colleagues, and others too that it is much harder to harvest money from legitimate tax deductions and credits than a lot of people think.

Would that be fair to say?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Absolutely. And based upon the experience we have had of actually voting on those issues in the past—or the fact that I stated how the President put certain things in his budget of February 2012, and none of those ideas have ever been brought up by the majority party in the period of time they have been before them. So if their own President—when I say their own President, the President of their party—our President proposes that they raise revenue from those places, and they do not do it, it signals to me it is a pretty difficult job to do, and it is not going to be any easier this year than in past years.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Senator GRASSLEY so much for his insight on that.

We also have Senator ENZI here, who is a member of the Finance Committee, and is a senior member of the Budget Committee also. He understands these issues deeply.

I yield to Senator ENZI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to share with the American public exactly what they are getting with the majority's budget for the coming year. I will be blunt. It is not good news. In fact, after 4 years of not bringing up a budget for consideration by the Senate, what the majority has offered is a severe disappointment. We have to grow the economy, not the government. But, unfortunately, the majority's budget focuses on growing the government—more taxing, more spending, more government.

During our last break, I had an opportunity to travel around Wyoming. I did about 2,000 miles, and I did a bunch of listening sessions. That is where I just take notes while people tell me what is on their mind. They are not going to be pleased with this budget. In fact, they think the best way to grow jobs is to cut government. And they were very adamant on making sure the sequester happened, which would be the first real cut in government we have had in forever. They recognize that what we usually call a cut is when an agency asks for a billion dollars, and they only get a half a billion dollars in new money. They call that a half billion dollar cut. It is not a cut, it is an increase of half a billion dollars. But around here that would be a cut. So we do not really do cuts. Sometimes we slow the growth of government, but we do not do cuts.

They actually want to see some action to cut, to balance the budget, and eventually to pay down the debt. They recognize that if interest rates go up, $16 trillion is going to be tough to pay the interest on, let alone pay back any principal, let alone do any other function of government.

So this is a budget that looks out over the next 10 years. It provides for significant tax increases, upwards of $1.5 trillion. But it also provides for significant spending increases. It is not as though we are increasing the revenue so that we could decrease the deficit and eventually decrease the debt. It is so we can add to spending—$162 billion next year alone. It provides for spending increases of 62 percent from today's budget levels.

Any savings are being claimed after the first year—after the first year. We never get to the second year, so the savings never make it—never pan out. It reminds me of a sign I saw on a restaurant. It said: Free drinks tomorrow. Of course, if you came in tomorrow, they said: No, no. Read the sign. It says: Free drinks tomorrow. That is the way we budget around here. We are always promising these things, but the real things do not happen.

Our problem is not that we tax too little but that we spend too much. A budget should serve as the blueprint to get the revenues and the spending aligned. Individuals have budgets. That is what they do. They see how much revenue they have coming in, and they see how much they can spend. They do not see how much they can spend and then see what the revenue is going to be. You cannot live in that kind of a world, but we do here.

Unfortunately, the majority's budget fails miserably in that respect. In fact, it does not balance the budget in any year over the next 10 years. The budget that was offered by the House Republicans, on the other hand, balances the budget in 2023. And, of course, the other side of the aisle talks about what a terrible budget that is. But they got it to balance. They have even introduced and passed budgets in the House for the last several years, and that takes a lot of courage when you know all that is going to happen over in this body is for it to get shot down by the majority. But those budgets have gotten some votes in favor of them.

The President has presented some budgets. The last 2 years, he has not gotten a single vote for his budget. I mean, he was not able to talk a single Democrat into voting for his budget—not one—let alone a Republican.

So the budget that was offered by the House Republicans balances in 2023. I have introduced a bill. It is called the Penny Plan. That cuts spending by 1 percent from every dollar for each of the next 3 years. If we could do that—true cuts—1 percent for each of the next 3 years, the budget would balance in 2016. I really think that is where we need to be—not 2023—2016. And, hopefully, we would not stop the cuts of 1 cent for every dollar. Families across America are having to cut more than that.

When I present this in Wyoming and other places, they say: Well, my wife just got laid off. We had to do a 20-percent cut, so why can't the Federal Government do a 1-penny-out-of-every-dollar cut? That would balance it by 2016. If we kept it going a little more, we would actually be paying down the debt—not just reducing the deficit but paying down the debt.

Our Nation owes $16 trillion, and no one is talking about reducing it. We have to get to balance—the sooner the better—and start paying down the debt. And do not get confused by the language the majority will use. They will say that their budget takes a ''balanced approach.'' But it does not balance. There is a big difference. ''Balanced approach'' to them means ''fair'' tax increases. I am not sure what that means, but that is what they mean by ''balance.'' And it is tax and spend, it is increasing deficits, and increasing debt as far as the eye can see. This is not the plan America needs to get its fiscal house in order. Next year alone, the majority wants to increase spending by nearly $162 billion, and the deficit next year is anticipated to be $152 billion above current projections. Over the next 10 years, deficits are expected to total $5.2 trillion. If we adopt the majority's budget, that is $5.2 trillion in addition to the $16 trillion we already owe. That is not balancing the budget. That is not a balanced approach.

None of this spending is associated with any kind of reforms to the drivers of our out-of-control deficits and debt that will bankrupt—bankrupt—Social Security and Medicare. The majority's budget provides no path to save Social Security and Medicare. They are hoping the Republicans will do that and take all the flak that is involved for it. Well, if we do it soon enough, there is not as much flak as if we do it later.

It has been a shame that we have been years without a budget, and when the majority finally gets around to doing it they do not even address the biggest driver.

Earlier this evening, the majority leader commented that we can learn from the bipartisanship shown by Senators MIKULSKI and SHELBY on their work on the bill that will fund the government for the rest of the year. I think it was a massive opportunity and expenditure of effort that they did. But what I want to point out is that they had the opportunity to work things out together—together. That is bipartisan. That means sitting down together and figuring out what both sides think are the priorities, and seeing if there is not some way to put those into a single budget. I know it has not been done in years, but it is something I imagine America dreams about. I wish the majority would have provided that same opportunity in the Budget Committee. Maybe then the majority would have brought a bipartisan budget to the Senate floor. This does not have to be a shooting match. It can be a realization of a way to match spending with the revenues we have.

I was disheartened last week when I finally received the majority's budget to see that it simply continues the mantra of ''tax and spend.'' We cannot tax the American people every time Congress screws up, every time we overspend. And there are a lot of ways we do overspend.

One of the favorite things around here is to propose a grand new idea, and since that grand new idea would have a huge pricetag on it, we reduce it by saying: We will just make it a demonstration project. We will just do it in five States to start with, with a very minimal budget, and that will prove the value of this project. And practically every one shows they are a valuable project.

Well, at that point the local governments or the States are supposed to take them over and sell it to the rest of the country so that everybody winds up with this tremendous project. That is not what happens. They come back the next year and they say: This worked phenomenally, so we need to expand it to all 50 States because everybody deserves a great program such as this.

Well, we increased it from 5 to 50, so we increased it tenfold, at least. And chances are pretty good that some of those projects are done in small States. So when you put them into big States, they are an even bigger blowup of the budget. That is the way we bust the budget around here—just one of many ways.

Rather than looking for waste and abuse and duplication in government spending—and we know there is some—the majority simply decided to ask the hard-working American public to send in more of their hard-earned dollars to Washington to pay for more spending. These tax increases the majority calls for will hit the middle class. They say it will not hit the middle class. But we did some of the rich, and I noticed, in the alternative minimum tax—that is a great phrase. That sounds like everybody ought to be paying tax, and that is kind of an American principle, but it is not something that happens around here. Over 50 percent of the people do not pay any tax now. But we had this alternative minimum tax so that the rich would pay more. Well, inflation changed it so that 34 million Americans are being hit by that in the middle class. Consequently, we changed it. That is what we do when we try and mess around with classes of people.

To my constituents back home in Wyoming and fellow citizens across the country, let me be clear: It is your money, not the government's money. That is what they were telling me as I traveled around Wyoming for 2,000 miles and did my listening sessions.

They say it is our money. As legislators, we have to do a better job of taking care of the funds they provide us and ensuring that it is spent wisely.

The majority thinks it knows best how to spend the money the American people work hard to make. The budget they have offered seeks more than $1 trillion—let me repeat that: more than $1 trillion—in new taxes over the next 10 years. And debt will still grow by $7 trillion. That would be $23 trillion. That is a lot to pay interest on. Take and figure that out, if you can, with all those zeros that are out there, how much money that amounts to—at some moderate rate, say, 5 percent, because that is what it is anticipated to grow to in that same amount of time. And I think it could go well higher than that. Because if the rest of the world that is loaning us 40 percent of our money decides we are not the best place to put that money, the interest rates will have to go up dramatically in order to encourage the kind of money to keep borrowing $23 trillion—or $16 trillion; that is, if we can balance the budget quickly. In fact, the majority wants to set up a fast-track legislative process to get $975 billion from you as quickly as possible.

Now, we had the discussion earlier about taxes. We thought we had worked the tax problem for everybody and preserved people's taxes for 99 percent of the people. We thought there were going to be some spending cuts coming. Somebody sent me this little chart that I have to share.

This says ''Republican'' on it: OK. I will raise taxes if you promise to cut spending.

Well, Lucy says: It is a deal.

But we have been watching this cartoon for years and years. We know what happens. When we go to pick up the spending cuts, the football suddenly gets lifted out of the way and we end up on our back, the American public winds up on its back. Those are not the kinds of spending cuts we are looking for. We are looking for some real spending cuts, not just a decrease in the growth but some real spending cuts. There is a way to do those.

Wyoming has been faced with probably an 8-percent reduction in its income. How did they handle it? The Governor saw that coming, got a hold of every department and program and said: I need a plan from you for how you would cut 2 percent, how you would cut 4 percent, how you would cut 6 percent, and how you would cut 8 percent. When he got the four plans from every department, he took a look at them to see if they were cutting the worst first—you know, reducing the pain as much as possible. It worked that way. There was hardly a whimper and hardly anything noticeable to the customer; that is, the people who live in Wyoming. That is good management, not an e-mail that goes out that says: Make the cut as painful as possible. That is the sequester we are going through now. That should never happen in any kind of a managed business or a managed government. I guess that would be saying it is not a managed government.

When we took up the budget in committee last week, I offered an amendment to strike the language that provided for the fast-track tax increase process. My amendment was meant to ensure that the tax reform would be conducted in a bipartisan manner, to generate a more efficient, fairer, and simpler Tax Code and spur economic growth rather than raise revenues through legislation that can be passed with a simple majority here in the Senate.

A simple-majority vote would ensure that the minority party's views would receive little, if any, consideration. We would have no input. Debate time and the number of amendments that could be offered to improve the legislation would also be limited. We need to have an open process where all Members can have their voices heard. We simply need to stop dealmaking and start legislating.

We have had the system around here for a while where we work from contrived crises that have very specific dates at which the sky falls and the United States is demolished. Of course, that does generate a lot of publicity and all the media and everything leading up to that crunch. A group goes off and makes a deal. We find out about that deal in the last hour. Our choice at that point is take it or leave it. Well, if the sky is going to fall and America is going to be destroyed, what is the choice?

That is not the way to do it. We have to quit dealmaking and start legislating. The way you legislate is to have the chairman and the ranking member and other interested people on the committee who have a very specific interest in an issue sit down together and see if they cannot work out a basic package. It only has to be a basic package. It does not have to be a comprehensive package. This basic package would then go to committee. That is where the people can turn in amendments and improve it from their viewpoint.

The reason we have so many people in the Senate and in the House is so that we can see as many unintended consequences as possible. But if it does not go through committee, we have turned those people off. We have said: Your views do not count; your amendments do not count. Consequently, we do not end up with a good piece of legislation coming out of committee. If you get it out of committee in good shape, you can get it to the floor in good shape. If you get it to the floor in good shape, you can take additional amendments and improve it maybe more. That has been my experience with this. Yes, there have to be some tough votes with that. That is what we do. That is what we get paid for—legislating, voting.

We have spent the last week working on a continuing resolution. We got to vote three times. There were only requests for 11 more votes. We did not get to vote on those until tonight. So they had it arranged in a very fast process. Some of the people did not actually get their say.

We have to stop dealmaking and start legislating, particularly on big and important issues such as tax reform. We have to get back to a regular process so all Members can give input and improve the legislation.

Senator Gregg and Senator WYDEN worked on income taxes for a long time. Then Senator COATS and Senator WYDEN worked on income taxes for a long time. Now I am working with Senator WYDEN and Senator COATS on income taxes. I think we can come up with something that will work. We can do both the individual and the corporate tax rates at the same time because they are very interrelated. We would not have that big of a tax code if it were not for all of the interrelationships. It is time that we made it simpler and fairer. It can be done, but it is not going to be done on a partisan basis in a very short period of time and get it right. So we have to get back to that regular process so all Members can give input and improve the legislation.

Unfortunately, my amendment was defeated. Every Member of the majority voted against it. But I will try here again on the Senate floor. Senator GRASSLEY, who was a former chairman of the Finance Committee, and I have come together. We will offer an amendment to get rid of the fast-track process and provide for progrowth, revenue-neutral tax reform for corporate, business, and individual taxes.

I have a few other amendments I plan on filing as well to improve this budget. One would provide for a phase-in or transition for any changes to the Tax Code so that people and businesses can plan accordingly and we do not inadvertently put companies out of business or add people to the unemployment rolls.

Another amendment would require that each Federal agency identify and prioritize its programs, its projects, its activities so that they can cut the worst first, as I mentioned in the Wyoming example. That way we get what is the least harmful and least painful. There would be spending reductions. We might even get into duplication between agencies.

Senator COBURN and I did a little study of the health, education, labor, and pension programs. We found there was $9 billion—$9 billion of duplication. You cannot get rid of all of that, but you ought to be able to get rid of half of it. Well, Senator COBURN got so enthused by it that he went and took a look at the rest of government. He found $900 billion a year in duplication. Now, how is that possible? Well, my jurisdiction was rather limited, but what I have jurisdiction over is duplicated in almost every way. Almost every department, agency, and program has something to do with financial literacy. Based on our budget process, I would say that is probably failing. Maybe we ought to get rid of all duplication.

I will also file an amendment that would provide for protecting and restoring monies in dedicated funds, such as the trust funds, so we will not steal money from other areas to make up for shortfalls, as the majority did with the abandoned mine land money for 10 years that was owed to Wyoming but instead was used to pay for a 2-year highway bill.

Finally, I will file an amendment reflecting the goals of the Marketplace Fairness Act so that we put all businesses, whether brick-and-mortar, online, or catalog, on a level playing field with respect to the collection of sales and use taxes.

The majority's budget would severely harm my home State of Wyoming. The more than $1 trillion in tax increases would mean losses in personal income, household disposable income, and job opportunities. Over the next 10 years, the tax increases would cut personal income in Wyoming over $4 billion. You have to remember, we are a small State. We finally got past the half-million mark in people. So $4 billion is a lot. It would cut household disposable income on an average of $26,000 per household. There would be an average of nearly 1,900 job losses. You have to remember, we only have half a million people. These tax increases clearly are not the recipe for fixing our ailing economy and certainly not the answer for the hard-working folks back home in Wyoming.

When you start with one party doing the drafting—and those who wrote the budget hold the majority on the Budget Committee—you can expect the bill to be one-sided. If you keep on doing what you have been doing, you can expect to get the same result. Unfortunately, I believe that is what we will see this week as we debate the budget on the Senate floor.

The majority kept us in the dark on the last budget until last Wednesday evening. We had to present our opening statements in the Budget Committee before we even saw the budget the majority would offer.

Now, I do have to say in the defense of the majority that is the way it has been for several years, both when the Republicans were in charge and when Democrats were in charge. That does not mean it is right. If you want a good budget, you have to share the information, and share it before people have to comment if you really want good comments.

Then we had to turn around and start voting on the amendments the next morning in the Budget Committee. We were not part of that process. It was on a partisan line.

I was particularly disheartened by one amendment that failed on a party-line vote that was offered by Senator PORTMAN from Ohio. His amendment was simply asking the Congressional Budget Office to provide additional information with the cost estimates it provides on legislation affecting revenues. That is right—he was just asking for additional information. Every Member of the majority voted against it. How could a request for additional information be so partisan? We can and must do better for our constituents and our country.

Several weeks from now, we may see the President's budget proposal. Of course, he will be late to the game since the House and Senate will have already acted on the budget. That would be the first time in over 90 years that would be the case. By the way, his budget was due nearly 2 months ago. I anticipate it will include many of the same things we have here in the Senate majority's budget—more taxes, more spending, more government.

As we are learning all too well with the majority's drive to repeal the recent spending cuts called sequestration, taxes generally go on forever, but spending cuts seldom make it through the year. We were promised spending cuts, but the football is about to be jerked out. We have to grow the economy, not the government. Unfortunately, the majority's budget has it backward: It grows the government at the expense of the economy.

I look forward to the debate on this budget and filing amendments to improve it both for my constituents in Wyoming and my fellow citizens across the country. I know the debate around here has delayed the beginning of the budget process so that we are going to be under a crunch. Perhaps it will go into the weekend and give us an opportunity to do all of the amendments rather than just trying to fatigue us on Friday.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Senator ENZI. Senator ENZI is an accountant, a businessman. I do not believe any Member of this body has traveled his State more on the ground than he in the last number of years. As a matter of fact, I will say with certainty that is so. He travels constantly, talks to people all over the State.

I just have one question of the Senator. When you talk to people in Wyoming, real people in gas stations——

Mrs. MURRAY. Would the Senator yield for a second on a unanimous consent?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would be pleased to yield.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 933

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the title amendment for H.R. 933 which is at the desk be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 176) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title to read: ''An Act making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.''

Mr. SESSIONS. So I guess the President here has said: Well, so you know my goal is not to chase a balanced budget just for the sake of balance. But when our colleagues talk about a balanced approach and they have a budget that does not actually balance—I guess what I am saying is that the Senator talks to his constituents more than any Senator here, I am sure. Does the Senator think they really believe we should have a balanced budget, revenue equaling outgo? I ask an accountant that question.

Mr. ENZI. The Wyoming people absolutely think there should be a balanced budget. They do not think it ought to take 10 years to get there. They know how they have to operate. These are just hard-working, ordinary people with big hearts and an interest in jobs and their families. They are not seeing jobs happening. They are not seeing the economy improving. They are seeing taxes rising and people just talking about raising taxes. That is not where they expect us to go. All of them can suggest someplace within their realm of work that there ought to be a change.

Most of them say the best way to improve the economy, the best way to do jobs is just to get the government out of our way. These are people sitting on a tractor, even working in government during the day, thinking of ways their job could be reinvented to maybe be a little bit better. That is how governments can improve. They come up with some commonsense suggestions. I haul it back here, but commonsense doesn't go very far around here. I will keep hauling it, continue talking to people and continue to see what their expectations are, and hopefully we can meet those expectations. It doesn't take an accountant to know we are overspending.

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator mentioned—which it does seem to me we are doing here by this budget—if it were to pass, we don't have any plans to change what we are doing. The problem is that you haven't sent us enough money. As the Senator indicated, send us more money, and we will all be happy in Washington. That is not what my constituents are telling me they think we should do. What are yours saying?

Mr. ENZI. They are saying there should be quite a changeover back here until we have people who understand that you are not supposed to spend more than you take in. The answer is not charging them more in taxes every time we can't meet that expectation. They already think there are enough programs out here. Sometimes I have to agree with them.

When I started as the chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions—HELP—Committee, within my jurisdiction was preschool programs. There were 119 preschool programs. We spent more on preschool than we did on K–12. Senator Kennedy and I were able to get those down to 69 programs. People wonder why we can't get it below 69 programs. Most of them aren't handled by the departments we work with. They are handled by Agriculture, Commerce, and other agencies. We don't get to dabble in those. There are ways we can eliminate duplication and save a little money, but we are not looking for that.

Mr. SESSIONS. Here is the GAO report I think the Senator referred to, the 2012 annual report: "Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue." I think my constituents would say this is exactly what you should do. Do yours?

Mr. ENZI. Absolutely. It looks like a tremendous manual. We have a thing called the Government Performance and Results Act, which is where every agency is supposed to list what they do and how we will know they completed it. At the end of the year, they are supposed to evaluate themselves to see if they did what they said they were going to do. Most of them don't report, and those that usually do fail, and that is a lot of what is in that report. The agency is saying: No, we didn't do what we are supposed to do.

Mr. SESSIONS. It is. It lists here on page 51 specific examples. The Senator mentioned duplication. This one is employment of people with disabilities—a very good goal. This is something we would like to see if we can facilitate and help them work. It states: "Better coordination among 50 programs in nine Federal agencies that support employment of people with disabilities." There are 50 programs in 9 agencies. Does the Senator believe we could get more help for the disabled if those programs were consolidated and brought together in a single or a few programs?

Mr. ENZI. One of the things that happen with the programs is they usually get named after some Senator and he is very protective of his particular program. This is one of the things that make it very difficult to eliminate programs. Yes, if the duplication is eliminated, you may put the emphasis on the programs that are really working and that should succeed. That should make a bigger difference to everybody.

Mr. SESSIONS. That is common sense. I thank the Senator so much for his contributions. I do believe the American people have a right to say to us: You fix the duplication. You fix some of this waste. You quit throwing money at Solyndras and hot tubs in Las Vegas before you ask us for any more money.

We haven't done it.

I know fundamentally it is fair to say the Chief Executive of the United States is the person responsible for managing this bureaucracy. We are sort of like an active board of directors that monitors this.

Would the Senator not expect that a really committed President, Chief Executive of the United States, should be sending to us proposals on a regular basis that are based on reports of his Cabinet and sub-Cabinet people to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse? Wouldn't that help us if we had more support from the President's side?

Mr. ENZI. That is probably the only way it can be done, is to have the President suggest this is leadership, this is management, this is what the White House is supposed to be in charge of and could do.

I also know that even if the President talks about eliminating a program, there will be the 10 good examples from across the United States that actually work that will come in and flood us with comments about how that program cannot be eliminated. This is why I have the penny plan—one cent of every dollar across the board. Then you don't run into that problem. As I said, that would balance in 3 years, not 10 years.

Mr. SESSIONS. If we reduce by 1 percent, one penny out of every dollar of spending for 3 years, the budget would balance in 3 years, 4 years?

Mr. ENZI. Yes. These are the latest figures. After the sequestration and after the fiscal cliff, it came down to that. Before that, it would have taken us 5 years.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator for sharing that and thank him for sharing his thoughts with us tonight.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the ranking member for the tremendous job he has done and the hours he and his staff have put into reviewing these things. This is not an easy thing to follow. The book we have is an actual manual. The bill we receive to work from is just a bunch of numbers. It is hard to put that all together, and I thank the Senator for the information he has provided.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we do have some serious differences of opinions between the two parties when it comes to our values and our priorities. We believe our budget should reflect this, and we are having a good debate. Those differences will be difficult enough to bridge, and we should be able to at least agree on what the facts are.

I wish to take a moment tonight to correct an inaccuracy I have heard a lot in the last few days, including on the floor tonight. We are hearing some Republicans say that the Senate budget includes a $1.5 trillion tax hike. This simply is not true. Here are the facts.

Of the $975 billion in new revenue, which comes from those who can afford it the most, $480 billion is matched with responsible spending cuts to fully replace the sequestration, $100 billion goes toward targeted high-priority infrastructure repair and job training to help restore the recovery, put Americans back to work, and the rest goes to help reduce the deficit.

Unfortunately, rather than seriously considering the credible path we have presented in our budget plan, some Republicans have decided to play games with the numbers, and they are not telling the truth. Instead of subtracting the sequestration replacement portion and the investment package from the $975 billion in total revenue, they are trying to say you should somehow add them all together. They are taking one side of the ledger, combining it with the other side of the ledger, and coming to some conclusion that makes absolutely no sense to us. It would be like handing over $2 to buy a cup of coffee and having someone say: Well, the price was actually $2 plus the value of that coffee. It doesn't make any sense.

You don't have to take my word for it. Fact checkers and reporters have called this claim false and a step too far. The Washington Post Fact Checker even gave it two Pinocchios.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a story from the Washington Post on this inaccurate claim.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MITCH MCCONNELL'S CLAIM THAT THE DEMOCRATS PLAN A $1.5 TRILLION TAX HIKE

(By Glenn Kessler)

"Their budget will do more to harm the economy than to help it, and it will let Medicare and Social Security drift closer to bankruptcy. And then there's the Democrats' $1.5 trillion tax hike. Trillion with a T. Let me just repeat that: Any senator who votes for that budget is voting for a $1.5 trillion tax hike, the largest in the history of our country."

—Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, speech on the Senate floor, March 14, 2013

Shortly after McConnell (R-Ky.) made these comments, Democrats cried foul. The budget plan, they said, has $975 billion in higher taxes, not $1.5 trillion. They point to the summary tables of the budget resolution unveiled by Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.), who chairs the Budget Committee. Sure enough, there's a line showing $975 billion in new revenue.

But nothing's ever easy with the budget process in Washington. In fact, it's a morass, with many things open to interpretation, as we discovered as we went back and forth between the Democrats and Republicans—and then consulted with various budget experts.

Let's take a tour through the numbers.

THE FACTS

There are two key parts to this discussion—the actual text of the legislation and what in effect is a glossy marketing document ("Restoring the Promise of American Opportunity"). The legislation does not have many numbers, whereas the marketing document does.

In the marketing document, Murray describes how she will use $480 billion of the tax revenues to reverse part of the automatic spending cuts in the sequester, and another $100 billion for new spending on infrastructure.

The text of the legislation, meanwhile, establishes a bunch of "deficit neutral reserve funds," including one labeled as "to replace sequestration" and the other "to promote employment and job growth." But there are no numbers attached to those funds. Meanwhile, the legislation also includes instructions (known as "reconciliation") to the Finance Committee to boost revenues by $975 billion.

Deficit neutral means you need a mix of taxes and spending cuts to fulfill your goals.

Republicans assumed that since Murray in her marketing document had said she would boost revenues by $480 billion to pay for the sequester and $100 billion to spend on infrastructure, the language meant that those funds would come from additional taxes. (Depending how you read the document, the $975 billion in new revenues is also slated for ''deficit reduction,'' and the same money in theory can't be used twice.)

Thus $975 billion plus $580 billion equals more than $1.5 trillion.

Democrats say this is ridiculous. They argue that they will apply the $975 billion in new tax revenue to the goals outlined in the document, including applying $480 billion to replace the sequestration cuts. (Another $480 billion to alter the sequester would come from spending cuts.) They cast the reserve funds more as a device to avoid legislative points of order, which would require a 60-vote threshold to overcome, rather than just the 50 votes generally required for a budget resolution.

The whole discussion reminded The Fact Checker of the budget headaches frequently experienced when he covered the budget process many years ago. Fierce battles are often waged over highly arcane matters.

We consulted with a variety of budget experts, and things became even more murky. The consensus was that Republicans have a point—that this was a theoretical possibility—but it was not likely.

G. William Hoagland, senior vice president of the Bipartisan Policy Center and longtime budget sage for Senate Republicans, said the GOP scenario was possible but ''unlikely,'' as the Democrats have ''a clear intention to raise $975 billion in revenues.'' He said that such reserve funds are more to send messages to fellow party members—in other words, to garner votes—as opposed to being substantive items. ''It's grease to make the wheels go around,'' he said.

In sum, he said, he viewed the legislation's reserve-fund language as ''a clumsy way to avoid directly addressing offsetting the sequester.''

Jason Delisle, another former GOP staff member on the Budget Committee now at the New America Foundation, said that ''Republicans are right to say that the wiggle room means the official number is not the official number—that it could be higher if the reserve funds are used. Fair point.''

But Delisle added: ''The Republican argument rests on the assumption that the Democrats bring up a tax-and-spend bill in addition to a reconciliation bill for each and every reserve fund in the budget resolution; thus there are more tax increases in the budget resolution than what they say. I think the Republicans are overstating the likelihood of that scenario.''

Ed Lorenzen, who was a budget policy adviser for House Democrats and is now at the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, agreed with Delisle and added that he viewed the reserve funds as ''primarily for procedural accounting purposes to adjust internal budget allocations for points of order.'' He said that ''the reserve fund doesn't require an additional $100 billion in revenues to pay for the $100 billion in stimulus spending; rather it allows the budget committee chairman to adjust the allocations to accommodate $100 billion for stimulus spending in the resolution if the revenues already assumed in the resolution to offset it have been adopted.''

Keith Hennessey, another former GOP budget expert who now teaches at Stanford University, took a darker view.

Democrats, he said, ''want to say the budget [plan] includes $100 billion in new spending for jobs and infrastructure by pointing to the assumption in the non-legislative document, but then say that nothing in the legislative text of the budget resolution requires $100 billion in extra taxes.'' He was especially suspicious of the fact that reserve funds do not have limits—as is sometimes the case in budget resolutions—and said it was perfectly acceptable to argue that the budget ''also allows for another $580 billion in tax increases to offset additional spending increases she [Murray] assumes and promotes aggressively.''

He added: ''If anything I'd argue that even the $1.5 trillion number understates the tax increases allowed by the Murray budget resolution. She's requiring $975 billion in tax increases to reduce future deficits, and allowing for unlimited amounts more to pay for new spending. I find that terrifying.''

THE PINOCCHIO TEST

Clearly, we're in a bit of an expert muddle here, with even Republican-leaning budget wonks lacking a consensus. But let's step back a moment and look at the big picture.

Democrats have repeatedly said they plan to seek $975 billion in additional revenue and would task the Finance Committee to come up with the precise closing of loopholes and such. There may be something vague and suspicious about the reserve funds, but under the GOP scenario, Democrats would also have to vote for even more taxes—which isn't very likely.

Budget resolutions, after all, are basically like a blueprint for a house, with the details filled in later. Both sides try to score political points with the votes that are cast on such documents, but in sum, many of these votes are relatively meaningless.

McConnell could have raised serious questions about what Democrats intended to do with these reserve funds and how they intended to fund them. But instead he has taken a theoretical possibility and turned it into a hard fact: ''Any senator who votes for that budget is voting for a $1.5 trillion tax hike, the largest in the history of our country.''

That's going a step too far.

Mrs. MURRAY. We are having an important conversation about the direction of our country, what kind of Nation we want to leave to our children and grandchildren. It will not be easy to reach a deal. We are working very hard to get a budget passed out of the Senate and to move forward from there. This is what the American people expect. It is what they deserve.

I hope our colleagues will stick to the facts and not try to muddy the water and help us focus on the urgent task at hand.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, another thing that I think is important and that we do agree on is the concept that our plan should be to create growth, jobs, and prosperity. A budget-balancing exercise must be a part of that whole vision of how we make America a better, more prosperous place. What we are learning is that we can't borrow our way to prosperity.

I will never forget being in Evergreen, AL, a few years ago at a town-hall meeting when a nice African-American gentleman stood up. He said, ''My daddy always told me you can't borrow your way out of debt.''

If you think about it, that is basically what we are saying we are going to do. We are saying it is not a spending problem. This is not the problem we have. The problem we have is that we don't have enough money.

We have two solutions: One is to borrow more money, and the other is to tax more, taking money from people who otherwise would use it in the economy to invest, expand businesses and the like, or raise—increase spending or borrow the money, adding to our debt.

Debt accumulates over time. Each billion dollars, trillion dollars that is added to the debt, we pay interest on. People lend us that money. A lot of people haven't thought about it much, but we have to pay interest on it. It is projected by the budget before us today that in 10 years we will be paying $800 billion—virtually $800 billion a year in interest. Think about this. Interest on our debt will be almost $800 billion a year. Under the CBO current baseline it is a similar number. The Defense Department budget, which is actually being reduced—one of our largest—is $500 billion, Social Security is about $750 billion, and Medicare is about the same or a little smaller. It would exceed every other budget item in our budget—interest on the debt—every year.

We have been wrestling, nickeling and diming, cobbling together money for a budget for our highways—$40 billion or so we could put together and have a program that doesn't cut our highway funding. We have more efficient cars, people are not buying as much gas, and taxes aren't as much as we projected they would be a number of years ago. It is getting to be a tight budget. We spend about $40 billion—maybe a little more now—on the highway budget every year. This is maybe 1.1 percent of the total Federal Government budget.

We will be spending $800 billion on interest each year. The money we spend on interest produces us nothing. All it does is help remind us of the good old high time we had back in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, when we were spending and borrowing. We can think back: Wasn't that a great time when interest rates were unbelievably, artificially low. They will not stay at that rate; they are going up. We have had a great time, but the piper is going to demand his due as the years go by. It is just a fact.

This is how countries get in trouble. Greece and all of those countries in trouble in Europe, their debt became so high, their interest rates started going up. People were afraid to lend them money, and they wouldn't lend them more money unless there was more interest. All of a sudden, their interest payments were so large that their whole economy and governments were threatened. I think this is a big deal.

We keep hearing that spending is not the problem. I would like to talk about this a little bit because it is very important.

NANCY PELOSI, minority leader in the House, said this earlier this year: ''So it is almost a false argument to say we have a spending problem.''

We don't have a spending problem. The American people need to send us more money, I guess is what she would say. No, don't look at these duplicative programs; don't look where we are wasting money. It is important. You can't have austerity and actually cancel a worthless government program. They somehow might lose their job and the country will sink into the ocean. America will be better, our economy will be stronger, if we are leaner and more productive as a government. Surely, we can agree on that. Surely, we can't maintain, as Paul Krugman did the other day—unless he is advising the Democratic majority in the Senate—that even wasteful Defense Department spending shouldn't be cut because we want to stimulate the economy with borrowed money, throwing money at programs that are no good. That is no way to do business.

STENY HOYER, one of the Democratic leaders in the House, says: Does the country have a spending problem? The country has a paying-for problem. We don't pay enough, Mr. HOYER says. Mr. HOYER says we need to pay more to Washington so Washington can keep spending.

We are not changing. It is the American people's fault. Don't you know, we are investing for you. Give us more money so we can invest. Don't you think all these programs work? Aren't they doing great? No, we are not going to reform them. We can't cut a single one—children will be thrown into the streets; old people won't have drugs for their health care. And all of this because of a modest reduction in the growth of spending?

Congressman RYAN has demonstrated, and the numbers are absolutely clear, that we can increase spending by 3.4 percent a year, and the budget will balance in 10 years. We don't even have to cut spending. We have to reduce the rate of growth in spending from around 5.4 percent to 3.4 percent and the budget balances. But President Obama says he is not interested in balancing the budget. My goal is not to chase a balanced budget, he says.

I know my colleagues have used the word ''balanced.'' I said earlier they used the word ''balanced'' tonight 14 times, but I have been corrected. It is 24 times already tonight that my colleagues have used the word ''balanced'' in relation to this budget that never balances and never will balance because they are not concerned about balancing the budget. That is not what it is about with them. They think bringing the budget into balance, as most States have to do, as all cities and counties have to do, is austerity. Oh, we can't have austerity. That might hurt the government. Somebody might lose their job. They no longer would be paid to do some worthless job that doesn't produce anything. We have to keep paying them anyway because it would be austere to cut that out.

Senator HARKIN said in February: We have the richest Nation in the world. If we are so rich, why are we so broke? Is it a spending problem? No, it's because we have a misallocation of capital, a misallocation of wealth. If we are so rich, why are we broke, he says. Is it a spending problem? No, it is because we have a misallocation of capital, a misallocation of wealth.

What he means is the government hasn't taken enough wealth from the American people who worked hard and earned it, so they can distribute it around. That is what he means; that we are entitled to more of it from the economy, and we can extract more of it and then we can pass it out and we can tell all the people who get our checks how much we did for them. By the way, we ask them to vote for us while we are at it. See what I sent you? I need your vote now. By the way, these awful Republicans, they are talking about taking those checks away. You might not get all that money now, or you might get $98 instead of $100, and I am going to protect you.

So this is the politics of this thing. It is clear we have a mentality around here that is not healthy, and the mentality is that it is not a spending problem and we don't have to cut spending and the Democratic budget increases spending over the baseline we are on. It raises taxes. We will submit a document for the record that we think shows we have $1.5 trillion in tax increases in this bill. But whether it is $1.5 trillion or $1 trillion, the deal is that spending goes up, and there is virtually no alteration in the debt course of America over the next 10 years.

So why is it that it is a spending problem? Let me explain it. It actually came to me more clearly during a hearing recently where Mr. Elmendorf, who is the Director of CBO, the Congressional Budget Office—and a very smart man and a decent individual—was talking about the growth in spending and taxes and the tax increases that just occurred and that sort of thing. This is the story.

I asked him this: If we raised enough taxes to balance the budget today, and if the economy is growing at 2 percent, would the taxes grow at about 2 percent a year?

He said: Yes. They work hard to figure out what kind of tax growth it is, but taxes basically grow with the economy. As more people are working, the economy grows, and they pay more taxes. If they grow at 4 percent, the government takes in more money than if it grows at 2 percent.

But the question was, What if spending is growing at 5 percent? Even if we raise enough money today to close the $1.2 billion deficit we had last year to zero, and the economy is growing at 2 percent, and spending is growing at 5 percent, we will immediately start off on an unsustainable debt course.

So I asked him: Well, then, that is the definition of an unsustainable course, isn't it; that you are on a path to raise spending more than you are on a path to have revenue come up?

And that is where we are. We can't keep raising taxes and keep allowing our spending rate to increase beyond what the economy will sustain. This economy, this government, this America that has produced the greatest wealth, the greatest freedom, the greatest prosperity, the greatest growth, the greatest innovation the world has ever known was not built on a state-dominated economy. It is not a socialist government state; it is not a European economy. It is a growth economy. We will make a mistake that we will regret, and it will be a colossal error for the future of this country if we alter that great characteristic of this fabulous country of which we are a part.

We are a government of limited powers, a constitutionally controlled government. It does not dominate our economy. It does not dominate the people's lives. People are free, and they should be encouraged to be independent and resourceful and to take care of themselves and their families. When they have a hard time, we need to help them. We have programs that spend $750 billion a year. I kid you not.

If you cobble together all the means-tested welfare programs that go to some—well, Medicaid. Medicaid is a free program for people whose income is below a certain level. Medicaid is a means-tested welfare social program, and there are a lot of them. It is the biggest. But you put all those together and it amounts to $750 billion a year in expenses or outflow. There are at least 83 of these programs, which are not brought together. They have independence, an independent management, different and independent departments of our government. They are not coordinated.

What we need to do when a person is hurting and they have lost their job and they need food stamps and TANF and unemployment compensation and other benefits that they are entitled to, and will get—and will continue to get, at least that kind of compensation—we need to be producing a system where these programs are brought together. We need to meet with that person—perhaps a single mom who has lost her job, maybe a young person who hasn't been able to find work—and we need to use some of those monies instead of just sending aid out and a person comes in every month and signs up and gets a benefit to help that person. What kind of skills do they need? Do they need an automobile to go to work? How can we help them move from dependency to independence? How can we help them create a healthy life for themselves, their family and their future? That is where we need to focus, and we are not doing that. We are not even close to that.

The 1996 welfare reform accomplished a lot of that. The number of children in poverty dropped dramatically. They did a lot of reform. The welfare office became an employment office in many areas of the country. It helped people move into an advanced lifestyle and away from dependency. But we have gradually drifted through the Bush years and into the Obama years to where those qualities of that program have been undermined, and President Obama is overtly advocating relaxing some of the rules that mandate work requirements for some of the people involved. He is retreating, too, and that is the wrong way to go.

We have a group of our excellent Senators—fine people—meeting in secret. Maybe they are down the hall now. I don't know where they are, but they are plotting right now on how to pass an immigration plan. We just can't wait to see what it is so we can just vote for whatever they decide we ought to have. You know what they tell us? We can't get workers. We have to have foreign workers. Yet we have never had more people on welfare, never had more people on food stamps.

In 2001 we spent $20 billion on food stamps. Last year we spent $80 billion on food stamps. It has gone up fourfold, but we are told there are not enough Americans to do work. Somehow this welfare office needs to be dealing with this problem, and we need to have a consolidated program. But there is no plan in this budget, and no plan that has been offered on the floor.

Any time anybody makes a suggestion that we make reform, they get attacked. I have been attacked. I offered an amendment when the Agriculture bill was moving last year and we were on track to spend $800 billion over 10 years on food stamps. We found there was a categorical eligibility provision that was being abused substantially, allowing people who basically did not qualify for food stamps under the program to get the food stamps. So I proposed to close it. It would have saved $10 billion. We would spend $790 billion over 10 years rather than $800 billion. And I was attacked. I was kind of shocked, really. It was said that I was trying to balance the budget on the backs of hungry people. I wasn't trying to balance the budget on hungry people, I was trying to close an abuse of the program and, actually, thankfully, would have saved $10 billion—$1 billion a year over 10 years.

So this is where we are. We have a firm resistance to reform throughout the system, and it is not a little bit of money. These 80-some-odd welfare programs—hold your hat—over the next 10 years are supposed to grow, as predicted by the Congressional Budget Office, by 80 percent—80 percent.

My fine budget staff has looked at those numbers and they have concluded if we could improve those 83 programs and let them grow at 60 percent instead of 80 percent, we could save the taxpayers $1 trillion over 10 years.

I kid you not, $1 trillion. This goes a long way toward balancing our budget and helps us in a lot of different ways. If it is done right, it will be better for the people who need help than the present 83 disjointed programs that have no coherence and no focus on helping poor people actually improve their lives.

I grew up in the country. I grew up with poor people. I was poor. We didn't have central heating. I have no doubt our income was below the poverty line most of the time I was growing up. We had a garden. My daddy had a country store. We got by. But we didn't have any money. I remember when we got our first air conditioner—and it gets hot in Alabama. We moved from one room to the other when you turned it off. You didn't want to pay for electricity you didn't need. We had a fireplace in the living room. That was the only heat we had. The fireplace burned in the winter all the time. We cut our own wood. I worked construction in the summers both summers I was going to college, saving a few bucks being a carpenter's helper and working out in the Alabama heat. It didn't hurt me. And this idea that people aren't willing to work and we have to import foreign labor and we have to give people welfare because we can't find them a job, while businesses say we don't have enough workers, is somehow a messed-up idea. This is not helping. We have got to confront this problem. There is no plan to confront this problem or talk about it in any realistic way. It is time for us to be honest about this country's problems.

We do have a spending problem. Spending is going up faster than the economy is growing, and it will always create a deficit. You can't create something out of nothing. Julie Andrews sang, ''Nothing comes from nothing. Nothing ever could.'' That is so true. So we need to have a government that is leaner, that is more productive, that does more for the American people than it is doing now for less money.

My office has been spending less than we are allocated every year. I believe this year the Senate has reduced its budget about 10 percent over the last couple of years. I am down about 20 percent. This idea that you can't cut spending throughout this government is one of the most ridiculous ideas that has ever been raised.

I was a U.S. Attorney. I managed an office of lawyers and staff. When Ronald Reagan came in and we didn't have any money, we watched every dime we spent. The former Deputy Attorney General of the United States, Larry Thompson, was from Atlanta and I was U.S. Attorney in Alabama. We were such dyed-in-the-wool frugal Reagan hawks, when we were made U.S. Attorney we came to a conference and we roomed together, in separate beds, but we thought it was cheaper and saved money for the taxpayers. This is the kind of mentality that needs to get back into what we are doing, and I would say that it is time for us to confront this.

The vision of the Members of this side, and I think a lot of Members of that side, is not that far apart. But I want to be clear about a couple things. This budget needs to be put on a path to balance. It can be done without cutting spending in any dramatic way. All you have to do is reduce the rate of growth in spending. The budget will balance in 10 years. We need to do that. We need to plan to do that. As I explained before, the debt is already pulling down economic growth in America. It is pulling down the growth we have. The debt has reached such a level, 104 percent of GDP, that it is above the limit and the level that the International Monetary Fund, the Bank for International Settlements, the European Central Bank, and the Rogoff-Reinhart study say begins to pull down growth. We are losing jobs, we are losing promotions, we are losing pay raises as a result of this debt right now.

We share the view on both sides of the aisle that we need to be looking to create growth. Our colleagues say, Let's keep doing what we have been doing the last number of years. We have another stimulus package, we have another $100 billion, and we are going to borrow this money because we are already in debt, and to spend an additional $100 billion requires borrowing an additional $100 billion, so we are going to borrow $100 billion and we are going to spend it, and this is going to make the economy stronger. Sorry. We have been there, done that. We say no. We have got to end this mentality. We need to make this government leaner and more productive. We need to have this government do things that create growth and jobs that do not add to the debt.

What are some of those things? Simplified taxes, eliminate unnecessary regulations, more American energy. Those are the kinds of things we can do that don't cost money that create jobs. Complete the Keystone Pipeline. Don't keep sending money to Venezuela or Saudi Arabia. Create jobs in America. Ask the people in North Dakota; they have got growth and prosperity as a result of energy production. These are the kinds of things we can do and we believe in and will continue to work for.

I would say that maybe, even though we have a big difference—and this budget will be quite different from the House budget—I don't say it is impossible that in conference some sort of more global agreement could be reached to put America on a sound path. We will have to deal with the entitlements. Entitlements represent half of the spending—and, with interest, more than half of the spending. Medicare, Social Security, those are growing well above the inflation rate and their growth level needs to be contained a little bit. We can make them sound, and people can retire and know that Medicare will be there for them, it won't fail, and that Social Security will be there for them, it won't fail. And we are going to stop adding to our debt until it reaches such a level that it could not only slow growth but could cause a financial crisis, as we had in 2007, and as they are having now in some of the European countries and that so many countries have had over the years.

We are excited to have a budget on the floor for the first time in 4 years. It does provide an opportunity for the American people—as our chair, Senator MURRAY, said—to compare the visions for America. It also provides an opportunity for our Members to learn about what things cost, how much you can get through tax increases, what kind of spending cuts are required, whether we have to cut or how much we can grow spending and still balance the budget. These kinds of things are learned when a bill actually goes to the floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, President Obama, being interviewed on ABC by George Stephanopoulos, not only said "my goal is not to chase—a balanced budget" but he also said, "we don't have an immediate crisis in terms of debt," and "in fact, for the next 10 years, it's gonna be in a sustainable place."

I would say two things about that. He appointed Mr. Erskine Bowles to be chairman of the fiscal commission. They spent quite a lot of time working on this debt question. They took testimony from experts, they examined documents, and they did what a good, public, spirited group would do. Mr. Bowles was Chief of Staff for President Clinton and a very successful businessman. Alan Simpson, his Cochair, was a former Republican Senator from Wyoming.

That is not what they told us. In the committee, 2 years ago, in the Budget Committee—maybe a little over 2 years now—they gave a joint statement in which they said this Nation has never faced a more predictable financial crisis.

What they were saying was the level of debt we are operating on, the unsustainability of the debt path, was so great that we will have some sort of fiscal crisis.

I remember about that same time, the Chairman of the Fed, Mr. Bernanke, testified that we have all these outyears and we talk about the debt numbers and all that, but we don't have to worry about them. I am paraphrasing, but this was pretty close to what he said. I think these were his exact words: But it will never happen.

What he basically told us was there would be a fiscal crisis before we get this far down the road—the demographics, the aging population, fewer workers, greater debt every year—mushrooming in the outyears.

I am troubled the President thinks that as a matter of fact, the next 10 years is going to be in a sustainable place. I don't believe he knows that. I will tell my colleagues a couple reasons why. Senator STABENOW had a chart about how great the economy or the fiscal situation of the country looked about the time President Bush took office. The last month of President Clinton's term in office was negative growth. I think that was the first month of negative growth in maybe 8 years. In fact, when President Clinton took office, he didn't inherit a recession, regardless of what the myth is around here. Former President Bush did have a recession in his second year or so of his term and he took action and the economy bounced back. About the time President Clinton took office, the economy was growing and it continued to grow through the decade. We don't know all the forces. We talk about it. We play politics about it. But nobody knows precisely what moves an economy, whether it was something 10 years ago or something 10 months ago that caused the difficulty. We make guesses and we do our best judgment.

So here we go. In early 2000, I am on the Budget Committee and Mr. Greenspan testified—the maestro, the guru, the Federal Reserve Chairman, the greatest we had ever had; the economy had long years of growth. He told the committee we are going to have surpluses as far as the eye can see. He discussed with the Budget Committee what would happen when we had all these surpluses and we would pay down the entire debt of the United States of America. Then he asked us what we would do. What is the Federal Government going to do with the extra money? Are they going to buy the bonds of Venezuela? Does it buy British bonds? What does it do with its money? Does it buy property? This was the mindset in early 2000, and he was the Federal Reserve Chairman. Didn't he see the demographics? Didn't he recognize—there was a little caution in his statement, but he was very positive.

I went back and read it again recently, because it teaches me that this man, at the peak of his powers—one of the greatest economic minds in history; at least it was so felt at that time—completely missed it, I have to tell my colleagues. He didn't think we had a problem in the future with debt. He didn't say by 2009 we are going to be running trillion-dollar deficits, right? So this makes me a bit humble about our ability to predict.

Mr. Bowles said we are on a path to a debt crisis. That is what he told us in the committee. I believe Chairman Conrad or ranking member Judd Gregg asked him: When?

He said: I think about 2 years.

Two years came and we didn't have a debt crisis. So now the President of the United States is saying we can continue for 10 years, no problem, no worries. I am happy. You are happy. We don't have to cut spending. We need to keep borrowing. We need to keep running up debt because we absolutely don't want to have austerity. We don't want to have austerity. We want to be happy and spend. So that is the deal.

I am telling my colleagues, nobody knows. It can happen just that quick. Kent Conrad told me—we were standing right over there—he said the rate we are heading is coming off that wall like a rubber ball at warp speed. He was on the debt commission, the fiscal commission. He was worried about the fact of our unsustainability on the debt course.

Things look good. The Sun is shining out there today. We don't want to talk about that. Who wants to be negative? Who wants to be Dr. Doom? Do my colleagues remember Dr. Doom or Nouriel Roubini, who said: We were going to have a debt crisis in 2005 or 2006. I am not sure when he predicted that. He said: The banks are borrowing too much money. It is unsustainable. We are going to have a crisis.

Months went by and we didn't have a crisis. One year went by, we didn't have a crisis. They mocked him. They called him Dr. Gloom. After 2007, when the bottom fell out and we had the worst recession since World War II, the reasons it happened were just what Mr. Roubini said. People said: Dr. Gloom wasn't so wrong after all. Maybe we should have listened to him.

I am just telling my colleagues, I believe we have a responsibility as men and women of public service, managing the finances of the United States of America, and we have a President who is in denial.

I think it is time for this Congress to assert itself and say we are not going to risk this country. I believe our debt is already too high. I believe it without a doubt. It is a fact. The Rogoff and Reinhart study was based on public debt, and our public debt is now over 100 percent of GDP. It is greater than the entire economy. That means we pull down and we place our country at risk because we are slowing growth, as I indicated earlier.

But this is what Secretary Geithner said in 2011 before the Budget Committee. I asked him what did he think about the Rogoff and Reinhart study, because it was troubling to the committee. Everybody on the committee knew about it. The fiscal commission people had consulted about it. We had Carmen Reinhart testify before the committee and then again a little later. So I asked him about it. This was his answer to my question to him, as I recall:

> It's an excellent study. And you could say in some ways what you summarize from it, understates the risks, because it's not just that governments or countries that live with very high debt-to-GDP ratios are consigned to weaker growth.

As I have been contending throughout the day—

They're consigned to the damage that comes from periodic financial crises as well.

February 17, 2011, Secretary Geithner, President Obama's own Secretary.

So he was warning us that when the debt gets this high, we are in a danger zone.

We know there are some countries that have more difficult problems than we. There was an article recently from the CATO Institute talking about some of the countries in the world. Japan is one of the most dangerous. What if the third, fourth largest economy in the world, Japan—one of our key trading partners—was to have an economic collapse such as Greece? Do my colleagues think it can't happen? I don't think it can't happen. I don't know. They are running way too high a debt-to-GDP ratio. Their population is aging even more quickly than ours.

Then we have France and Spain and Italy. Any one of those countries had an economy so large they can't be bailed out like Greece. What would happen if Europe were to go into turmoil? I am not predicting that to happen, but I am telling my colleagues we are on a path where I don't believe any responsible person can say it couldn't happen to us, and we could be embroiled in this too. The worst thing that could happen to us is we have to face a fiscal crisis where we get our debt under control at a time when the country is in a recession as a result of financial mismanagement. It would make it be an utter nightmare. As many experts have said, we have shifted a lot of debt from the private sector to the government. The government picked up liabilities it had no business picking up and the result is it has increased its debt substantially.

I am very concerned that we not treat this lightly. I am very unhappy the President of the United States who, to my knowledge, never had an economics course in his entire life—a community organizer—is going on national television when the needle of our debt is in the red zone, by any estimation, and he blithely says: We don't have an immediate crisis in terms of debt. In fact, for the next 10 years, it is going to be in a sustainable place.

I don't believe he is correct to say that. I have not heard any economists say that with full authority, certainly not a lot of them, and I am worried about where we are.

There is another chart I wanted to show about the question of taxes. This is a chart that I saw in Barron's magazine just a few weeks ago. Gene Epstein did this chart. On the cover of Barron's was a picture of the President, having made his State of the Union Address, and the caption on the front of the newspaper was ''The way to Greece'' or something like that, and it was a very serious analysis of the deep, systemic debt problems this Nation has, and a plea for us to act, to move forward and avoid the risks we are now undertaking.

One part of what they did was to actually analyze what we could do with more taxes, particularly taxes on upper income people, and they ran the numbers. I believe this is an accurate run of the numbers. On the left side, it has the public debt as a percentage of the GDP and on the right at the bottom are the years over time. Mr. Epstein ran it based on increasing taxes and increasing taxes a lot.

His first run was the purple line, how much the debt would go up; how much the debt would go up if the current tax rate stayed in effect. This is the purple line. It grows a little faster than the green line and the red line. It grows a little faster because the taxes are a little lower than his next two estimates.

Then he estimated for the wealthy people who were raised from 35 to 40 percent, what if they were raised to 50 percent? In Alabama, it is about average. We have a 5-percent income tax in our State. So for the wealthy, making it 50 percent, plus paying 5 percent to the State, he is paying a pretty big chunk of his money right off the top. But let's assume it went up there. It has almost no impact on the debt course of America according to the Barron's analysis.

The third one, the red one is based on raising the tax rate of upper income people to 50 percent and then rolling back all the tax cuts President Bush had for the lower income people, the middle-class people who got substantial reductions in their rates and we have been operating that for about 13 years now and we made those permanent.

President Bush was attacked for having tax cuts, but I am pleased to see my Democratic colleagues are joining with the Republicans to make 99 percent of those tax rates permanent. It must not have been so evil if everybody overwhelmingly voted to make them permanent. So if we raised all those rates and had a 50-percent tax increase on the wealthy, we still hadn't changed the debt course of America.

What does that say? It says the debt problem in America is a spending problem, and a big part of that spending problem is the huge mandatory programs we have.

I am a lawyer. What is a mandatory program? It means when you reach 66, 67, you walk in and ask for your Social Security check and they have to pay you whether there is any money in the bank or not, whether the government has any money or not. The government has to borrow the money and pay your check because you are entitled to it as a matter of law at a certain age you qualify. Many of our entitlement programs are based on income. If your income is below a certain level, you are entitled to the money whether Uncle Sam has it or not, and that is based on law. That is based on legislation Congress passed that entitled people under certain circumstances to obtain Federal money and get it as a matter of entitlement.

When those programs are surging at 6 percent a year—Medicaid, the poor person's insurance program is projected to grow 8 percent a year over the next decade, 117 percent over the next 10 years—when those programs are growing at that rate and the economy is growing at 2 percent, you have a problem. You do not have to go to the Harvard Business School to know that. You really do not have to go to Harvard to know that.

When I talk to the American people, they understand it fully. They expect that we are going to have to make tough choices in this country to get the country on the right path, and they are girding themselves to support such tough choices, but they want them fair. They are willing to tighten their belt, but they do not want somebody who never works and lays around and watches TV all day, the soap operas, to have an advantage over people who are out working hard every day. But, anyway, people are prepared for that. The good news is, that as the economy grows, we do not have to cut spending, we just have to reduce the rate of growth in spending. This is not a myth I am talking about. This is absolute fact. You can spend more. This government can spend more every year. We can spend more at the rate of 3.4 percent, instead of increasing it at 5.4 percent, and the budget balances over 10 years. How much better is that? Most people think we have to have cuts across the board.

Now some programs are going to have to be cut. And let's be frank. What is the real challenge for us? Social Security and Medicare are great programs that our seniors depend on, and can grow steadily, can grow more than 3.4 percent, really. But those programs have a double problem. Not only do we want to see a cost of living occur for our seniors, but we have more seniors on the program every year. So this makes the numbers harder to deal with.

So you can say: Well, Social Security is just going to grow 4 percent instead of 5.5 percent and people will not lose much money. They will get a $4 increase instead of a $5.5 increase. No, no, it is more complicated than that because since you have more people on Social Security and Medicare, because of the age of the population that we have, it will be a larger impact than that—not disastrous, sustainable.

And we can do other things. We can say: Well, we want to work a little longer. We want to change the rate of the increase, the inflation index that most experts tell us should be altered under a new system that would save some money on the inflation index. So that is the kind of thing people have been talking about. The Gang of 6 talked about it. The President talked about it. Vice President BIDEN talked about it. The debt commission talked about it. The gang, the 12 people, in the

Budget Control Act, tried to talk about a serious alteration of our spending path in which we fix Social Security and put it on a sound path, we fix Medicare and put it on a sound path, and we fix the entire budget of the United States in a way that is sustainable.

I would say people I talk to in the business community, people I talk to who testify before the committee, experts and just common people, tell me repeatedly: If you guys put this country on a sound path, so we knew we could see what the future is, we could plan for the future, and we would know our finances are getting better and moving to a balanced budget instead of getting worse. We believe people would not lose money, they would spend more money. We would have more growth. More people would be working and not drawing welfare and unemployment insurance, and the budget of the United States would start improving right there because more people would pay taxes and fewer people would need help from the government.

That is the spiral we need to be on. We are now still muddling through with exceedingly low growth, and they are still predicting low inflation. So you consider Social Security, maybe increasing it 6 percent a year, and inflation is just 2 percent. The Congressional Budget Office is predicting that inflation will be 2.2 percent, I think, a year, equaling almost 25 percent over 10 years. That is how much inflation will add over 10 years. Who knows? But we have kept low rates longer than anybody thought. The economy is not moving. If the economy actually jumped 4 percent or 5 percent growth for 2 or 3 years, you probably would have a jump in inflation. Obviously, CBO is not expecting that. They are expecting only slow growth over the next 10 years, and I think that is consistent with the consensus of independent analysts. So I wanted to share that thought.

The question before the House is— and all our colleagues need to confront it honestly—is this budget the kind of budget that puts America on a sound path? Is it what we need to do at this moment in history to change the debt course of America, to create confidence, to create the kind of growth that will increase that 2-percent growth, to get it to 3, 3.5, 4 percent?

Just 2 years ago, the Congressional Budget Office projected growth for 2013—the year we are in—would be 4.6 percent. The year before that, they predicted, last year, 2012, that we would have over 3 percent, 3.6 percent, something like that, growth. We have fallen way below that both years. I think the reason is the debt is pulling down growth, at least that is part of the reason. But regardless, the truth is, we are having to adjust ourselves to what Bill Gross at PIMCO, the largest bond group in the world, would call a new normal. The new normal is, we are not likely to see 5, 6-percent growth even in really great times in the next 10 or 15 years—maybe the next 20 or 30 years. We are just not likely to, for a lot of reasons. Of course, nobody knows. Mr. Greenspan thought we were going to have surpluses, and we did not. And we could have growth we are not expecting. Nobody knows. But we just have to make the best judgment we have, and the best judgment we have is that we are not on a sound path.

So we are responsible leaders, and we have to ask ourselves, is the budget here going to do the right thing? We must remember and can never forget who will suffer the most if we have a fiscal crisis. Won't it be the poor? Won't it be the people in the most fragile working environments? Won't it be the people with less skills? Won't they be the ones who would suffer the most? Don't we have an obligation as a Senate to reach out to the House and say: We get it. This is dangerous. We do not know for sure where we are going. But we know. Shame on us if we allow decent, hard-working people—struggling to get by right now—to get hammered by another fiscal crisis that Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson virtually guaranteed was on the way?

I think we have a duty. I think we have a responsibility. I think when the American people find out it is not going to take massive slashing of spending, as our colleagues say—a lot of the programs can be more efficient than they have ever been, and we get just as much benefit, even if they do not get as much money. There has not been any reform, any management improvements in this government in decades.

I will just say politically, I thought that was the greatest offer Governor Romney had. He was a very good manager. In my opinion, we have had enough speechmakers, we have had enough war Presidents, we have had enough grand and glorious stuff. We need somebody to run this government, like the Presiding Officer ran the State of Virginia. It takes hard work, and you have to stay on top of it. It would have been great for us to have had a real top management, so that every Cabinet person, when they are hired, understands they have a duty to produce more for less for the American people, and every subcabinet and subcabinet and subcabinet person, and every department head gets the message, from top leadership on down: You are expected—as Larry Thompson and I did—to share a hotel room if need be to save running up debt in the U.S. Government.

This budget does not do it. I think we quoted earlier what the Washington Post said on March 15:

> In short, this [budget] document gives voters no reason to believe that Democrats have a viable plan for—or even a responsible public assessment of—the country's long-term fiscal predicament.

That is a serious condemnation.

What about USA Today, I guess maybe the widest read publication of its kind in the country? A USA Today editorial:

> The plan produced by the Senate Budget Committee Chairman Patty Murray . . . is a disappointing document. It is a namby-pamby plan that underwhelms at every turn. The Murray budget neither balances the budget nor reins in entitlements . . . the nation would be helped if Democrats were to embrace Ryan's goal of a balanced budget.

That is USA Today. They are not a rightwing publication, but they have written some good material on the budget. So has the Washington Post. Both of those have covered the budget situation more than most publications—both of them—and they have been trying to say to the Congress and to the President: You guys need to get together and do something. So both these editorials reflect a very informed judgment by two independent publications of national repute that the Senate—which they have been watching— has failed to produce a budget that puts the country on a sound path. I just have to tell you, I think they are totally correct. I wish it were not so.

Investor's Business Daily:

> [An] IBD review of the budget data shows that the Senate vastly overstates the size of its spending cuts.

Boy, that is correct. They vastly overstate how much spending is cut in this bill. It goes on to say:

> In fact, it could be that the Senate [budget] would, if enacted, increase federal spending by hundreds of billions of dollars.

Was Investor's Business Daily correct? Yes. Spending increases under this budget. Spending is not decreased at all under this budget, although we are told that it does. And we are told 20-some-odd times it is a balanced plan. They even go so far as to say it is a balanced budget. They have said it is a balanced plan so much, they started saying it is a balanced budget. It is nothing nowhere close to being a balanced budget. What they mean by ''balanced'' is, they promised that there will be $1 trillion in tax increases and $1 trillion in spending reductions. And it increases spending. Give me a break. There is not a one-to-one. It increases spending. There is no cut in spending off the current law we are now on.

They tried to claim credit for the Budget Control Act almost 2 years ago. President Obama resisted that. You remember how he just threatened the whole government was going to sink into the ocean? Why? Because we would not raise the debt ceiling. The Republicans said: We have to have some cuts, Mr. President. We have to do something about the debt course. We cannot continue. We are not going to allow you to continue running with the credit card of the people of America if you do not show that you are changing your habits and you are containing some of your lust to spend.

So, finally, an agreement. He hated it worse than anything. Finally, an agreement was done. He signed it. I agree if you will raise my debt ceiling right now, for $2.1 trillion, I promise in the future that I will cut spending $2.1 trillion. Over 10 years. If you let me do it over 10 years, OK, I will sign it. But I have to have my debt ceiling now.

Less than 2 years later we have already increased the debt ceiling $2.1 trillion. We are right up there again having to raise the debt ceiling again. It will be a matter of weeks that this has to be confronted again. Well, what about the spending cuts?

Before the ink was dry on that agreement signed by the President himself—I have the document right here. In blue ink, ''Barack Obama'' right there, agree to cut $2.1 trillion in spending over 10 years. This was not a big cut. If spending were flat for 10 years, we would have spent $37 trillion. As I recall, if under the baseline then in effect we were expected to grow to $49 trillion over 10 years—$49 trillion. This would have reduced it to $47 trillion.

So we reduced the growth of spending from $37 trillion to $47 trillion instead of $49 trillion. You would have thought we were throwing the sink in the country into the ocean. But in January, 6 months later, he proposes a budget which wipes out 60 percent of that agreement, those savings. So I am just going to tell you the way I felt. I have talked to my Republican colleagues. You know, we all—none of us are perfect. Sometimes we make improvident promises. We cannot just fulfill them. We cannot honor them. I try not to do that, but I have done it. Any person who is honest knows they have had to face those choices. But I am not voting to change the sequester. I am prepared to change it, and I support totally the spreading out of the cuts. They are too much on the Defense Department. I can explain how much it hammers the Defense Department. It is not acceptable.

But I am going to tell you, I told the American people that the Congress of the United States agreed to cut $2.1 trillion in exchange for raising the debt ceiling $2.1 trillion. And 6 months later, I am not changing; 18 months later, I am not changing. If we give up on that, we have no credibility whatsoever. The American people should never trust this Congress again. They ought to vote all of us out of office.

That was a solemn promise made before the whole world that we would sustain these cuts. President Obama has not stopped trying to eliminate them. This budget does just that. It eliminates 60 percent of the Budget Control Act cuts. It eliminates the sequester entirely. It is absolutely unacceptable. It will not happen. I do not know why anybody would want to vote for the budget. A vote for this budget is a vote to go back on a promise that was made in August 2011 to act a little bit responsibly when the debt ceiling of the country was raised.

The Wall Street Journal, March 15, right after the budget comes out. They have been very critical. This is just one of them. Well, first, Politico, March 17. A Washington beltway publication, Politico—they like to dig up stuff. This is what they said, ''To win over her caucus, Murray begins from the left of Obama himself.''

Apparently, Politico's conclusion is that the budget that came through committee was driven by people to the left of President Obama. I know this: Last year the chairman of the Budget Committee, Kent Conrad, was prepared to bring a budget to the floor. My staff and I spent weeks preparing for the markup. They met in a Democratic conference. Some of the more liberal members hollered they could not accept Kent Conrad's budget, the Democratic budget he was going to set forth. So they, basically, refused to let him mark up a budget in the Budget Committee and refused to bring it to the floor of the Senate even though U.S. law called for the Budget Committee to have hearings and called for a bill to be brought to the floor. They just refused to do it in violation of plain law.

So the Wall Street Journal said: The bill manages the unique achievement of offering no net nondefense spending cuts and no entitlement reform worth the name, while proposing to raise $1.5 trillion in new tax revenue in such a way that would ruin the prospects for bipartisan tax reform.

Let me stop right there. Our colleagues keep saying we are going to close loopholes and we are going to raise revenue and nobody is going to have to pay more. Well, these loopholes, as Senator GRASSLEY showed us from the Finance Committee chart, these are real serious deductions. They are programs that are deeply entrenched, and many of them our Democratic colleagues have protected and expanded with great tenacity. They will never vote to give them up probably unless some epiphany occurs around here. So how are we going to get tax reform?

Last week at the Budget Committee hearing the chief Democratic witness testified that he believes the corporate tax rate in America was unacceptably high, that we now have the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world, and that 35 percent is not acceptable. He said it needs to be the mid-twenties. This is not the Republican witness, but the Republican witness agreed with him. Most Republicans agreed with this approach. Many of the Democrats did.

So he said: You close loopholes on corporations, make the tax simpler, more growth oriented, you can bring the tax rate down to 25 percent without in any way losing revenue. You can make it revenue neutral. So that was an interesting thing.

I asked him as a followup: But if you close the loopholes on corporations, if you close the loopholes on corporations and raise revenue, do you not need that money so you can reduce the rate from 35 to 25?

He said: Yes. All of it should be dedicated to rate reduction. We have Senator RON WYDEN, a Democratic Senator, Senator MAX BAUCUS, the chairman of the Finance Committee, all believe this needs to be done.

A lot of work has been done on this for several years. The President has even indicated that this is the kind of approach that is worthwhile. But our colleagues, claiming they are going to close loopholes, do not save the money for tax reduction. They want to take the new revenue raised from closing loopholes and spend it. Then it is not available for the bipartisan tax reform to which the Wall Street Journal made a reference.

That is when I asked the witness: Do you not have to save this money to reduce rates at the end of the year?

He said: Yes, you have to save these loopholes, these deductions—really most of them are perfectly legitimate deductions that businesses use. But they are going to take them away from them, in effect raising the amount of taxes they pay. But they were going to bring the rates down.

That is the bipartisan plan that was in the works for a long time. Mr. Kleinbard is our witness. This is what he said: Corporate income tax statutory rate of 35 percent is today far outside world norms. The rate needs to come down. I, therefore, conceive of corporate tax reform as a roughly revenue-neutral undertaking in which the corporate tax base will be broadened through closing business tax expenditures and loopholes and the resulting revenues used to pay down the corporate rate.

That was March 5 in our committee. I know a lot of Senators, Democrats on the committee, agreed with that. If we look at the budget, the new revenue obtained from closing loopholes, really closing deductions and some tax expenditures—liberals have started calling deductions tax expenditures. So if you have a charitable deduction or you have an interest deduction or you have some sort of depreciation as a business, those are not deductions anymore. They have become tax expenditures. So it is like the United States Government is mad at you because you did not send enough money.

But the truth is, it is the corporate person's money or the corporation's money or the private individual's money. When you eliminate his deductions, you make him or her pay more taxes. So Mr. Kleinbard was crystal clear. This is what the bipartisan discussions have been. The Wall Street Journal is exactly right. If you spend that money that you raised from closing loopholes, expenditures, and deductions, you do not have it to reduce rates. You cannot fix the tax reform.

The Wall Street Journal goes on to say:

> As a statement of governing principles, the Senate Democratic budget shows that if they get the chance, they would govern like they did in 2009 and 2010. Much higher taxes to fund much higher spending to finance a much bigger government. It is the status quo only more so.

I have to say, I think that is correct. Hard for me to understand how anybody can dispute that. Next. I have been saying—I have not heard much pushback—that the sequester elimination which allows the expenditure of $1.2 trillion more than we are presently on a path to extend, that this elimination of the sequester was not scored in the Democratic budget.

When I asked the staff members, he said: Well, you know, we never did intend to make that permanent. It was always temporary. Then he said: Well, we got billions of dollars in PAUL RYAN's budgets over here.

I said: No, no. I am talking about this budget. You claim you are not scoring, as an increase in spending, $1.2 trillion, which you allowed to occur by eliminating the reduction in spending required in current law that is part of the law of the United States today and will not be changed?

This is baloney. Surely, Congress will never change this. Surely, we will not go back on the promise we made in 2011 when we raised the debt ceiling. But, anyway, this is what the Associated Press said about it: Because the Democrats want to restore $1.2 trillion in automatic spending cuts over the same period, cuts imposed by Washington's failure to reach a broader budget pact—the committee did not reach an agreement, so these automatic cuts occurred—MURRAY's blueprint increases spending slightly when compared with current policy.

So you take the $1.2 trillion there, and you have tax increases over here, but the increases in spending are greater than the taxes. They conclude that it increases spending overall, increases spending overall.

The chairman, and probably the Budget Committee Members who support this, want to assert somehow this is a one-for-one budget, a balanced plan, a balanced budget amendment. You have $1 trillion in tax increases and $1 trillion in spending cuts, but they are not there.

This chart is a very important chart on the subject I am talking about. It is, I believe, pretty much not disputable. I don't like to raise this, but I am not going to take it.

Mr. Lew came before our committee, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and he said our budget will not add to the debt, spends only money we have and puts us on a path to pay down the deficit.

I asked Mr. Lew—he said it on national television, CNN with Candy Crowley. He said it with other networks too when he announced his budget. Three days later, he was at the Budget Committee. I asked him was that accurate. He said it was accurate.

It absolutely was not accurate. His budget never produced a single year in which the deficit fell below $600 billion. Yet he told the American people squarely in the eye his budget would stop adding to the debt, spend only money we have, and allow us to pay down the debt.

This is one of the greatest misrepresentations in history. We are never going to have bipartisan agreement in this Congress until we learn to be honest about numbers. This budget is not honest about numbers, I need to tell you.

They claim a big savings and big reduction in spending and totally overlook this. Where is the deficit? They claim they reduce the deficit by $ 1.85 trillion, $1.850 billion. Let's look at that number. What about the sequester I have been talking about? They eliminate sequester and spending goes up $1.223 trillion.

Was this scored in their number? No. They tell us we have 1.85, and we have to take off 1.2 because they didn't score the obvious increase in spending that their budget plan for the next 10 years includes. Take that off. We have looked at it more carefully. It took us a while to find this and took a while to get these in the budget numbers, but we have a good staff.

They found out, unlike what we thought at first, there was no pay-for for the doctors. For the last number of years, we found the payment schedule for doctors is totally inadequate based on a law passed in the nineties which has cut their payment to a degree that if we cut them another 20-some-odd percent, they would quit taking patients. They couldn't operate.

We put the money in every year because we need to put the money in or else they will not treat our patients. They can't afford to. Everybody, Republicans and Democrats, we hate it. We wish it weren't so, but it is every year we need to confront this thing which should have long been made a permanent fix. Every year it hasn't been, so every year we need to find the money.

We also found the 2009 stimulus extension in the bill which continued more borrowing and spending for a stimulus was not accounted for. You add those, and there is another $348 billion which ought to be scored. It leaves us with a subtotal of $279 billion. That sounds nice, but that is not correct.

Where are we next? Is there anything in this budget we have found that is not sound, gimmicky, which misrepresents the facts? Yes, there is, a big one. That is the war spending.

President Obama has long been very late in producing his budget. It should have been here in the Senate February 4, and it still hasn't been produced. It is one of the oddest things I have ever seen. He basically punted to the Congress and refused to lay out the budget the law requires him to submit. He violates it all the time.

People ask me all the time, why does the President not follow the law? It is a very bad thing. He should follow the law. He sets a bad example. Children around this country, adults around this country, when they find out the President ignores law, the Senate ignores law, it is not good for America. We are a nation of laws.

The President, the last budget he sent, last January of 1 year ago, he laid out what he projected the costs would be for the war on terror. He is bringing those costs down dramatically, some say too fast, some say not fast enough, but they are coming down dramatically. He projects, however, we are still going to have military efforts against our enemy with whom we are at war, al-Qaida, for the next 10 years.

That costs money. He projected the cost over 10 years for the war on terror would be $467 billion. I think that is pretty close to accurate. You could give or take a little bit, but apparently we are not stopping drone attacks.

I just met with our Ambassador who is negotiating an agreement with Afghanistan. We are projecting to have troops over there for a long time. More and more are in the support role, but it is an expense to maintain the war against terror.

We are free to attack al-Qaida wherever they are. We have people in Iraq, Yemen, Mali, and different places throughout the world where our interests have been threatened, and that costs money.

What did our good friends on the Senate Budget Committee do? They needed more money in savings. They wanted to say they cut spending. They came up with a clever idea; we will just cut all the war spending and pretend we will not spend it. That is it. OK. We will just pretend we are not going to spend that much.

One year from that, the total amount they say we are going to spend over 10 years is not $467 billion, it is 75. The last 8 years will be zero, so we spend 75 over 2 years, and we will not spend any more money. There will be peace in the world, we will not have to chase al-Qaida, we will not need drones, troops, and special forces operating around the world. We will be completely out of Iraq and Afghanistan. Won't that be great? Let's just play it that way.

I have to tell you, they know that is not going to happen. Even President Obama is projecting substantial reductions.

If you take that down, what we find is the budget doesn't reduce the deficit at all. The budget increases the deficit based on the course we are on today, apples to apples, oranges to oranges.

We are not playing around with different baselines to gimmick it up. This is the right way to analyze the situation.

I just have to say, the American people need to know the budget before us does not do what it says it will do. Even what it says it will do is insufficient, but it doesn't come close to doing what it says, and it is not close to doing what is needed. It will never balance the budget, not in 10 years, not in any time. It makes no changes, none, to the deeply troubling surging growth of our entitlement programs, welfare programs, of Medicaid; the 83 means-tested welfare programs which are expected to grow 80 percent over the next 10 years, there are no changes.

There is no reform there we believe in. I am disappointed. Presumably, we may see it pass out of the Senate on a party-line vote, go to the House, and we will see what happens in conference. Could anything come out of conference? It is possible. I am not overconfident, particularly if we can't get Members of the Senate to lay out good numbers.

How can we negotiate with a person such as PAUL RYAN, who absolutely knows what is up and what is down? There is not a person in America who knows the numbers better than PAUL RYAN.

He has integrity. He works hard. He has dedicated himself to mastering this subject. He has mastered it, and he has laid out a plan. I am not saying I agree with everything in his plan. It is not before us. He has laid out a plan. He is prepared to negotiate, to discuss with people who are willing to discuss how to reach some compromise and some consensus on some of the things we need to do. It is very hard to do that if you are putting up bogus numbers such as this.

What about The Hill, another one of the inside Washington publications. On March 13, The Hill reported:

> Murray argues that her budget cuts $1.85 trillion from deficits over 10 years. But once the sequester cuts are turned off, Murray's budget appears to reduce deficits by about $800 billion, using the Congressional Budget Office's baseline. The Murray budget does not contain net spending cuts with the sequester turned off.

We score here about 700 after you take that—645. They estimated 8, but essentially they are making the same point. The budget the Democrats produced did not score the sequester.

As we wrestle with these issues, talking about spending and how we create growth in our economy—and all of us want growth—we just contend growth is better achieved through progrowth policies than by borrowing and spending.

I wish to say there is academic research which validates that opinion. Senator MURRAY's budget, the Democratic budget, proposes yet more stimulus and proposes a 60-percent increase in spending over the next 10 years, a $162 billion increase over next year alone.

This is an increase in spending next year, not a reduction, of 162 next year. It is a fair criticism around here that the only budget that counts is the next year. It does tend to control next year, but it often normally gets altered before the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth, but it doesn't tell us a plan.

I contend reducing excessive spending without increasing taxes makes the economy stronger, not weaker. Let's look at this. Real evidence supports this. It shows reducing spending can help an economy which has too much debt. A Harvard University study which I think all of us have seen, the OECD, developed nations, looked at 107 different periods of fiscal adjustments in these nations.

This is what they have found:

> Spending cuts are much more effective than tax increases in stabilizing the debt and avoiding economic downturn.

I believe that is accurate. If it is, that is very important for us to know. Many countries have reduced spending and had large increases in job growth thereafter.

You would hear our Members say: Oh, you can't cut spending; it will hurt job growth. You could have something in the short term, but these countries have had substantial increases in job growth after cutting spending—Austria, Denmark, Finland, Estonia, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden. This chart gives some of that insight: "Job Gains 5 years After Successful Spending Reductions." Look at these again. Japan in 1987 had an 8.6-percent growth; Canada in 1997 had 11.1 percent; Netherlands in 1997, 9.5 percent; United States in 1997, after spending reductions, 5.2 percent. That is when we were on the path to balance the budget. That was when Newt Gingrich and the House Republicans met with President Clinton and negotiated and fought and wrestled and shut the government down and cut spending and the economy grew. And then Sweden, in 1998, had 6.5 percent growth. The average job growth over these five countries was 8 percent after cutting spending.

One I noticed on here is really something we should consider; that is, the small country of Estonia, which was part of the Soviet Union, dominated by Russia and the Communists. It is a great little country in the Baltics. I was there 2 years ago. Senator Jon Kyl took us there. They had just suffered through the same financial catastrophe in 2007 to 2008 that we had, but it hit them worse. They had a larger drop in GDP than we did, and it was very damaging. They had to decide what to do about it, so they began to consider what to do about it, and they didn't go for this idea that they had to borrow, borrow, borrow so they could keep spending because the revenue had dropped so much and they were going to keep spending at the same level. That isn't what the Estonians decided to do. This new democracy, this free enterprise, this free country, so excited about their future, do you know what they did? They cut spending. They cut spending big time—big time.

This is what a Cabinet member told me. We had dinner, a group of us, and he said Cabinet people had their pay cut 40 percent. He said their pay was cut 40 percent, and he said: But I can tell you who is really mad and giving me a hard time.

I said: Who is that?

He said: My wife. She is a doctor. We hammered them too.

So Estonia hardly had a debt increase at all. Now Estonia has been showing some of the fastest growth of any country in Europe, maybe any country in the developed world. So cutting spending, making their government leaner, more productive, and people taking pay cuts did not destroy their economy. It allowed them to bounce back quite successfully. I am so proud to see their numbers continue to be great economically because they were courageous. The first thing their leaders did was take pay cuts themselves.

Other countries have not followed this path. Other countries haven't tightened their belts or they have relied too heavily on tax increases to reduce deficits. These countries have not fared as well. Greece, Portugal, the United Kingdom and Spain all have had big tax increases as part of their deficit reduction plans, and these results are confirmed by studies at the International Monetary Fund, the University of Chicago, and the University of California.

So we spent $830 billion on stimulus in early 2009. That passed through here without my vote, and I opposed it at the time vigorously. But it was passed, and every dime of it was borrowed. We didn't have the money. We were in debt. But the geniuses said we have to stimulate the economy. Oh, if we don't borrow money and spend it, we will sink into oblivion. It wasn't what Estonia did, but we did that. We spent the money, and we haven't seen the growth we needed. We helped surge our debt.

We continue to spend substantially. We continue to run up debt the likes of which we have never seen before. I believe that debt right now is slowing economic growth and that debt right now could be a threat to our financial security in the future. It is sad to see us go in that direction.

Spending reductions are doable. We can do this. A lot of people think it is not possible. They get depressed, and every time someone talks about spending reductions, people start whining: It can't be done. It can't be done. We will hurt the Defense Department because the cuts on the Defense Department were too great.

But the Defense Department will still be there if we don't fix it the way these cuts are imposed. It will still be there—and who knows, it could be stronger.

I am worried about it. In fact, the way the sequester was crafted, at the request of the President, one-half of all the cuts in the entire $1.2 trillion in cuts fell on the Defense Department, which makes up one-sixth of the Federal Government. So these cuts fell on the Defense Department disproportionately. Medicaid was increasing at 8 percent a year, no cuts; food stamps had gone up from $20 billion to $80 billion in 11 years—fourfold—but got no cuts; and, of course, Social Security had no cuts. There was a 2-percent maximum reduction trim on Medicare providers, which are the doctors and hospitals. They had a minor cut. So a huge portion of the budget had none, but the Defense Department took a huge, huge cut. It was not smart the way we did it, but the amount of cuts, if properly allocated across the entire government's spending, would have little impact on reducing growth but would really begin to solidify public confidence that we have a smart plan to get out of this debt.

If we just slow the spending growth to 3.4 percent a year over the next 10 years, we could balance this budget without raising taxes. You have heard that said. It is true. This is true. We do not have to have substantial spending cuts; we can do it and still have growth.

Some programs need to be cut. Some programs have to be cut. Some programs are growing much faster than 3.4 percent. Medicaid is growing at 8 percent. It needs to be reformed. We can't sustain that kind of increase year after year after year.

Most Americans know the old story about the rule of seven. If you increase something at 7 percent a year on your savings account, it doubles in 10 years. So if you have 8 percent, you are seeing a 117-percent increase in spending over 10 years.

So if we allow 3.4 percent a year in spending growth, that means we would spend $11,000 per person in 2022, 10 years out—$11,000 per person by the Federal Government. That is a higher rate of spending per person than we had in 2007. Yet we are going broke.

We can reduce spending without affecting services. We can. Federal programs—many of them—are very wasteful, very inefficient, duplicative, and subject to fraud. I just held up the GAO 2012 report that listed a pile—page after page—of programs that are wasteful, duplicative, and so forth. We have social service, domestic disaster assistance, Internal Revenue Service enforcement efforts that all have duplicative gaps and are not properly managed. They talk about how the programs are duplicative, how the programs are mismanaged, how they need to be tightened up, and there is a whole list of these things. There are about 50 different major programs—51—that need reform. We haven't done any of that.

What does Congress say to the American people? Well, we don't have time to execute, carry out, or study GAO's report. That is too much work. Just send us more money. No, we don't have time to do this. You don't understand—these little programs, they do not save much money. They do not make any difference. We don't have to focus on them. Send us more money. You have to send us more money.

I think the American people may be getting tired of this.

Nine different agencies, according to GAO, run over 50 job-training programs for people with disabilities. This budget proposes to create more. We had an amendment offered at the Budget Committee that would create another job program. I mean, we have them all over the place. It sounded like a good idea. Something good happened in some State, so we have a plan to offer Federal legislation to do it here or expand it.

Last year alone, Washington paid out $44 billion to people who, through deceit or error, did not deserve Medicare payments. Let me repeat. Forty-four billion dollars was paid out to people who, through deceit or error, did not deserve Medicare payments. That is more money than we spend running our national parks, the FBI, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Army Corps of Engineers' civil works projects, and the Internal Revenue Service combined. Forty-four billion is a lot. That is just about what the Federal highway budget is—$44 billion. Fraud, deceit, and error out the door in Medicare alone.

Well, Mr. President, we have been at it a long time. I am very unhappy that the budget process has been shifted to the end of the week. I am very unhappy that we are at a point where we are not going to have as full a debate because people are going to be stressed, they are going to be here at night and maybe into the weekend. Somebody may say: Well, SESSIONS, it is your fault. Why don't you just yield back this time? But it would take every Senator here to yield back the time. And if I did, I am sure somebody would object. And I am not yielding back time now.

We have problems. We can yield, we can work through the night, we can compromise tonight and maybe save a few hours, or we can work to be as accommodating to our colleagues as we can. I am willing to do that. But I just have to say that this budget should have been up earlier. We should have reached an agreement with Senators MORAN and AYOTTE and given them amendments early in the week or last week, and we could have had the budget up Monday. We wouldn't have had all this fuss. We would have had Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and we would have had a full day, completed all amendments, and been out of here. But, oh no, I think there is something to the fact that it was considered to be a good idea just to carry this budget over to the end of the week and that Senators would want to leave and we would just wrap it all up, do it in the dead of night so the American people wouldn't see, perhaps, what is going to be done, wouldn't pay much attention to the votes, and we could get out of here and do the least possible public discussion of this bad budget that we can.

Now, some might say: Well, that is really not so.

I think it is so. We haven't had a budget on the floor for 4 years. Why? Senator REID said publicly that it is foolish to have a budget. Why did he say that? He meant it was foolish politically. I have said this before. He knows how I feel about it.

He said it was foolish—politically, basically—to have a budget. Why? Because writing a budget requires a party to lay out their vision for the future, to be prepared to defend it in public debate, and to have amendments on it. He has been controlling this Senate to a degree no majority leader has ever controlled the Senate, and the one thing he is not able to control is the budget process: You have 50 hours and virtually unlimited amendments. He didn't want to do that. So he was willing to violate the law of the United States and not bring up a budget so he wouldn't have to do this.

Finally, this year the House got fed up. They have been passing an honest budget that lays out a future plan for America. They have defended it publicly. They have taken unfair attacks and abuse for doing their duty every year—like they are supposed to do.

So they sent over a bill this year. It said: No budget, no pay, Congress. If you don't bring up your budget, you don't get paid. So now we have a budget for the first time in 4 years. Maybe the House should be given a medal for that.

But I am not happy. I don't believe we are doing this right. I was disappointed that for the first time in 3 years, when a budget was brought up in the Senate committee, we had statements made one afternoon for a few hours before we even saw the chairman's mark. It was produced after that, and we had 1 day—the next day—to offer amendments. That wasn't a very good process, in my view.

If we really want to deal with the debt—the greatest danger of our time—and deal with it properly, why wouldn't we want to have an open public hearing? Why wouldn't we have had expert witnesses all year to help talk to us? We had a few hearings, but we could have had a lot more because this has complex questions for us to decide. We should have had more time in committee, and we should have had full time on the floor of the Senate. So I don't make any bones about it. I wish we had done it differently.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT'S MIDDLE EAST TRIP

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, President Obama arrived in the Middle East today. It is his first visit as President to Israel and the West Bank.

Some in the press have focused on the fact that the White House has lowered expectations for what will be accomplished in the 3 days of the President's visit. Others, including Members of Congress, have signed letters to the President.

Rather than prejudge what can be achieved by this trip or try to tie the President's hands concerning the Middle East, I want to simply make a few straightforward points.

First, no one who knows the Middle East can honestly expect momentous accomplishments from a short visit like this, especially when the new Israeli Government is still in the process of forming. But despite that, it is very positive that the President is traveling to the region, and this is as good a time as any.

Second, the peace process, as we have come to refer to it, between Israelis and Palestinians has been stalled for a dozen years. In many ways the prospects for an end to the conflict are worse today than in the mid-1990s, and there is plenty of blame to go around. Just traveling to Israel and the West Bank reaffirms this administration's interest in helping the parties find ways to make progress on the key issues. Ultimately, however, it is up to them, not the United States, to resolve their differences.

Third, it reaffirms President Obama's longstanding support for Israel. While during the Presidential campaign there were shameful attempts to portray the President as somehow not committed enough or supportive enough of Israel, that was pure politics. The record is abundantly clear that he has been, is—and, there is every reason to believe, will continue to be—a strong supporter of Israel. Top Israeli officials have acknowledged this.

That is not to say that we and the Israeli Government are going to agree on every issue. Israel and the United States share fundamental interests, but we are different countries and sometimes our interests diverge. That is to be expected.

Fourth, the President's visit is an opportunity for Israelis and Palestinians to recognize that the status quo is unsustainable. Maintaining this untenable limbo is neither in their interests nor in the interests of our great Nation. Unilateral actions by either side are harmful to the peace process. Rhetoric that dehumanizes or demonizes the other is harmful. Settlement construction in disputed territory is harmful. Incitement to violence is harmful. Both sides need to demonstrate that they want lasting peace through negotiations.

The President will also visit Jordan, which is facing increasing pressure from the flood of Syrian refugees, an issue that concerns us all. The fiscal year 2013 continuing resolution that is expected to pass the Senate this week includes additional assistance for Jordan and for Syria's other neighbors to help address these needs.

And, of course, there are growing concerns about Iran's nuclear program. I believe the President has wisely proceeded with caution in the way his administration has responded to this grave threat. While some have urged the President to adopt a purely military policy toward Iran, the advice of our top military leaders is restraint. We should exhaust other means at our disposal to try to convince Iran to abandon its nuclear ambitions and to avoid another war in that part of the world.

Mr. President, I commend President Obama for traveling to the Middle East. Real peace with enduring security between Israelis and Palestinians has long been and remains a key goal of the United States. It is one toward which the Congress and the administration should work together.

FREE SPEECH IN THE AMERICAS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there is much at the Organization of American States that needs to be reformed, but the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, IACHR, is not among them. Yet that is what the Government of Ecuador and some other Latin American governments purport to be calling for when the OAS general assembly meets this coming Friday.

In reality, it is not about reform at all but a concerted effort to severely weaken the IACHR, the one institution in the Americas that has been a consistent, strong defender of free expression and other fundamental human rights that have been too often denied by those same governments.

I have spoken previously about the courageous work of Colombian lawyer Dr. Catalina Botero, the special rapporteur for freedom of expression. I have also spoken about the efforts by Ecuador's President Rafael Correa to intimidate and control what remains of an independent press in his country. So I will not repeat myself here.

But the United States is the largest contributor to the OAS, and we have provided additional funds in recent years to support the critically important work of the IACHR. I want to be sure Senators are aware of what is happening, as it could have serious consequences for our future support for the OAS. I ask unanimous consent that an article in the Washington Post by Cesar Gaviria Trujillo, former President of Colombia and Secretary General of the OAS, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Washington Post, Mar. 19, 2013]

MUZZLING A FREE-SPEECH CHAMPION

(By César Gaviria Trujillo)

César Gaviria Trujillo is a former president of Colombia and past secretary general of the Organization of American States.

A historic showdown set to occur at Friday's meeting of the general assembly of the Organization of American States could determine the future of human rights protections throughout the Western Hemisphere.

A group of nations led by Ecuador is pushing to "reform" the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and its office on freedom of expression. The purported aim of these changes is to "strengthen" human rights protections. If implemented, however, the reforms will severely weaken the commission and make it easier for governments to ignore basic rights and limit free speech.

When I served as president of Colombia from 1990 to 1994, I saw how difficult it could be for national institutions to evolve and change without external pressure. As secretary general of the OAS between 1994 and 2004, I saw firsthand how effective the Inter-American Commission could be in providing this pressure when nations needed help to move forward on human rights.

The commission has played a crucial role, particularly in defending the principles of the Inter-American Democratic Charter. It has pressed for transparency and fair elections, and, equally important, it has intervened when governments sought to undermine judicial independence or free speech. A genuine democracy requires checks and balances as well as freedom of the press.

The changes being promoted would drastically curtail the autonomy that has been critical to the Inter-American Commission's success. One proposal would prevent the commission from obtaining funds from outside the region, effectively putting a financial stranglehold on the panel. As of this year, about a third of the commission's budget comes from Europe.

This measure would have a devastating impact, especially on the commission's Special Rapporteurship for Freedom of Expression, which for many years has led the fight for press freedoms throughout the region and has served as a constant thorn in the side of governments that do not believe in free speech. The office stands to lose virtually all of its budget, making it easier for governments to prosecute their critics, impose censorship and close independent media outlets.

Another reform under consideration would prevent states that have not ratified the American Convention on Human Rights from nominating members to the commission. This measure appears to be designed to limit the involvement of the United States and Canada, neither of which has ratified the convention though they are nonetheless subject to its monitoring and, most important, are major sources of financial and political support for its work.

Our region has made important progress on human rights since the dark days of the Cold War. Nearly all of this hemisphere's dictatorships have been replaced by democracies. Yet these democracies have at times trampled on free speech and other fundamental rights. The Inter-American human rights system is the best mechanism we have for ensuring that governments in the Americas do a better job of protecting these rights and freedoms.

So far, only a handful of countries have joined Ecuador in this determined effort to weaken our regional human rights system. Those governments that are truly committed to human rights and democracy must stand up for the commission this week and put an end to this ill-conceived campaign.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, during the past 50 years there has been significant progress in improving living standards in developing countries. Some of the successes have been particularly noteworthy: eradicating smallpox and almost eradicating polio, stabilizing population growth rates in many areas, longer life spans, lower infant mortality, fewer people living in poverty, the expansion of democracy.

Investments in international development made by government agencies, nonprofits, businesses, and philanthropic foundations in the United States and around the world have made a difference. Our country is more secure and our economy more resilient than it would otherwise be, thanks to these investments.

Yet there is plenty of room for improvement to get better value for our overseas investments, particularly to increase the sustainability of the assistance we provide. Too often we set unrealistic goals, do not hold governments accountable for corruption, ignore local input, and channel our aid through contractors that charge high fees and put profit over results.

There are other critical areas that have not received nearly the attention they deserve, either by our government or other donors, including the explosive growth of cities and the world's changing climate.

The President mentioned the looming threat of climate change in his inauguration speech, and like many others I am glad he did. To date, our efforts to address this global challenge have been painfully slow and woefully inadequate. As anyone who works the land will tell you, the world's climate is changing fast—spring is coming earlier, polar ice and glaciers are melting, and storms are more violent. Scientists say these changes are potentially catastrophic, and that we will experience even more frequent severe weather events, shrinking water supplies, more intense heat waves and droughts, the spread of disease, and more and more threats to food production.

It is the poorest people who are most vulnerable to these phenomena, and who are most likely to be uprooted from their homes as a result. If the international community does not mobilize quickly to address this challenge we risk the reversal of many or most of the international development gains of the last 50 years, leaving an unprecedented crisis for our children and future generations.

Then there is the related challenge of urbanization. I am proud to say that a Vermont organization called the Institute for Sustainable Communities, founded by former Vermont Governor Madeleine Kunin, is leading an effort to accelerate climate solutions among more than 320 U.S. cities—and the list is growing. The institute is focusing on cities because it is in densely populated areas that the opportunity to quickly strengthen climate resilience and reduce greenhouse gas emissions is greatest. This work should be expanded on a global scale.

Currently, only a very small percentage of international development dollars is spent to address problems in urban areas, yet 70 percent of the world's population will live in cities by 2030. The number of people migrating to New Delhi, Mumbai, Dhaka, Lagos, Kinshasa, and Karachi each year is greater than the entire population of Europe. Between now and 2030—only 17 years—the world will need to build a city of 1 million people every 5 days to keep up with the urbanization of the developing world. That is a staggering and frightening statistic.

Those cities are not remotely prepared to handle this flood of desperate people. These are not places like Boston or London, Washington or Paris that expanded gradually over centuries becoming stronger as they grew. Cities in developing countries expand through shantytowns, like the vast slums of Nairobi and Lagos. And bit by bit, the edges of the city creep out and suddenly the city's size has doubled, or quadrupled. Closer to home, Tijuana, on the United States Mexican border, is one of Mexico's fastest growing cities. Tijuana adds about 80,000 people each year, and is projected to be the second largest city in Mexico by 2030. Many of its inhabitants arrive with no place to live and no job. The city's infrastructure is utterly unprepared to handle them. It is a recipe for crime and misery.

Slums are not infrastructure, and in general most infrastructure decisions are not well planned. Most of the developing world does not have running water or reliable electricity, and nearly 40 percent of the world's population does not have access to basic sanitation, including 1 billion children. That number is likely to rise as rapidly expanding cities become even less able to meet the demand for basic sanitation and health care.

This immense growth in cities is a cauldron for chaos and instability. People living in cities without safe water or electricity, plagued by hunger, disease and unhealthy living conditions, threatened by rising sea levels and violent storms—these desperate conditions are likely to lead to violence, displacement, and even the toppling of governments.

Rapid urbanization is already putting tremendous pressure on the environment and threatens productive farmland. What will happen when there is not enough food or water for cities filled with millions of people? What will happen if the population of Jakarta doubles without an improvement in living conditions?

Yet as cities grow we also have an opportunity to prevent chaos. Growing cities are going to be constructing new buildings—let's make sure they are energy efficient. They are going to be creating new transport systems—let's focus on low-carbon strategies that move people, not just cars. They are going to need to feed hundreds of millions of hungry people—let's make sure urban centers are connected to the rural economy in a sustainable way. And as they build new infrastructure, let's make sure that it is designed to support livable communities and built in ways that are more resilient to extreme weather and sea level rise.

Investing in cities gives us economies of scale. We can accomplish a great deal through investing in efficient infrastructure, and we can apply lessons learned all across the developing world. An estimated 60 percent of the infrastructure needed to keep pace with the growth in urban centers has not been built yet, but it will be by 2030.

Let's focus on helping cities build smarter. It is a lot easier and cheaper to build it right the first time, than to go back and fix it later. And here in the United States there are companies that produce some of the world's best technology and some of the world's best thinking about creating smart cities. Together with our international partners we can meet this challenge if we share our expertise.

International donors, led by the U.S. Agency for International Development, should devote a larger portion of resources and effort to addressing the urgent problems of climate change and rapid urbanization. It is a critical investment for the 21st century.

VERMONTERS MAKING A DIFFERENCE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have been privileged to serve Vermonters for many years as a voice on foreign policy matters, and I am always reminded that my work is a reflection of the outward looking posture of the people of my State. Vermonters have a long history of defending human rights and social justice at home and abroad. The longest functioning international exchange program is based in Vermont, and there are over 3,600 nonprofits registered in Vermont that are carrying out programs to protect the environment, support public health, and many other activities here and abroad.

These small businesses help bring Vermont values to such far off places as Vietnam, central Africa, the Middle East, and Central America. One example of the far-reaching contributions Vermont small businesses make every day is the BOMA Project. Based in Manchester, VT, Kathleen Colson started the BOMA Project in the mid-2000s as a way to help women in Kenya escape extreme poverty. Kathleen's company replaces loans with grants and creates opportunities for these women to start small, sustainable income-generating businesses. To date, her company has launched over 1,100 micro-enterprises across northern Kenya.

Other examples of Vermont organizations doing innovative work to improve the lives of people overseas are the Institute for Sustainable Communities, Pure Water for the World, Clear Path International, the ARAVA Institute for Environmental Studies, and World Learning. And there are many others.

A February 10, 2013, article by the Associated Press quoted Peace Corps recruiter Brian Melman as he spoke about the people who work with these Vermont organizations: "These are people who are willing to think big with small resources. They will go out of their way to make relationships with anyone that they can and to make believers out of all they come across because the passion is so genuine.'' That article, entitled ''Vt. home to many worldwide development groups,'' is notable because it points out the many ways our small State has contributed in a big way to those less fortunate all across the globe. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Associated Press, Feb. 10, 2013]

VT. HOME TO MANY WORLDWIDE DEVELOPMENT GROUPS

(By Wilson Ring)

DORSET, VT. (AP).—From a converted garage in Dorset, James Hathaway helps rid Afghanistan and Vietnam of land mines. A few miles away in Manchester, Kathleen Colson helps women in northern Kenya start businesses.

They are just a few of the nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations that call Vermont home while doing work worldwide in fields as varied as promoting democracy or clean water. Besides working on development projects in some of the remotest and neediest parts of the globe, the organizations are also pumping millions of dollars and hundreds of jobs into the Vermont economy.

''These are people who are willing to think big with small resources. They will go out of their way to make relationships with anyone that they can and to make believers out of all they come across because the passion is so genuine,'' said Peace Corps recruiter Brian Melman, who earned a graduate degree at the University of Vermont in Burlington and has also lived in Montpelier.

''There are people in Vermont who accomplish amazing things with just about nothing,'' he said.

While many of the organizations are small, taken as a whole, Vermont's international nonprofit sector appears to boost the state's economy.

Though precise figures for international nonprofits are hard to come by, a 2011 Vermont Community Foundation report found that 3,626 domestic and international nonprofit organizations bring $2.5 billion to the state, about 12 percent of the gross state product.

Some groups do local fundraisers. Others attract grant money from foundations while the larger ones work on contracts with government agencies.

The Montpelier-based Institute for Sustainable Communities, formed in 1991, does environmental, health care and other projects in Serbia, China, India and Bangladesh. It's working with Burlington's Champlain College to learn more about the international organizations in Vermont.

''There's a wealth of global experience hidden in our hills and valleys, and most people don't know it,'' said vice president Barbara McAndrew. ''Putting together a real picture of Vermont's international footprint helps us build connections between people working in the same regions. It can raise our profile with national and international funders and it helps us attract and retain talented people.''

Melman said that the same sense of community and the desire to help that he sees in Peace Corps volunteers is what led Vermonters to form nonprofits, in many cases based on work they did while overseas in the Peace Corps or other service. Vermont, per capita, produces more Peace Corps volunteers than any other state.

Burlington, he said, ''was just absolutely awash with nonprofits,'' Melman said. ''We used to joke that there were more nonprofits than people.''

One of Vermont's first international NGOs was the Brattleboro-based organization now known as World Learning. The organization employs 185 people and does work with education, exchange, and development programs in more than 60 countries. It was founded in 1932.

''Even back then, Vermont was attracting innovative, different thinking individuals,'' said Simon Norton of World Learning.

Norton, who lives in Nevada but travels to Vermont frequently, said there are pockets across the country that have ''the same vibe'' as Vermont and have many groups working across the globe. He mentioned the San Francisco area; parts of Seattle; Flagstaff, Ariz.; Boulder, Colo.; and Asheville, N.C. In Vermont, it's statewide.

''People choose to either stay or move to Vermont for those small-town community values,'' he said.

Colson fits the profile. She said she got her first taste of Africa through a program offered by her college and later spent 25 years in Africa running safaris. In the mid-2000s she branched out and started working on a program that helps women start tiny income-generating businesses in areas where opportunities are otherwise unavailable. Now her program, the BOMA Project, has a staff of four.

A native of western New York, she and her husband moved back to the U.S. to raise their children in a small town similar to where she grew up.

Colson now spends about three months a year in Kenya where she travels with an armed bodyguard.

''To be able to be in that place and then come home to Vermont . . . all of a sudden you are in one of the safest places on the planet,'' Colson said.

Many of the organizations are in Vermont's larger communities, but others are on back roads. Hathaway helped found Clear Path International in the converted garage outside his Dorset home in 2000, where he still works as its communications director. The organization's main office has since moved to Bainbridge Island, Wash.

Rutland-based Pure Water for the World, which helps provide clean water to communities in Honduras and Haiti, employs three people in Vermont and about 25 overseas. It has a budget this year of $1.2 million, much of which comes from individual donations, said the group's executive director, Carolyn Crowley Meub.

''I know individuals who have a small NGO they run from their living room and are doing all kinds of interesting work from these seemingly small, sleepy towns that are incredibly connected to the world,'' said Norton.

BIG SKY CONFERENCE CHAMPIONS

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, Johnny Wooden, the 10-time national championship winning coach of UCLA, once said: ''The main ingredient of stardom is the rest of the team.''

It takes a little star power and teamwork to win 10 championships, but it takes something extra special to win the Big Sky Coach of the Year Award 20 times. That is Lady Griz Coach Robin Selvig.

Coach Selvig hails from Outlook, MT. He has true grit. He grew up north of the Hi-Line. I know the occupant of the chair knows where the Hi-Line is. That is up in northern Montana. There is a Hi-Line across Montana that even stretches over Highway 2 over into North Dakota.

Under Coach Selvig's leadership, the Lady Griz have made it to the Big Dance 20 times in the NCAA's 32-year history. Selvig has 798 wins in 35 seasons.

I also rise to honor Montana Grizzly men's basketball coach Ben Tinkle. Coach Tinkle was also honored this week as the Big Sky's Coach of the Year for the men's basketball program. Coach Tinkle is leading the team to their second trip in a row to the NCAA tournament, after winning a dramatic Big Sky Conference championship against Weber State. Jordan Gregory's free throws in the final seconds of the game were icing on the cake that pulled the Griz ahead to win the game. The Griz basketball teams have had many spectacular seasons. And the Congress, I might add, could learn a lesson or two from the Big Sky Conference basketball champions. Both programs join a long tradition of excellence and a long tradition of teamwork that makes Montana proud. That is why they win games. These teams have shown a dedication to their school, their fans, their studies, and their community that is a reflection of our Montana values.

As both the Lady Griz and the Grizzly Men's basketball teams head into the NCAA tournament this week, I take this opportunity to publicly congratulate each player on the roster, the coaching staff, and the entire University of Montana community for this terrific season. I join Montanans in celebrating their teamwork and wishing them the best.

Go Griz.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the players and coaches be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

12–2013 UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

COACHES

Wayne Tinkle—Head Coach
Jonathan Metzger-Jones—Assistant Coach
Freddie Owens—Assistant Coach
Kerry Rupp—Assistant Coach
Matt Erickson—Director of Basketball Operations
Joey Petschl—Manager

PLAYERS

Will Cherry
Spencer Coleman
Keron DeShields
Nick Emerson
Jordan Gregory
Kevin Henderson
Eric Hutchison
Kareem Jamar
Andy Martin
Mathias Ward
Michael Weisner
Jake Wiley
Morgan Young

2012–2013 UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

COACHES

Robin Selvig—Head Coach

Annette Rocheleau—Assistant Coach
Shannon Schweyen—Assistant Coach
Trish Duce—Assistant Coach

PLAYERS

Katie Baker
Kellie Cole
Kenzie De Boer
Hannah Doran
McCalle Feller
Shanae Gilham
Torry Hill
Alexandra Hurley
Molly Klinker
DJ Reinhardt
Maggie Rickman
Carly Selvig
Alyssa Smith
Rachel Staudacher
Jordan Sullivan
Haley Vining

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT STEVEN BLASS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the life of SSG Steven Blass, who was killed in a helicopter crash in Afghanistan while serving his country. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Tricia, his young son Hayden, his parents, Randy and Carol, and all his family and friends. I know they are feeling his loss very deeply now, as is the entire community of Estherville, IA, his hometown. I understand that Steven Blass was patriotic even as a child and that joining the Army had been a dream of his. He was doing what he loved when he gave the ultimate sacrifice. His love of country and zeal for freedom represent the very best of America. Like all the patriots before him, his sacrifice has helped keep the torch of liberty burning bright. The United States of America is indeed fortunate to have a native son like Steven Blass, eager to serve his country and risk everything for his fellow citizens. We are forever in his debt. Although it is a debt which we can never repay, it is a debt we must honor by remembering SSG Steven Blass and what he did for all of us.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this Saturday marks the third anniversary of the passage of the Affordable Care Act. At age 3, the law is protecting consumers against abusive insurance practices, helping seniors by lowering prescription drug costs, and building the infrastructure to expand health insurance coverage to millions of Americans. For the first time, patients' interests and needs are being put ahead of those of the insurance and drug companies.

The Obama administration has worked tirelessly to implement the law, in the face of constant opposition. My Republican colleagues in Congress have voted to repeal or defund the Affordable Care Act well over 30 times. It is a chilling, if useless, political refrain from the tea party.

On this third anniversary, it is important not only to reflect on how far we have come but to continue pressing forward on the Affordable Care Act's many improvements to our health care system, particularly the delivery system reforms.

The Council of Economic Advisers' 2013 ''Economic Report of the President'' identified a number of sources of waste in our health care system, including the fragmentation of the delivery system; duplicate care and overtreatment; the failure of providers to adopt best practices; and payment fraud. The council notes:

> Taken together, [these factors] have been estimated to account for between 13 and 26 percent of national health expenditures in 2011. The magnitude of this waste offers an equally large opportunity for spending reductions and improvement in quality of care an opportunity that underpins many of the provisions of the Affordable Care Act.

Thankfully, we have the tools necessary to seize the opportunity described by the Council of Economic Advisers to drive down costs and improve the quality of patient care. The Affordable Care Act included 45 provisions dedicated to improving the way we deliver health care in 5 priority areas: payment reform, primary and preventive care, measuring and reporting quality, administrative simplification, and health information technology.

The effort to extract from the wasteful swamp of our health care bureaucracy a lean, humane, patient-centered system is vital. National health spending hit $2.7 trillion in 2011 or about 18 percent of GDP. The next least efficient developed country—the Netherlands—spent 12 percent of its GDP on health care in 2010. Germany and France spent 11.6 percent of their GDP on health care. If we were as efficient as the Netherlands, if we merely moved from last place to second-to-last place in health care efficiency, we would save over $800 billion per year.

For all of our excess spending, one might expect that Americans live longer, healthier lives. But that is not the case. The Institute of Medicine recently compared the United States to 17 peer countries. We were worst for prevalence of diabetes among adults, worst for obesity across all age groups, and worst in infant mortality. We suffer higher death rates and worse outcomes for conditions such as heart disease and chronic lung disease.

According to the Week, avoidable infections passed on due to poor hospital hygiene kill as many people in the United States—about 103,000 a year—as AIDS, breast cancer, and auto accidents combined. These deaths are tragic because they are largely preventable. As we have shown in Rhode Island, when hospital staff follow a checklist of basic instructions washing their hands with soap, cleaning a patient's skin with antiseptic, placing sterile drapes over the patient, etc.—rates of infection plummet, and the costs of treating those infections disappear. The costs of treating the 100,000 who die, as well as the hundreds of thousands who suffer nonlethal infections, disappear.

Delivery system reform has real promise in improving the management and prevention of chronic disease. These diseases accounted for 7 out of 10 deaths in the United States in 2011 and at least 75 percent of our health care spending.

I am not alone in saying that a correct diagnosis of the problem will lead us to delivery system reform. Gail Wilensky, the former Administrator of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services under President George H.W. Bush, said in 2011, ''If we don't redesign what we are doing, we can't just cut unit reimbursement and think we are somehow getting a better system.''

In the private sector, George Halvorson, chairman and CEO of Kaiser Permanente said, ''There are people right now who want to cut benefits and ration care and have that be the avenue to cost reduction in this country and that's wrong. It's so wrong, it's almost criminal. It's an inept way of thinking about health care.''

Saving money by reforming how we deliver health care isn't just possible, it is happening. At a 2011 hearing I chaired of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, Greg Poulsen of Intermountain Healthcare said:

> Intermountain and other organizations have shown that improving quality is compatible with lowering costs and, indeed, high-quality care is generally less expensive than substandard care.

So when Republicans say we must cut Medicare and Medicaid benefits to fix our deficit, that assertion is flat-out wrong.

Attacking Medicare and Medicaid is consistent with a particular political ideology, but it is not consistent with the facts. It ignores the fact that we operate a wildly inefficient health care system and that our health care spending problem is systemwide, not unique to Federal health programs. It is not just Medicare and Medicaid; former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said of the Defense budget, ''We're being eaten alive by health care.''

The President's Council of Economic Advisers estimates that we could save approximately $700 billion every year in our health care system without compromising health outcomes. The Institute of Medicine recently put this number at $750 billion. Other groups are even more optimistic: The New England Healthcare Institute has reported that $850 billion could be saved annually. The Lewin Group and former Bush Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill have estimated annual savings of a staggering $1 trillion. Most recently, the Commonwealth Fund laid out a set of policies that would accelerate health care delivery system reform and slow health spending by $2 trillion over the next 10 years.

These savings will have a dramatic impact on the Federal budget. The Federal Government spends 40 percent of

America's health care expenditures. If the estimate by the Council of Economic Advisers is correct, we could reduce the Federal deficit by up to $280 billion per year. If we achieve only one-quarter of the Council of Economic Advisers' estimate, the Federal savings would be $70 billion annually. Over a 10-year budget period, that amounts to $700 billion in Federal health care savings all without taking away any benefits, all while likely improving quality of care.

In a report I issued last year for the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, I found that the administration has made considerable progress on implementing the 45 delivery system reform provisions in the law. But more can and must be done. Specifically, I again urge the administration to set a cost-savings target for health care delivery system reform. A cost-savings target will focus, guide, and spur the administration's efforts in a manner that vague intentions to ''bend the health care cost curve'' will not. As the Commonwealth Fund concluded, ''The establishment of targets can serve both as a metric to guide policy development and as an incentive for all involved parties to act to make them effective.''

In 1961, President Kennedy declared that within 10 years the United States would put a man on the Moon and return him safely. The message—and the mission outlined—was clear. The result was a vast mobilization of private and public resources to achieve that purpose.

This administration has a similar opportunity—particularly now, at the height of the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. We need to put the full force of American innovation and ingenuity into achieving a serious cost-savings target for our Nation's health care system. But it is hard to do that if they won't set one.

I urge the administration to set a cost-savings target, with a number and a date. And then let's get to work to give American families the health care system they deserve. Instead of waste and inefficiency, poor outcomes and missed opportunities, we would have a health care system that is the envy of the world.

ADDITIONAL SATEMENTS

MUSIC EDUCATION

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise with great pride that my home State of West Virginia received special recognition today for its support of music education in our public school system. The recognition came from three organizations that are committed to music education—the VH1 Save The Music Foundation, the National Association of Music Merchants—NAMM, and the National Association for Music Education—NAfME.

I want to extend my personal thanks to the leaders of all three organizations for recognizing West Virginia, for their support of our efforts to rebuild music programs in our State and for making a special day even more special—with an award ceremony today that included performances by singer-songwriter Vanessa Carlton, jazz guitarist and former New York Yankees champion Bernie Williams and Red Hot Chili Peppers drummer Chad Smith.

I enjoyed their performances, but I also was moved by their stories of personal and professional benefits from their music education. Their stories made clear how the opportunity to learn about the arts and to perform as an artist helps students' ideas and realities beyond words and numbers in textbooks.

But even more special was the fact that the Save The Music award ceremony included a performance from a student jazz ensemble from Shepherdstown Middle School, which received a VH1 Save The Music grant in 2012. I was so proud to listen to these young musicians. They are a wonderful example of the extraordinary way music can impact the lives of students, not just in West Virginia but all over the country.

I would like to congratulate these students on their performance today and on their many accomplishments leading up to this special day—and I wish them many more successes in the future. Also, I would like to especially thank Shepherdstown Middle School Principal Elizabeth Best and Shepherdstown music teacher Mrs. Chad Conant for their generous contributions and assistance.

On behalf of the State of West Virginia, I was honored to accept, along with fellow West Virginia Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER and Randall Reid-Smith, Commissioner of the West Virginia Division of Culture and History, a Support Music Award from NAMM, which works in partnership with the VH1 Save The Music Foundation and NAfME.

I deeply appreciate the acknowledgement of our efforts to support music education. And, of course, I deeply appreciate the contributions to music education that these organizations make in West Virginia and throughout the United States.

The VH1 Save the Music Foundation is a nonprofit organization dedicated to restoring instrumental music education programs in America's public schools, and raising awareness about the importance of music as part of each child's complete education. To date, VH1 Save the Music has provided more than $49.5 million in new musical instruments to 1,850 public schools in more than 192 school districts around the country, impacting the lives of over 2.1 million children. Research sponsored by NAMM shows clearly that students participating in music education do better in school and go on to college.

Since 2009, the VH1 Save the Music Foundation has given instrumental music education grants valued at $1.05 million to 35 schools in 30 counties throughout West Virginia. And I am informed that the Foundation is committed to funding music education in all 55 counties of the Mountain State. This initiative started when I was Governor, and I am pleased to see it moving forward so positively.

This collaboration is a true example of the huge benefits of public-private partnerships. It is also a strong incentive for all of us to work for more Federal and State funding to enhance music education in our public schools.

In today's global economy, creativity is essential. Consequently, education in the arts is more important than ever because education in the arts helps students be inventive, resourceful and imaginative. Music education is not just a privilege—it is essential.•

REMEMBERING VIRGINIA ''GINNY'' HILL WOOD

• Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Virginia ''Ginny'' Hill Wood. On March 8, 2013, Ginny passed away at the young age of 95. Alaska lost a true pioneer and advocate for Alaska's wilderness. The Alaskan outdoors was always at the center of her life; she guided her last backcountry trip at age 70, cross-country skied into her mid-80s, and gardened into her early 90s.

Born Virginia Hill on October 24, 1917, Ginny grew up in Washington and Oregon, where she fell in love with the outdoors. She took her first plane ride at the early age of 4 sitting in her father's lap as they flew with a barnstorming pilot. Ginny attended Washington State University, and in 1938 she took a break when she biked through Europe for a year before resuming her studies at the University of Washington. She was eager to pursue her passion for flying, and joined the Civilian Pilot Training Service in college. During World War II, she enrolled in the Women Airforce Service Pilots corps, known as WASP, and ferried all types of military planes throughout the Lower 48.

Her flying and sense of adventure brought her north to Alaska. Ginny landed, literally, in Fairbanks, AK at Weeks Field on a very cold New Year's Day in 1947—along with fellow pilot and great friend Celia Hunter in a second aircraft. Her arrival in Fairbanks when the town was just barely out of its rough mining camp days is illustrative of her pioneering spirit. People were not flocking to Fairbanks in January of 1947, and it was especially rare to find a female pilot. She soon began flying tourists from Fairbanks to Kotzebue. In the late 1940's Ginny took a bicycling tour throughout postwar Europe with Celia Hunter, and when asked where she was from, Ginny would say ''Alaska.''

In 1950, Ginny married Morton ''Woody'' Wood, a forest ranger at Mt. McKinley National Park. On a rainy day in the summer of 1951, Ginny, Woody, and Celia arrived near the northern boundary of Mt. McKinley National Park in search of some land to homestead within view of Denali. That fall, Celia Hunter homesteaded 67 acres. Together, the founders built Camp Denali with locally-harvested spruce logs and reclaimed materials from the National Park Service, often with the help of friends and visitors, who would drop in just to look, but would stay to help haul logs. Ginny and Celia ran Camp Denali for 25 years, operating the remote tourist resort, forging livelihoods out of ingenuity, hospitality, and love of the land.

Ginny was a committed, persistent, eloquent voice for conservation issues in Alaska. She was not afraid to speak on behalf of her values, and will be remembered in part as Alaska's pioneer conservationist. Her independent lifestyle, from building cabins, flying in the bush, and guiding in the Brooks Range and ANWR has inspired and served as an example for those around her. Her service as a WASP earned her a Congressional Gold Medal. She also received the Alaska-Siberia Lend Lease Award for her flying in 2002. I had the honor of presenting Ginny her Congressional Gold Medal at her cabin in Fairbanks in 2010 as she was unable to attend the ceremony in Washington, DC. Pouring through her scrapbook and listening to her stories was a visit I will always remember.

Though many have noted that she served as a role model for other women, Ginny stated that ''I did what I wanted to do and I happened to be a woman.'' I admired her strong commitment to protecting the beauty of Alaska and her zest for life.

I extend my sincerest condolences to Ginny's remaining family; her daughter Romany Wood and son-in-law Carl Rosenberg of San Cristobal, NM. Alaska has lost a friend and champion. May she rest in peace.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–852. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amitraz; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9381–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–853. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District'' (FRL No. 9779–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–854. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Region 4 States; Prong 3 of Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) Infrastructure Requirement for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 9792–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–855. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Washington; Revised Format of 40 CFR Part 52 for Materials Incorporated by Reference'' (FRL No. 9768–9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–856. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Flint Hills Resources Pine Bend'' (FRL No. 9792–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–857. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of California; Imperial Valley Planning Area for PM 10; Clarification of Nonattainment Area Boundary'' (FRL No. 9791–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–858. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Physical Protection of Byproduct Material'' (RIN3150–AI12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–859. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Requirements for Long-Term Care (LTC) Facilities; Notice of Facility Closure'' (RIN0938–AQ09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–860. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates'' (Notice 2013–23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–861. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the United States having provided limited technical support to French forces that conducted an operation in Somalia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–862. A communication from the Deputy Assistant to the President and Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff of the National Security Staff, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93–148); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–863. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of a proposed amendment of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 13–019); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–864. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the effectiveness of United Nations efforts to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse and trafficking in persons in UN peacekeeping missions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–865. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from the Hanford site in Hanford, Washington, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–866. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers from General Steel Industries, Granite City, Illinois, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–867. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Baker Brothers site in Toledo, Ohio, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–868. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Joslyn Manufacturing and Supply Co. at the covered facility in Fort Wayne, Indiana, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–869. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Battelle Laboratories King Avenue site in Columbus, Ohio, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–870. A communication from the Investigative Specialist, Directorate of Whistleblower Protection Program, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procedures for the Handling of Retaliation Complaints Under Section 1558 of the Affordable Care Act'' (RIN1218–AC79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2013; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–871. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness (PAIMI) Program Activities Report for Fiscal Years 2009 and 2010''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HARKIN, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 622. An original bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Frederick Vollrath, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

*Eric K. Fanning, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

*Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. John E. Hyten, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Tod D. Wolters, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Brigadier General John J. Broadmeadow and ending with Brigadier General Vincent R. Stewart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 22, 2013.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Bruce E. Grooms, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Alexander M. Archibald III and ending with Timothy Y. Salam, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 27, 2013.

Army nomination of Michael J. Burke, to be Major.

Army nomination of Charles A. Slaney, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Sara L. Carlson and ending with David R. Trainor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 27, 2013.

Army nominations beginning with James W. Ness and ending with Zachary T. Irvine, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 27, 2013.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with James B. Thompson and ending with Jason A. Woodworth, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 23, 2013.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Michael A. Brown and ending with Michael E. Samples, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 23, 2013.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 618. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain special resource studies; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 619. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 620. A bill to withhold the salary of the Director of OMB upon failure to submit the President's budget to Congress as required by section 1105 of title 31, United States Code; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 621. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to make any substance containing hydrocodone a schedule II drug; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 622. An original bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VITTER):

S. 623. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 624. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require criminal background checks for child care providers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 625. A bill to provide for a biennial appropriations process with the exception of defense spending and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 626. A bill to de-link research and development incentives from drug prices for new medicines to treat HIV/AIDS and to stimulate greater sharing of scientific knowledge; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 627. A bill to provide incentives for investment in research and development for new medicines, to enhance access to new medicines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 628. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend the duration of the Physical Disability Board of Review and to the expand the authority of such Board to review of the separation of members of the Armed Forces on the basis of mental condition not amounting to disability, including separation on the basis of a personality or adjustment disorder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 629. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 630. A bill to establish a partnership between States that produce energy onshore and offshore for our country with the Federal Government; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. COWAN):

S. 631. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. Res. 82. A resolution commemorating the 30th anniversary of the proposal for the Strategic Defense Initiative; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 83. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. NELSON, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 84. A resolution recognizing the 192nd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 85. A resolution designating April 2013 as ''National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 17

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 17, a bill to stimulate the economy, produce domestic energy, and create jobs at no cost to the taxpayers, and without borrowing money from foreign governments for which our children and grandchildren will be responsible, and for other purposes.

S. 169

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 288

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 288, a bill to increase the participation of historically underrepresented demographic groups in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education and industry.

S. 294

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 294, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 309, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to recalculate and restore retirement annuity obligations of the United States Postal Service, to eliminate the requirement that the United States Postal Service prefund the Postal Service Retiree Health Benefits Fund, to place restrictions on the closure of postal facilities, to create incentives for innovation for the United States Postal Service, to maintain levels of postal service, and for other purposes.

S. 330

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 330, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV).

S. 350

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 350, a bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency.

S. 392

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 392, a bill to support and encourage the health and well-being of elementary school and secondary school students by enhancing school physical education and health education.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 484, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act relating to lead-based paint renovation and remodeling activities.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms.

S. 504

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that valid generic drugs may enter the market.

S. 603

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 603, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 610

At the request of Mr. JOHANNS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits.

S. 614

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 614, a bill to require the continuation of tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces for the remainder of fiscal year 2013.

S. 615

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 37

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 37, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in disapproving the proposal of the International Olympic Committee Executive Board to eliminate wrestling from the Summer Olympic Games beginning in 2020.

S. RES. 65

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 65, a resolution strongly supporting the full implementation of United States and international sanctions on Iran and urging the President to continue to strengthen enforcement of sanctions legislation.

S. RES. 77

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 77, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to the commemoration of the 180th anniversary of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Kingdom of Thailand.

AMENDMENT NO. 65

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 65 proposed to H.R. 933, amend the title to read: ''An Act making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 67

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 67 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, amend the title to read: ''An Act making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 72

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 72 proposed to H.R. 933, amend the title to read: ''An Act making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013.''.

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 72 proposed to H.R. 933, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 126

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 126 intended to be proposed to H.R. 933, amend the title to read: ''An Act making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013.''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 618. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct certain special resource studies; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 618

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Pacific Islands Parks Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDIES.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of each of the following sites:

(A) The Ka'u Coast on the island of Hawaii, Hawaii.

(B) The northern coast of Maui, Hawaii.

(C) The southeastern coast of Kauai, Hawaii.

(D) Historic sites on Midway Atoll.

(E) On request of the Governor of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the island of Rota in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(2) CONTENTS.—In conducting each study required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) evaluate the national significance of the site and the area surrounding the site;

(B) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the site as a unit of the National Park System;

(C) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the site by Federal, State, or local governmental entities or private and nonprofit organizations;

(D) consult with any interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations, or individuals; and

(E) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives considered under the study.

(b) UPDATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall update the study authorized by section 326(b)(3)(N) of the National Park Service Studies Act of 1999 (as enacted in title III of Appendix C of Public Law 106–113; 113 Stat. 1501A-195) relating to World War II sites in the Republic of Palau.

(2) CONTENTS.—In updating the study described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) determine whether conditions have changed to justify designating the site as a unit of the National Park System;

(B) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the site by Federal, State, or local governmental entities or private and nonprofit organizations;

(C) consult with any interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations, or individuals; and

(D) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives considered under the study.

(c) APPLICABLE LAW.—The studies and updates to the study required under section shall be conducted in accordance with section 8 of the National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–5).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the studies and updates to the study under this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the results of each study and updates to the study; and

(2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary based on the results described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act such sums as are necessary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 619. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent unjust and irrational criminal punishments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I join with Senator PAUL to introduce the Justice Safety Valve Act of 2013, which will start to take on the problem of the ever-increasing Federal prison population and spiraling costs that spend more and more of our justice budget on keeping people in prison, thereby reducing opportunities to do more to keep our communities safe. This bill will combat injustice in Federal sentencing and the waste of taxpayer dollars by allowing judges appropriate discretion in sentencing.

As a former prosecutor, I understand that criminals must be held accountable and that long sentences are sometimes necessary to keep violent criminals off the street and deter those who would commit violent crime. I have come to believe, however, that mandatory minimum sentences do more harm than good. As Justice Kennedy said, ''In too many cases, mandatory minimum sentences are unwise and unjust.''

Currently a ''safety valve'' provision allows low-level drug offenders to avoid mandatory minimum penalties if certain conditions are met. The bill we introduce today would extend that safety valve to all Federal crimes subject to mandatory minimum penalties, allowing a judge to impose a sentence other than a statutorily designated mandatory sentence in cases in which key factors are present. The judge would be required to provide notice to the parties and to state in writing the reasons justifying the alternative sentence.

The United States has a mass incarceration problem. Between 1970 and 2010, the number of people incarcerated grew by 700 percent. Although the United States has only 5 percent of the world's population, we incarcerate almost a quarter of its prisoners. At the end of 2011, 2.2 million people were in jail or prison in the United States. That means we incarcerate roughly 1 in every 100 adults.

As of last week, the Federal prison population was over 217,000. Almost half of those men and women are imprisoned on drug charges. Compare this with 1980, when the Federal prison population was just 25,000. Since 2000 alone, the Federal prison population has increased by 55 percent.

As more and more people are incarcerated for longer and longer, the resulting costs have placed an enormous strain on the Justice Department's budget and have at the same time severely limited the ability to enact policies that prevent crimes effectively and efficiently. At a time when our economy has been struggling to recover from the worst recession in the last 75 years and our budget is limited, we must look at the wasteful spending that occurs with overincarceration.

At the federal level, over the last 5 years, our prison budget has grown by nearly $2 billion. In 2007, we spent approximately $5.1 billion on Federal prisons. Last year, the Federal Bureau of Prisons requested more than $6.8 billion. That means less money for Federal law enforcement, less aid to State and local law enforcement, and less funding for crime prevention programs and prisoner reentry programs. In short, we have less to spend on the kinds of programs that evidence has shown work best to keep crime rates down. Building more prisons and locking people up for longer and longer—especially nonviolent offenders—is not the best use of taxpayer money and is, in fact, an ineffective means of keeping our communities safe.

The proliferation of Federal mandatory minimum sentences is not the only factor driving the increase in incarceration rates, but it is an important factor. The number of mandatory minimum penalties in the Federal code nearly doubled from 1991 to 2011. Even those defendants not subject to mandatory minimums have seen their penalties increase as a result of mandatory penalties being incorporated into the U.S. sentencing guidelines.

In addition to driving up our prison population, mandatory minimum penalties can lead to terribly unjust results in individual cases. This is why a large majority of judges oppose mandatory minimum sentences. In a 2010 survey by the U.S. Sentencing Commission of more than 600 Federal district court judges, nearly 70 percent agreed that the existing safety valve provision should be extended to all Federal offenses. That is what our bill does.

Judges, who hand down sentences and can see close up when they are appropriate and just, overwhelmingly oppose mandatory minimum sentences.

Congress has too often moved in the wrong direction by imposing new mandatory minimum sentences unsupported by evidence while failing to reauthorize crucial programs like the Second Chance Act to rehabilitate prisoners who will be released to rejoin our communities. Our reliance on mandatory minimums has been a great mistake. I am not convinced it has reduced crime, but I am convinced it has imprisoned people, particularly nonviolent offenders, for far longer than is just or beneficial. It is time for us to let judges go back to acting as judges and making decisions based on the individual facts before them. A one-size-fits-all approach to sentencing does not make us safer.

This is a bipartisan issue. Sentencing reform works. States, including very conservative States such as Texas, that have implemented sentencing reform have saved money and seen their crime rates drop.

I thank Senator PAUL for his dedication to this cause and for working with me on this legislation. I hope other Senators will join us in advancing this legislation and ensuring that taxpayer dollars are used more efficiently to better prevent crime rather than simply building more prisons.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 620. A bill to withhold the salary of the Director of OMB upon failure to submit the President's budget to Congress as required by section 1105 of title 31, United States Code; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the No Budget No OMB Pay Act of 2013.

The No Budget No OMB Pay Act of 2013 will prohibit paying the salaries of the OMB Director, the Deputy Director of OMB, and the Deputy Director for Management of OMB for any period of time that the President is late in meeting his statutory requirement of submitting a budget by the first Monday of February.

As many of my colleagues know, it has been over 1,400 days since the Senate has passed a budget. It is certainly progress that the Majority has decided to finally put forward a budget and that the Senate will be able to debate and amend a budget—a budget that raises taxes by $1.5 trillion, increases Washington spending by 62 percent, and fails to balance the budget anytime in the next ten years.

Unfortunately, for the first time in recent memory, Congress is acting before receiving the President's budget. According to a recent headline in the March 11, 2013 edition of the National Journal this is unprecedented and is a break from a 92-year tradition of having the President exercise leadership in the budget process.

Current law requires the President to send his budget by the first Monday of February. But President Obama has ignored this requirement. In fact, he has missed the statutory deadline four out of five times. This year he was required to issue his budget proposal on February 4, 2013. But he missed this deadline. So while the Senate is finally acting, it has been 44 days since the President has failed to live up to his commitment.

We know that for Congress to get paid, it must live up to its responsibilities and pass a budget. The OMB Director and other high-level OMB officials also have obligations to meet. After all, these officials are responsible for putting together the President's budget. Both the executive and legislative branch share responsibility when it comes to the federal budget. But without Presidential leadership Washington spending will remain out of control. Taxpayers deserve better. They deserve accountability.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 620

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''No Budget, No OMB Pay Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH STATUTORY REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.

Not later than 3 days after the President's budget is due, the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management shall—

(1) make an annual determination of whether the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the President are in compliance with section 1105 of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) provide a written notification of such determination to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. NO PAY UPON FAILURE TO TIMELY SUBMIT THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be appropriated or otherwise be made available from the United States Treasury for the pay of the Director of OMB, Deputy Director of OMB, and the Deputy Director for Management of OMB during any period of noncompliance determined by the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management under section 2.

(b) NO RETROACTIVE PAY.—The Director of OMB, Deputy Director of OMB, and the Deputy Director for Management of OMB may not receive pay for any period of noncompliance determined by the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management under section 2 at any time after the end of that period.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect upon the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. COWAN):

S. 631. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, 10 years ago, Senator Ted Kennedy first introduced the Healthy Families Act. This landmark legislation addressed a problem that so many working families struggle with each and every day—how do I balance my job responsibilities with my health and the health of my family? The Healthy Families Act sought to make that difficult juggling act a little bit easier by ensuring that hardworking people have access to paid sick days. At the time, supporters of the bill, myself included, argued that families were under increasing strain, with rising costs, stagnant wages, and disappearing job security. We argued that families were forced to make impossible choices between their jobs and their families. We pledged that working families deserved better.

Today, a decade later, the circumstances facing working families are even more challenging: Americans are still struggling to get by. Wages are still stagnant, job security is even more tenuous, and too many workers struggle with whether to give up a paycheck or put their jobs at risk whenever a child has an asthma attack or an elderly parent comes down with the flu. Ten years later, working families still deserve better.

Today, 10 years later, almost 40 percent of American workers, including ⅔ of low-wage workers, don't have the ability to earn even a single paid sick day. For these workers, missing work due to an illness, injury, or doctor's appointment can mean putting their job and their family's financial security in jeopardy. As a consequence, many of these workers have no choice but to report to work sick or send their children to school or day care sick—which puts public health in jeopardy as well.

Health officials urge people with contagious illnesses to stay home from work to avoid spreading disease. But workers in industries with the most intensive contact with the public, such as food service and hospitality, are the least likely to have paid sick days. In 2010, three-quarters of food service workers lacked paid sick days. So not surprisingly, nearly two-thirds of restaurant workers have reported cooking or serving food while sick. Similarly, most personal care and service jobs, like child care workers and elder care workers, work with vulnerable populations but are unable to take a sick day without risking their jobs or paychecks. This has clear implications for public health. In fact, a recent study found that a lack of workplace policies including paid sick days contributed to an additional 5 million cases of influenza-like illness during the H1N1 outbreak in 2009.

It doesn't have to be this way. We can give working people the tools they need to protect their families' health and economic well-being while also safeguarding the public health.

This is why Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO and I are reintroducing the Healthy Families Act, which would allow U.S. workers to earn up to seven paid sick days per year to recover from short-term illness, care for a sick family member, seek routine medical care, or seek help if they are victims of domestic violence. This important legislation will provide much-needed security for hardworking families struggling to balance the obligations of work and family. It will improve public health and decrease health costs by preventing the spread of disease and giving employees better options for obtaining preventive care and treatment. It will also help victims of domestic violence to protect their families and their futures.

Providing paid sick days to workers will be good for working people and their families, and good for our businesses and our economy as well. Allowing workers to attend to their own health or their families' health fosters good will and loyalty toward employers, and boosts morale and productivity in the workplace. In fact, 70 percent of lost productivity due to illness is not attributed to absent workers but rather to ''presenteeism,'' the practice of employees working while sick, infecting their colleagues, and being less productive themselves. Businesses whose workers have paid sick days will also benefit from reduced turnover—and its high associated costs—when workers can hold on to their jobs. Paid sick days can also help reduce occupational injuries. In fact, a recent study found that workers with access to paid sick leave were 28 percent less likely than workers without paid sick leave to suffer nonfatal occupational injuries. Employers themselves are beginning to recognize the positive effects of paid sick days. Five years after paid sick days were implemented in San Francisco, ⅔ of employers surveyed said they were ''supportive'' of paid sick days, while one third said they were ''very supportive.''

Ensuring that workers have paid sick days will also reduce health care costs, by helping ensure that workers get timely care including preventive care, before medical issues become acute. A 2011 study shows that a universal paid sick days policy would reduce preventable visits to the emergency room and result in cost savings of $1.1 billion per year, including $500 million in savings for public health insurance like Medicaid. And a 2012 study showed that workers with paid sick leave were more likely to get cancer screenings, including a mammogram, Pap test, or endoscopy, and they were more likely to have visited a doctor in the previous year than workers without paid sick leave.

One more very important benefit; paid sick days will allow workers peace of mind and financial security. They won't face a lost paycheck or a lengthy job search each time they become ill. They won't face reduced income and have to cut back on their spending on food, medicine, and other necessities bought in their local communities. Working people will have the security of knowing that if illness strikes, they will be able to tend to their families without losing their jobs or their paychecks.

I thank my colleagues who are joining me today as original cosponsors of this critically important legislation, and I encourage all Senators to join us in supporting the Healthy Families Act. This bill is no less important today than it was when it was first introduced by my friend, the late Senator Ted Kennedy, a decade ago. Knowing that 10 years have gone by and workers around the country have still not secured paid sick days should not discourage us. It should strengthen our resolve to see this basic right afforded to all working Americans and their families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 631

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Healthy Families Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Working Americans need time to meet their own health care needs and to care for family members, including their children, spouse, domestic partner, parents (including parents-in-law), and other children and adults for whom they are caregivers.

(2) Health care needs include preventive health care, diagnostic procedures, medical treatment, and recovery in response to short- and long-term illnesses and injuries.

(3) Providing employees time off to meet health care needs ensures that they will be healthier in the long run. Preventive care helps avoid illnesses and injuries and routine medical care helps detect illnesses early and shorten their duration. A 2012 study published by BioMed Central Public Health of results of the National Health Interview Survey found that lack of paid sick leave is a barrier to receiving cancer screenings and preventive care. Workers with paid sick leave were more likely to have a mammogram, Pap test, or endoscopy, and were more likely to have visited a doctor in the previous year, than workers without paid sick leave, even when the results were adjusted for sociodemographic factors.

(4) When parents are available to care for their children who become sick, children recover faster, more serious illnesses are prevented, and children's overall mental and physical health improve. In a 2009 study published in the American Journal of Public Health, 81 percent of parents of a child with special health care needs reported that taking leave from work to be with their child had a ''good'' or ''very good'' effect on their child's physical health. Similarly, 85 percent of parents of such a child found that taking such leave had a ''good'' or ''very good'' effect on their child's emotional health.

(5) When parents cannot afford to miss work and must send children with contagious illnesses to child care centers or schools, infection can spread rapidly through child care centers and schools.

(6) Providing paid sick time improves public health by reducing infectious disease. Policies that make it easier for sick adults and children to be isolated at home reduce the spread of infectious disease. A 2012 study published in the American Journal of Public Health found that a lack of workplace policies like paid sick days contributed to an additional 5,000,000 cases of influenza-like illness during the H1N1 pandemic of 2009.

(7) Routine medical care reduces medical costs by detecting and treating illness and injury early, decreasing the need for emergency care. These savings benefit public and private payers of health insurance, including private businesses. A 2011 study by the Institute for Women's Policy Research found that a universal paid sick days policy would reduce preventable visits to the emergency room and result in cost savings of $1,100,000,000 per year, including $500,000,000 in savings for public health insurance like Medicaid.

(8) The provision of individual and family sick time by large and small businesses, both here in the United States and elsewhere, demonstrates that policy solutions are both feasible and affordable in a competitive economy. A 2009 study by the Center for Economic and Policy Research found that, of 22 countries with comparable economies, the United States was 1 of only 3 countries that did not provide any paid time off for workers with short-term illnesses.

(9) Measures that ensure that employees are in good health and do not need to worry about unmet family health problems help businesses by promoting productivity and reducing employee turnover.

(10) The American Productivity Audit completed in 2003 found that lost productivity due to illness costs $226,000,000,000 annually, and that 71 percent of that cost stems from presenteeism, the practice of employees coming to work despite illness. Studies in the Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, the Employee Benefit News, and the Harvard Business Review show that presenteeism is a larger productivity drain than either absenteeism or short-term disability.

(11) Working while sick also increases a worker's probability of suffering an injury on the job. A 2012 study published by the American Journal of Public Health found that workers with access to paid sick leave were 28 percent less likely than workers without paid sick leave to suffer nonfatal occupational injuries.

(12) The absence of paid sick time has forced Americans to make untenable choices between needed income and jobs on the one hand and caring for their own and their family's health on the other.

(13) Nearly 40 percent of the private sector workforce, and 25 percent of the public sector workforce, lacks paid sick time. Another 4,000,000 theoretically have access to sick time, but have not been on the job long enough to use it. Millions more lack sick time they can use to care for a sick child or ill family member.

(14)(A) Workers' access to paid sick time varies dramatically by wage level.

(B) For private sector workers—

(i) for workers in the lowest quartile of earners, 71 percent lack paid sick time;

(ii) for workers in the next 2 quartiles, 36 and 25 percent, respectively, lack paid sick time; and

(iii) even for workers in the highest quartile, 16 percent lack paid sick time.

(C) For public sector workers—

(i) for workers in the lowest quartile of earners, 25 percent lack paid sick time;

(ii) for workers in the next 2 quartiles, 7 percent lack paid sick time; and

(iii) for workers in the highest quartile, 2 percent lack paid sick time.

(D) In addition, millions of workers cannot use paid sick time to care for ill family members.

(15) Due to the roles of men and women in society, the primary responsibility for family caregiving often falls on women, and such responsibility affects the working lives of women more than it affects the working lives of men.

(16) An increasing number of men are also taking on caregiving obligations, and men who request paid time for caregiving purposes are often denied accommodation or penalized because of stereotypes that caregiving is only ''women's work''.

(17) Employers' reliance on persistent stereotypes about the ''proper'' roles of both men and women in the workplace and in the home continues a cycle of discrimination and fosters stereotypical views about women's commitment to work and their value as employees.

(18) Employment standards that apply to only one gender have serious potential for encouraging employers to discriminate against employees and applicants for employment who are of that gender.

(19) It is in the national interest to ensure that all Americans can care for their own health and the health of their families while prospering at work.

(20) Nearly 1 in 3 American women report physical or sexual abuse by a husband or boyfriend at some point in their lives. Domestic violence also affects men. Women account for about 85 percent of the victims of domestic violence and men account for approximately 15 percent of the victims. Therefore, women disproportionately need time off to care for their health or to find solutions, such as obtaining a restraining order or finding housing, to avoid or prevent physical or sexual abuse.

(21) One study showed that 85 percent of domestic violence victims at a women's shelter who were employed missed work because of abuse. The mean number of days of paid work lost by a rape victim is 8.1 days, by a victim of physical assault is 7.2 days, and by a victim of stalking is 10.1 days. Nationwide, domestic violence victims lose almost 8,000,000 days of paid work per year.

(22) Without paid sick days that can be used to address the effects of domestic violence, these victims are in grave danger of losing their jobs. One survey found that 96 percent of employed domestic violence victims experienced problems at work related to the violence. The Government Accountability Office similarly found that 24 to 52 percent of victims report losing a job due, at least in part, to domestic violence. The loss of employment can be particularly devastating for victims of domestic violence, who often need economic security to ensure safety.

(23) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has estimated that domestic violence costs over $700,000,000 annually due to the victims' lost productivity in employment.

(24) Efforts to assist abused employees result in positive outcomes for employers as well as employees because employers can retain workers who might otherwise be compelled to leave.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to ensure that all working Americans can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families by requiring employers to permit employees to earn up to 56 hours of paid sick time including paid time for family care;

(2) to diminish public and private health care costs by enabling workers to seek early and routine medical care for themselves and their family members;

(3) to assist employees who are, or whose family members are, victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, by providing the employees with paid time away from work to allow the victims to receive treatment and to take the necessary steps to ensure their protection;

(4) to address the historical and persistent widespread pattern of employment discrimination on the basis of gender by both private and public sector employers;

(5) to accomplish the purposes described in paragraphs (1) through (4) in a manner that is feasible for employers; and

(6) consistent with the provision of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution relating to equal protection of the laws, and pursuant to Congress' power to enforce that provision under section 5 of that Amendment—

(A) to accomplish the purposes described in paragraphs (1) through (4) in a manner that minimizes the potential for employment discrimination on the basis of sex by ensuring generally that paid sick time is available for eligible medical reasons on a gender-neutral basis; and

(B) to promote the goal of equal employment opportunity for women and men.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CHILD.—The term ''child'' means a biological, foster, or adopted child, a stepchild, a child of a domestic partner, a legal ward, or a child of a person standing in loco parentis, who is—

(A) under 18 years of age; or

(B) 18 years of age or older and incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability.

(2) DOMESTIC PARTNER.—The term ''domestic partner'' means the person recognized as being in a relationship with an employee under any domestic partnership, civil union, or similar law of the State or political subdivision of a State in which the employee resides.

(3) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The term ''domestic violence'' has the meaning given the term in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)), except that the reference in such section to the term ''jurisdiction receiving grant monies'' shall be deemed to mean the jurisdiction in which the victim lives or the jurisdiction in which the employer involved is located.

(4) EMPLOYEE.—The term ''employee'' means an individual who is—

(A)(i) an employee, as defined in section 3(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)), who is not covered under subparagraph (E), including such an employee of the Library of Congress, except that a reference in such section to an employer shall be considered to be a reference to an employer described in clauses (i)(I) and (ii) of paragraph (5)(A); or

(ii) an employee of the Government Accountability Office;

(B) a State employee described in section 304(a) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16c(a));

(C) a covered employee, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301), other than an applicant for employment;

(D) a covered employee, as defined in section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code; or

(E) a Federal officer or employee covered under subchapter V of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code.

(5) EMPLOYER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''employer'' means a person who is—

(i)(I) a covered employer, as defined in subparagraph (B), who is not covered under subclause (V);

(II) an entity employing a State employee described in section 304(a) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991;

(III) an employing office, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995;

(IV) an employing office, as defined in section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code; or

(V) an employing agency covered under subchapter V of chapter 63 of title 5, United States Code; and

(ii) is engaged in commerce (including government), or an industry or activity affecting commerce (including government), as defined in subparagraph (B)(iii).

(B) COVERED EMPLOYER.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In subparagraph (A)(i)(I), the term ''covered employer''—

(I) means any person engaged in commerce or in any industry or activity affecting commerce who employs 15 or more employees for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year;

(II) includes—

(aa) any person who acts, directly or indirectly, in the interest of an employer to any of the employees of such employer; and

(bb) any successor in interest of an employer;

(III) includes any ''public agency'', as defined in section 3(x) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(x)); and

(IV) includes the Government Accountability Office and the Library of Congress.

(ii) PUBLIC AGENCY.—For purposes of clause (i)(III), a public agency shall be considered to be a person engaged in commerce or in an industry or activity affecting commerce.

(iii) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subparagraph:

(I) COMMERCE.—The terms ''commerce'' and ''industry or activity affecting commerce'' mean any activity, business, or industry in commerce or in which a labor dispute would hinder or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce, and include ''commerce'' and any ''industry affecting commerce'', as defined in paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 501 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 142 (1) and (3)).

(II) EMPLOYEE.—The term ''employee'' has the same meaning given such term in section 3(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)).

(III) PERSON.—The term ''person'' has the same meaning given such term in section 3(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(a)).

(C) PREDECESSORS.—Any reference in this paragraph to an employer shall include a reference to any predecessor of such employer.

(6) EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.—The term ''employment benefits'' means all benefits provided or made available to employees by an employer, including group life insurance, health insurance, disability insurance, sick leave, annual leave, educational benefits, and pensions, regardless of whether such benefits are provided by a practice or written policy of an employer or through an ''employee benefit plan'', as defined in section 3(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(3)).

(7) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—The term ''health care provider'' means a provider who—

(A)(i) is a doctor of medicine or osteopathy who is authorized to practice medicine or surgery (as appropriate) by the State in which the doctor practices; or

(ii) is any other person determined by the Secretary to be capable of providing health care services; and

(B) is not employed by an employer for whom the provider issues certification under this Act.

(8) PAID SICK TIME.—The term ''paid sick time'' means an increment of compensated leave that can be earned by an employee for use during an absence from employment for any of the reasons described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 5(b).

(9) PARENT.—The term ''parent'' means a biological, foster, or adoptive parent of an employee, a stepparent of an employee, parent-in-law, parent of a domestic partner, or a legal guardian or other person who stood in loco parentis to an employee when the employee was a child.

(10) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Labor.

(11) SEXUAL ASSAULT.—The term ''sexual assault'' has the meaning given the term in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)).

(12) SPOUSE.—The term ''spouse'', with respect to an employee, has the meaning given such term by the marriage laws of the State in which the employee resides.

(13) STATE.—The term ''State'' has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).

(14) STALKING.—The term ''stalking'' has the meaning given the term in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)).

(15) VICTIM SERVICES ORGANIZATION.—The term ''victim services organization'' means a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization that provides assistance to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking or advocates for such victims, including a rape crisis center, an organization carrying out a domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking prevention or treatment program, an organization operating a shelter or providing counseling services, or a legal services organization or other organization providing assistance through the legal process.

SEC. 5. PROVISION OF PAID SICK TIME.

(a) ACCRUAL OF PAID SICK TIME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employer shall permit each employee employed by the employer to earn not less than 1 hour of paid sick time for every 30 hours worked, to be used as described in subsection (b). An employer shall not be required to permit an employee to earn, under this section, more than 56 hours of paid sick time in a calendar year, unless the employer chooses to set a higher limit.

(2) EXEMPT EMPLOYEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), for purposes of this section, an employee who is exempt from overtime requirements under section 13(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213(a)(1)) shall be assumed to work 40 hours in each workweek.

(B) SHORTER NORMAL WORKWEEK.—If the normal workweek of such an employee is less than 40 hours, the employee shall earn paid sick time based upon that normal work week.

(3) DATES OF ACCRUAL AND USE.—Employees shall begin to earn paid sick time under this section at the commencement of their employment. An employee shall be entitled to use the earned paid sick time beginning on the 60th calendar day following commencement of the employee's employment. After that 60th calendar day, the employee may use the paid sick time as the time is earned. An employer may, at the discretion of the employer, loan paid sick time to an employee in advance of the earning of such time under this section by such employee.

(4) CARRYOVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), paid sick time earned under this section shall carry over from 1 calendar year to the next.

(B) CONSTRUCTION.—This Act shall not be construed to require an employer to permit an employee to accrue more than 56 hours of earned paid sick time at a given time.

(5) EMPLOYERS WITH EXISTING POLICIES.—Any employer with a paid leave policy who makes available an amount of paid leave that is sufficient to meet the requirements of this section and that may be used for the same purposes and under the same conditions as the purposes and conditions outlined in subsection (b) shall not be required to permit an employee to earn additional paid sick time under this section.

(6) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring financial or other reimbursement to an employee from an employer upon the employee's termination, resignation, retirement, or other separation from employment for earned paid sick time that has not been used.

(7) REINSTATEMENT.—If an employee is separated from employment with an employer and is rehired, within 12 months after that separation, by the same employer, the employer shall reinstate the employee's previously earned paid sick time. The employee shall be entitled to use the earned paid sick time and earn additional paid sick time at the recommencement of employment with the employer.

(8) PROHIBITION.—An employer may not require, as a condition of providing paid sick time under this Act, that the employee involved search for or find a replacement worker to cover the hours during which the employee is using paid sick time.

(b) USES.—Paid sick time earned under this section may be used by an employee for any of the following:

(1) An absence resulting from a physical or mental illness, injury, or medical condition of the employee.

(2) An absence resulting from obtaining professional medical diagnosis or care, or preventive medical care, for the employee.

(3) An absence for the purpose of caring for a child, a parent, a spouse, a domestic partner, or any other individual related by blood or affinity whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a family relationship, who—

(A) has any of the conditions or needs for diagnosis or care described in paragraph (1) or (2); and

(B) in the case of someone who is not a child, is otherwise in need of care.

(4) An absence resulting from domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, if the time is to—

(A) seek medical attention for the employee or the employee's child, parent, spouse, domestic partner, or an individual related to the employee as described in paragraph (3), to recover from physical or psychological injury or disability caused by domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

(B) obtain or assist a related person described in paragraph (3) in obtaining services from a victim services organization;

(C) obtain or assist a related person described in paragraph (3) in obtaining psychological or other counseling;

(D) seek relocation; or

(E) take legal action, including preparing for or participating in any civil or criminal legal proceeding related to or resulting from domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(c) SCHEDULING.—An employee shall make a reasonable effort to schedule a period of paid sick time under this Act in a manner that does not unduly disrupt the operations of the employer.

(d) PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paid sick time shall be provided upon the oral or written request of an employee. Such request shall—

(A) include the expected duration of the period of such time;

(B) in a case in which the need for such period of time is foreseeable at least 7 days in advance of such period, be provided at least 7 days in advance of such period; and

(C) otherwise, be provided as soon as practicable after the employee is aware of the need for such period.

(2) CERTIFICATION IN GENERAL.—

(A) PROVISION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), an employer may require that a request for paid sick time under this section for a purpose described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b) be supported by a certification issued by the health care provider of the eligible employee or of an individual described in subsection (b)(3), as appropriate, if the period of such time covers more than 3 consecutive workdays.

(ii) TIMELINESS.—The employee shall provide a copy of such certification to the employer in a timely manner, not later than 30 days after the first day of the period of time. The employer shall not delay the commencement of the period of time on the basis that the employer has not yet received the certification.

(B) SUFFICIENT CERTIFICATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A certification provided under subparagraph (A) shall be sufficient if it states—

(I) the date on which the period of time will be needed;

(II) the probable duration of the period of time;

(III) the appropriate medical facts within the knowledge of the health care provider regarding the condition involved, subject to clause (ii); and

(IV)(aa) for purposes of paid sick time under subsection (b)(1), a statement that absence from work is medically necessary;

(bb) for purposes of such time under subsection (b)(2), the dates on which testing for a medical diagnosis or care is expected to be given and the duration of such testing or care; and

(cc) for purposes of such time under subsection (b)(3), in the case of time to care for someone who is not a child, a statement that care is needed for an individual described in such subsection, and an estimate of the amount of time that such care is needed for such individual.

(ii) LIMITATION.—In issuing a certification under subparagraph (A), a health care provider shall make reasonable efforts to limit the medical facts described in clause (i)(III) that are disclosed in the certification to the minimum necessary to establish a need for the employee to utilize paid sick time.

(C) REGULATIONS.—Regulations prescribed under section 13 shall specify the manner in which an employee who does not have health insurance shall provide a certification for purposes of this paragraph.

(D) CONFIDENTIALITY AND NONDISCLOSURE.—

(i) PROTECTED HEALTH INFORMATION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require a health care provider to disclose information in violation of section 1177 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d–6) or the regulations promulgated pursuant to section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 1320d–2 note).

(ii) HEALTH INFORMATION RECORDS.—If an employer possesses health information about an employee or an employee's child, parent, spouse, domestic partner, or an individual related to the employee as described in subsection (b)(3), such information shall—

(I) be maintained on a separate form and in a separate file from other personnel information;

(II) be treated as a confidential medical record; and

(III) not be disclosed except to the affected employee or with the permission of the affected employee.

(3) CERTIFICATION IN THE CASE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An employer may require that a request for paid sick time under this section for a purpose described in subsection (b)(4) be supported by 1 of the following forms of documentation:

(i) A police report indicating that the employee, or a member of the employee's family described in subsection (b)(4), was a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(ii) A court order protecting or separating the employee or a member of the employee's family described in subsection (b)(4) from the perpetrator of an act of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, or other evidence from the court or prosecuting attorney that the employee or a member of the employee's family described in subsection (b)(4) has appeared in court or is scheduled to appear in court in a proceeding related to domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(iii) Other documentation signed by an employee or volunteer working for a victim services organization, an attorney, a police officer, a medical professional, a social worker, an antiviolence counselor, or a member of the clergy, affirming that the employee or a member of the employee's family described in subsection (b)(4) is a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of paragraph (2) shall apply to certifications under this paragraph, except that—

(i) subclauses (III) and (IV) of subparagraph (B)(i) and subparagraph (B)(ii) of such paragraph shall not apply;

(ii) the certification shall state the reason that the leave is required with the facts to be disclosed limited to the minimum necessary to establish a need for the employee to be absent from work, and the employee shall not be required to explain the details of the domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking involved; and

(iii) with respect to confidentiality under subparagraph (D) of such paragraph, any information provided to the employer under this paragraph shall be confidential, except to the extent that any disclosure of such information is—

(I) requested or consented to in writing by the employee; or

(II) otherwise required by applicable Federal or State law.

SEC. 6. POSTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each employer shall post and keep posted a notice, to be prepared or approved in accordance with procedures specified in regulations prescribed under section 13, setting forth excerpts from, or summaries of, the pertinent provisions of this Act including—

(1) information describing paid sick time available to employees under this Act;

(2) information pertaining to the filing of an action under this Act;

(3) the details of the notice requirement for a foreseeable period of time under section 5(d)(1)(B); and

(4) information that describes—

(A) the protections that an employee has in exercising rights under this Act; and

(B) how the employee can contact the Secretary (or other appropriate authority as described in section 8) if any of the rights are violated.

(b) LOCATION.—The notice described under subsection (a) shall be posted—

(1) in conspicuous places on the premises of the employer, where notices to employees (including applicants) are customarily posted; or

(2) in employee handbooks.

(c) VIOLATION; PENALTY.—Any employer who willfully violates the posting requirements of this section shall be subject to a civil fine in an amount not to exceed $100 for each separate offense.

SEC. 7. PROHIBITED ACTS.

(a) INTERFERENCE WITH RIGHTS.—

(1) EXERCISE OF RIGHTS.—It shall be unlawful for any employer to interfere with, restrain, or deny the exercise of, or the attempt to exercise, any right provided under this Act, including—

(A) discharging or discriminating against (including retaliating against) any individual, including a job applicant, for exercising, or attempting to exercise, any right provided under this Act;

(B) using the taking of paid sick time under this Act as a negative factor in an employment action, such as hiring, promotion, or a disciplinary action; or

(C) counting the paid sick time under a no-fault attendance policy or any other absence control policy.

(2) DISCRIMINATION.—It shall be unlawful for any employer to discharge or in any other manner discriminate against (including retaliating against) any individual, including a job applicant, for opposing any practice made unlawful by this Act.

(b) INTERFERENCE WITH PROCEEDINGS OR INQUIRIES.—It shall be unlawful for any person to discharge or in any other manner discriminate against (including retaliating against) any individual, including a job applicant, because such individual—

(1) has filed an action, or has instituted or caused to be instituted any proceeding, under or related to this Act;

(2) has given, or is about to give, any information in connection with any inquiry or proceeding relating to any right provided under this Act; or

(3) has testified, or is about to testify, in any inquiry or proceeding relating to any right provided under this Act.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to state or imply that the scope of the activities prohibited by section 105 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2615) is less than the scope of the activities prohibited by this section.

SEC. 8. ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection:

(A) the term ''employee'' means an employee described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 4(4); and

(B) the term ''employer'' means an employer described in subclause (I) or (II) of section 4(5)(A)(i).

(2) INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To ensure compliance with the provisions of this Act, or any regulation or order issued under this Act, the Secretary shall have, subject to subparagraph (C), the investigative authority provided under section 11(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 211(a)), with respect to employers, employees, and other individuals affected.

(B) OBLIGATION TO KEEP AND PRESERVE RECORDS.—An employer shall make, keep, and preserve records pertaining to compliance with this Act in accordance with section 11(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 211(c)) and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(C) REQUIRED SUBMISSIONS GENERALLY LIMITED TO AN ANNUAL BASIS.—The Secretary shall not require, under the authority of this paragraph, an employer to submit to the Secretary any books or records more than once during any 12-month period, unless the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe there may exist a violation of this Act or any regulation or order issued pursuant to this Act, or is investigating a charge pursuant to paragraph (4).

(D) SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.—For the purposes of any investigation provided for in this paragraph, the Secretary shall have the subpoena authority provided for under section 9 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 209).

(3) CIVIL ACTION BY EMPLOYEES OR INDIVIDUALS.—

(A) RIGHT OF ACTION.—An action to recover the damages or equitable relief prescribed in subparagraph (B) may be maintained against any employer in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction by one or more employees or individuals or their representative for and on behalf of—

(i) the employees or individuals; or

(ii) the employees or individuals and others similarly situated.

(B) LIABILITY.—Any employer who violates section 7 (including a violation relating to rights provided under section 5) shall be liable to any employee or individual affected—

(i) for damages equal to—

(I) the amount of—

(aa) any wages, salary, employment benefits, or other compensation denied or lost by reason of the violation; or

(bb) in a case in which wages, salary, employment benefits, or other compensation have not been denied or lost, any actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation up to a sum equal to 56 hours of wages or salary for the employee or individual;

(II) the interest on the amount described in subclause (I) calculated at the prevailing rate; and

(III) an additional amount as liquidated damages; and

(ii) for such equitable relief as may be appropriate, including employment, reinstatement, and promotion.

(C) FEES AND COSTS.—The court in an action under this paragraph shall, in addition to any judgment awarded to the plaintiff, allow a reasonable attorney's fee, reasonable expert witness fees, and other costs of the action to be paid by the defendant.

(4) ACTION BY THE SECRETARY.—

(A) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION.—The Secretary shall receive, investigate, and attempt to resolve complaints of violations of section 7 (including a violation relating to rights provided under section 5) in the same manner that the Secretary receives, investigates, and attempts to resolve complaints of violations of sections 6 and 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206 and 207).

(B) CIVIL ACTION.—The Secretary may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction to recover the damages described in paragraph (3)(B)(i).

(C) SUMS RECOVERED.—Any sums recovered by the Secretary pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to each employee or individual affected. Any such sums not paid to an employee or individual affected because of inability to do so within a period of 3 years shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(5) LIMITATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an action may be brought under paragraph (3), (4), or (6) not later than 2 years after the date of the last event constituting the alleged violation for which the action is brought.

(B) WILLFUL VIOLATION.—In the case of an action brought for a willful violation of section 7 (including a willful violation relating to rights provided under section 5), such action may be brought within 3 years of the date of the last event constituting the alleged violation for which such action is brought.

(C) COMMENCEMENT.—In determining when an action is commenced under paragraph (3), (4), or (6) for the purposes of this paragraph, it shall be considered to be commenced on the date when the complaint is filed.

(6) ACTION FOR INJUNCTION BY SECRETARY.—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, in an action brought by the Secretary—

(A) to restrain violations of section 7 (including a violation relating to rights provided under section 5), including the restraint of any withholding of payment of wages, salary, employment benefits, or other compensation, plus interest, found by the court to be due to employees or individuals eligible under this Act; or

(B) to award such other equitable relief as may be appropriate, including employment, reinstatement, and promotion.

(7) SOLICITOR OF LABOR.—The Solicitor of Labor may appear for and represent the Secretary on any litigation brought under paragraph (4) or (6).

(8) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE AND LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, in the case of the Government Accountability Office and the Library of Congress, the authority of the Secretary of Labor under this subsection shall be exercised respectively by the Comptroller General of the United States and the Librarian of Congress.

(b) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) to the Board (as defined in section 101 of that Act (2 U.S.C. 1301)), or any person, alleging a violation of section 202(a)(1) of that Act (2 U.S.C. 1312(a)(1)) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to that Board, or any person, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 4(4)(C).

(c) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CHAPTER 5 OF TITLE 3, UNITED STATES CODE.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in chapter 5 of title 3, United States Code, to the President, the Merit Systems Protection Board, or any person, alleging a violation of section 412(a)(1) of that title, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the President, that Board, or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 4(4)(D).

(d) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CHAPTER 63 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in title 5, United States Code, to an employing agency, provided in chapter 12 of that title to the Merit Systems Protection Board, or provided in that title to any person, alleging a violation of chapter 63 of that title, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to that agency, that Board, or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 4(4)(E).

(e) REMEDIES FOR STATE EMPLOYEES.—

(1) WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—A State's receipt or use of Federal financial assistance for any program or activity of a State shall constitute a waiver of sovereign immunity, under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution or otherwise, to a suit brought by an employee of that program or activity under this Act for equitable, legal, or other relief authorized under this Act.

(2) OFFICIAL CAPACITY.—An official of a State may be sued in the official capacity of the official by any employee who has complied with the procedures under subsection (a)(3), for injunctive relief that is authorized under this Act. In such a suit the court may award to the prevailing party those costs authorized by section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988).

(3) APPLICABILITY.—With respect to a particular program or activity, paragraph (1) applies to conduct occurring on or after the day, after the date of enactment of this Act, on which a State first receives or uses Federal financial assistance for that program or activity.

(4) DEFINITION OF PROGRAM OR ACTIVITY.—In this subsection, the term ''program or activity'' has the meaning given the term in section 606 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d–4a).

SEC. 9. COLLECTION OF DATA ON PAID SICK TIME AND FURTHER STUDY.

(a) COMPILATION OF INFORMATION.—Effective 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Labor Statistics shall annually compile information on the following:

(1) The number of employees who used paid sick time.

(2) The number of hours of paid sick time used.

(3) The number of employees who used paid sick time for absences necessary due to domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(4) The demographic characteristics of employees who were eligible for and who used paid sick time.

(b) GAO STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall annually conduct a study to determine the following:

(A)(i) The number of days employees used paid sick time and the reasons for the use.

(ii) The number of employees who used the paid sick time for periods of time covering more than 3 consecutive workdays.

(B) The cost and benefits to employers of implementing the paid sick time policies.

(C) The cost to employees of providing certification to obtain the paid sick time.

(D) The benefits of the paid sick time to employees and their family members, including effects on employees' ability to care for their family members or to provide for their own health needs.

(E) Whether the paid sick time affected employees' ability to sustain an adequate income while meeting needs of the employees and their family members.

(F) Whether employers who administered paid sick time policies prior to the date of enactment of this Act were affected by the provisions of this Act.

(G) Whether other types of leave were affected by this Act.

(H) Whether paid sick time affected retention and turnover and costs of presenteeism.

(I) Whether the paid sick time increased the use of less costly preventive medical care and lowered the use of emergency room care.

(J) Whether the paid sick time reduced the number of children sent to school when the children were sick.

(2) DISAGGREGATING DATA.—The data collected under subparagraphs (A) and (D) of paragraph (1) shall be disaggregated by gender, race, disability, earnings level, age, marital status, family type, including parental status, and industry.

(3) REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress concerning the results of the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) and the data aggregated under paragraph (2).

(B) FOLLOWUP REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit a followup report to the appropriate committees of Congress concerning the results of the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) and the data aggregated under paragraph (2).

SEC. 10. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

(a) FEDERAL AND STATE ANTIDISCRIMINATION LAWS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to modify or affect any Federal or State law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, familial status, or any other protected status.

(b) STATE AND LOCAL LAWS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to supersede (including preempting) any provision of any State or local law that provides greater paid sick time or leave rights (including greater amounts of paid sick time or leave, or greater coverage of those eligible for paid sick time or leave) than the rights established under this Act.

SEC. 11. EFFECT ON EXISTING EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.

(a) MORE PROTECTIVE.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to diminish the obligation of an employer to comply with any contract, collective bargaining agreement, or any employment benefit program or plan that provides greater paid sick leave or other leave rights to employees or individuals than the rights established under this Act.

(b) LESS PROTECTIVE.—The rights established for employees under this Act shall not be diminished by any contract, collective bargaining agreement, or any employment benefit program or plan.

SEC. 12. ENCOURAGEMENT OF MORE GENEROUS LEAVE POLICIES.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to discourage employers from adopting or retaining leave policies more generous than policies that comply with the requirements of this Act.

SEC. 13. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act with respect to employees described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 4(4) and other individuals affected by employers described in subclause (I) or (II) of section 4(5)(A)(i).

(2) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE; LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.—The Comptroller General of the United States and the Librarian of Congress shall prescribe the regulations with respect to employees of the Government Accountability Office and the Library of Congress, respectively, and other individuals affected by the Comptroller General of the United States and the Librarian of Congress, respectively.

(b) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 90 days after the Secretary prescribes regulations under section 13(a), the Board of Directors of

the Office of Compliance shall prescribe (in accordance with section 304 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1384)) such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act with respect to employees described in section 4(4)(C) and other individuals affected by employers described in section 4(5)(A)(i)(III).

(2) AGENCY REGULATIONS.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Secretary to carry out this Act except insofar as the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulations prescribed under paragraph (1), that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections involved under this section.

(c) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CHAPTER 5 OF TITLE 3, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 90 days after the Secretary prescribes regulations under section 13(a), the President (or the designee of the President) shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act with respect to employees described in section 4(4)(D) and other individuals affected by employers described in section 4(5)(A)(i)(IV).

(2) AGENCY REGULATIONS.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Secretary to carry out this Act except insofar as the President (or designee) may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulations prescribed under paragraph (1), that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections involved under this section.

(d) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CHAPTER 63 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 90 days after the Secretary prescribes regulations under section 13(a), the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act with respect to employees described in section 4(4)(E) and other individuals affected by employers described in section 4(5)(A)(i)(V).

(2) AGENCY REGULATIONS.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall be the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Secretary to carry out this Act except insofar as the Director may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulations prescribed under paragraph (1), that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections involved under this section.

SEC. 14. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect 6 months after the date of issuance of regulations under section 13(a)(1).

(b) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—In the case of a collective bargaining agreement in effect on the effective date prescribed by subsection (a), this Act shall take effect on the earlier of—

(1) the date of the termination of such agreement; or

(2) the date that occurs 18 months after the date of issuance of regulations under section 13(a)(1).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 82—COMMEMORATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROPOSAL FOR THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 82

Whereas on March 23, 1983, President Ronald Reagan delivered a televised address to the Nation on the nuclear and ballistic missile threat to the United States and appealed to the people of the United States to support the development of new technologies to counter this threat;

Whereas March 23, 2013, marks the 30th anniversary of this landmark address;

Whereas President Reagan believed that United States security is based on being prepared and willing to meet all threats;

Whereas President Reagan envisioned a defensive, non-nuclear capability to intercept and destroy strategic nuclear missiles before they reached the United States and our allies;

Whereas President Reagan envisioned these defenses to significantly reduce any incentive an adversary may have to threaten or attack the United States and our allies;

Whereas the proposal for these defenses, together with the defenses themselves, have come to be known as the ''Strategic Defense Initiative'';

Whereas President Reagan's vision has been inspired through the efforts of dedicated Americans and allies who have championed the pursuit of deterrence and protection to overcome immense technical hurdles in developing ballistic missile defense technologies and systems to protect the United States, our allies, and our vital interests overseas;

Whereas on January 15, 1991, soldiers from the 11th Air Defense Artillery brigade changed modern warfare forever when they successfully intercepted an Al Hussein Missile launched from Iraq towards Dhahran, Saudi Arabia;

Whereas missile defense was used in combat and was successful during Operation Desert Storm and Operation Iraqi Freedom in defending the United States Armed Forces and the forces of our allies;

Whereas the United States has achieved 58 successful missile defense intercept tests since 2001;

Whereas the capability of United States missile defenses were first successfully put on alert in response to a July 2006 missile launch by North Korea, and later put on alert for all subsequent missile launches by North Korea (including its last launch in December 2013), and was successfully demonstrated on February 21, 2008, when a Standard Missile–3 interceptor launched from the U.S.S. Lake Erie intercepted and destroyed a disabled satellite of the National Reconnaissance Office;

Whereas ballistic missile defense technology continues to be developed, tested, and operationally deployed by the United States, 21 allies and friends of the United States, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO);

Whereas the Missile Defense Agency and the United States Armed Forces stand ever vigilant to deter aggression and preserve the peace;

Whereas the Missile Defense Agency epicenter for test, integration, and fielding United States rocket technology, located in Huntsville, Alabama, is responsible for guiding the programs essential to the overall success of the Missile Defense Agency mission;

Whereas the United States Ballistic Missile Defense System is intended to lead any potential adversary to conclude that the risks of attacking the United States or our allies, or our troops in theater, far outweigh potential gains;

Whereas the AEGIS Ballistic Missile Defense System functions as a key, proven component of the integrated United States Ballistic Missile Defense System and as the foundation of sea-based ballistic missile defense for the United States, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Spain, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

Whereas the United States Army Air Defense Artillery Missile Defense Systems function as a key, proven component of the integrated United States Ballistic Missile Defense System and as the foundation of land-based ballistic missile defense for Bahrain, Germany, Israel, Japan, Kuwait, the Netherlands, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

Whereas the AEGIS Ballistic Missile Defense System and the United States Army Air Defense Artillery Missile Defense Systems effectively serve to deter aggression and devalue the missiles of those who would threaten the peace and security of the United States and our allies;

Whereas the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System and its effective interceptor missiles currently deployed at Fort Greely, Alaska, and Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, together with the Missile Defense Integration and Operations Center in Colorado Springs, Colorado, function as key components of the integrated United States Ballistic Missile Defense System;

Whereas the Ballistic Missile Defense Review of 2010 concluded the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense System is the only system currently capable of protecting the United States from an intercontinental ballistic missile;

Whereas the dedicated members of the Alaska National Guard in the 49th Missile Battalion at Fort Greely, Alaska, stand ready on a daily basis to defend and protect the Nation; and

Whereas the integrated ballistic missile defense system is a key element of the national defense of the United States and a vital capability to deter aggression and preserve freedom and peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the vision and efforts of President Ronald Reagan to promote peace and security;

(2) recognizes and expresses support for the refusal of the people of the United States to accept United States vulnerability to a ballistic missile attack on the homeland or overseas; and

(3) commemorates the 30th anniversary of the address of President Reagan to the Nation on national security and the Strategic Defense Initiative.

SENATE RESOLUTION 83—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 83

Whereas multiple sclerosis can impact men and women of all ages, races, and ethnicities;

Whereas approximately 2,100,000 individuals worldwide have been diagnosed with multiple sclerosis;

Whereas multiple sclerosis is typically diagnosed between the ages of 20 and 50, yet it is estimated that between 8,000 and 10,000 children and adolescents are living with multiple sclerosis;

Whereas multiple sclerosis is an unpredictable neurological disease that interrupts the flow of information within the brain and between the brain and the rest of the body;

Whereas symptoms of multiple sclerosis range from numbness and tingling to blindness and paralysis and the progress, severity, and specific symptoms of multiple sclerosis in any 1 individual cannot yet be predicted;

Whereas there is no laboratory test available that definitely defines a diagnosis for multiple sclerosis;

Whereas although multiple sclerosis is not directly inherited, studies show that genetic factors can indicate that certain individuals are susceptible to the disease;

Whereas the exact cause of multiple sclerosis is still unknown and there is no cure;

Whereas in rare cases, multiple sclerosis is so progressive that the disease is fatal, but most people with multiple sclerosis have a normal or near-normal life expectancy;

Whereas severe multiple sclerosis can shorten the life span of an individual;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition, an affiliation of multiple sclerosis organizations dedicated to the enhancement of the quality of life for all individuals affected by multiple sclerosis, recognizes and supports Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

Whereas the mission of the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition is to increase opportunities for cooperation and provide greater opportunity to leverage the effective use of resources for the benefit of the multiple sclerosis community;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition recognizes and supports Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week during March of every calendar year;

Whereas the goals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week are—

(1) to invite individuals to join the movement to end multiple sclerosis;

(2) to encourage individuals to demonstrate a commitment to moving toward a world free of multiple sclerosis; and

(3) to acknowledge the individuals who have dedicated time and talent to promote multiple sclerosis research and programs; and

Whereas this year, Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week is recognized during the week of March 11, 2013, through March 17, 2013: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(2) encourages States, territories, possessions of the United States, and localities to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week by issuing proclamations designating Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(3) encourages media organizations to participate in Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week and help provide education to the public about multiple sclerosis;

(4) commends the efforts of the States, territories, and possessions of the United States to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(5) recognizes and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to ending multiple sclerosis by promoting—

(A) awareness about individuals that are affected by multiple sclerosis; and

(B) education programs, supporting research, and expanding access to medical treatment;

(6) recognizes all individuals in the United States living with multiple sclerosis;

(7) expresses gratitude to the family members and friends of individuals living with multiple sclerosis, who are a source of love and encouragement to those individuals; and

(8) salutes the health care professionals and medical researchers who—

(A) provide assistance to those individuals affected by multiple sclerosis; and

(B) continue to work to find ways to stop the progression of the disease, restore nerve function, and end multiple sclerosis forever.

SENATE RESOLUTION 84—RECOGNIZING THE 192ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. NELSON, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. ENZI) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 84

Whereas the people of ancient Greece developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the founding fathers of the United States, many of whom read Greek political philosophy in the original Greek language, drew heavily on the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming the representative democracy of the United States;

Whereas Petros Mavromichalis, the former Commander in Chief of Greece and a founder of the modern Greek state, said to the citizens of the United States in 1821, ''It is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode and . . . in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you'';

Whereas the Greek national anthem, the ''Hymn to Liberty'', includes the words, ''most heartily was gladdened George Washington's brave land'';

Whereas the people of the United States generously offered humanitarian assistance to the people of Greece during their struggle for independence;

Whereas Greece, in one of the most consequential ''David vs. Goliath'' victories for freedom and democracy in modern times, refused to surrender to the Axis forces and inflicted a fatal wound at a crucial moment in World War II, forcing Adolf Hitler to change his timeline and delaying the attack on Russia where the Axis forces met defeat;

Whereas Winston Churchill said, ''if there had not been the virtue and courage of the Greeks, we do not know which the outcome of World War II would have been'' and ''no longer will we say that Greeks fight like heroes, but that heroes fight like Greeks'';

Whereas hundreds of thousands of people of Greece were killed in Greece during World War II in defense of the values of the Allies;

Whereas, throughout the 20th century, Greece was one of a few countries that allied with the United States in every major international conflict;

Whereas Greece is a strategic partner and ally of the United States in bringing political stability and economic development to the volatile Balkan region, having invested billions of dollars in the countries of the region, thereby helping to create tens of thousands of new jobs, and having contributed more than $750,000,000 in development aid for the region;

Whereas the Government and people of Greece actively participate in peacekeeping and peace-building operations conducted by international organizations, including the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, and have more recently provided critical support to the operation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Libya;

Whereas Greece received worldwide praise for its extraordinary handling during the 2004 Olympic Games of more than 14,000 athletes and more than 2,000,000 spectators and journalists, a feat the Government and people of Greece handled efficiently, securely, and with hospitality;

Whereas Greece, located in a region where Christianity meets Islam and Judaism, maintains excellent relations with Muslim countries and Israel;

Whereas the Government of Greece has taken important steps in recent years to further cross-cultural understanding, rapprochement, and cooperation in various fields with Turkey, and has also improved its relations with other countries in the region, including Israel, thus enhancing the stability of the wider region;

Whereas the governments and people of Greece and the United States are at the forefront of efforts to advance freedom, democracy, peace, stability, and human rights;

Whereas those efforts and similar ideals have forged a close bond between the people of Greece and the United States; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable for the United States to celebrate March 25, 2013, Greek Independence Day, with the people of Greece and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which those two great countries were founded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends warm congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece as they celebrate the 192nd anniversary of the independence of Greece;

(2) expresses support for the principles of democratic governance to which the people of Greece are committed; and

(3) notes the important role that Greece has played in the wider European region and in the community of nations since gaining its independence 192 years ago.

SENATE RESOLUTION 85—DESIGNATING APRIL 2013 AS ''NATIONAL CONGENITAL DIAPHRAGMATIC HERNIA AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.:

S. RES. 85

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia occurs when the diaphragm fails to fully form, allowing abdominal organs to migrate into the chest cavity and prevent lung growth;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention defines congenital diaphragmatic hernia as a birth defect;

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia occurs in 1 of every 2,500 births;

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia affects approximately 1,600 babies each year in the United States;

Whereas the majority of congenital diaphragmatic hernia patients have underdeveloped lungs or poor pulmonary function;

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia patients often endure long-term complications, including pulmonary hypertension, pulmonary hypoplasia, asthma, gastrointestinal reflex, feeding disorders, and developmental delays;

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia survivors sometimes endure long-term mechanical ventilation dependency, skeletal malformations, supplemental oxygen dependency, enteral and parenteral nutrition, and hypoxic brain injury;

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia patients have a survival rate ranging from 62 percent to 90 percent depending on the severity of the defect, the treatment available at delivery, and whether extracorporeal membrane oxygenation must be used;

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia has affected more than 600,000 babies throughout the world since 2000;

Whereas babies born with congenital diaphragmatic hernia endure extended hospital stays in intensive care with multiple surgeries;

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia is as common a birth defect as spina bifida and cystic fibrosis;

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia is diagnosed in utero in only 75 percent of cases;

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia is treated through mechanical ventilation, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation machines (commonly known as ''heart and lung bypass machines'') and surgical repair;

Whereas patients often outgrow congenital diaphragmatic hernia surgical repair, leading to reherniation and requiring additional surgery;

Whereas the occurrence of congenital diaphragmatic hernia does not discriminate based on race, gender, or socioeconomic status;

Whereas the cause of congenital diaphragmatic hernia is unknown;

Whereas the average hospital bill for a congenital diaphragmatic hernia patient is $500,000; and

Whereas the total annual cost of medical care for children with congenital diaphragmatic hernia in the United States is more than $800,000,000: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2013 as ''National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month'';

(2) declares that steps should be taken to—

(A) raise awareness of and increase public knowledge about congenital diaphragmatic hernia;

(B) inform minority populations in the United States about congenital diaphragmatic hernia;

(C) disseminate information on the importance of good neonatal care for congenital diaphragmatic hernia patients;

(D) promote good prenatal care and the use of ultrasounds to detect congenital diaphragmatic hernia in utero; and

(E) encourage research on congenital diaphragmatic hernia in order to discover its causes, develop treatments, and find a cure; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interest groups, and affected persons to—

(A) promote awareness of congenital diaphragmatic hernia;

(B) take an active role in the fight against this devastating birth defect; and

(C) observe National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 136. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 137. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 138. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ENZI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 139. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 140. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 141. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 142. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 143. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 144. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 145. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 146. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 147. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 148. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MCCAIN, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 149. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 150. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 151. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 152. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 153. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 154. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 155. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 156. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 157. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 158. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 159. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 160. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 161. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 162. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 163. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 164. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 165. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 166. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 167. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 168. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 169. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 170. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 171. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 172. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 173. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 174. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 175. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 176. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 26 proposed by Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. SHELBY) to the bill H.R. 933, making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013.''.

SA 177. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 178. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 179. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 180. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 181. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 182. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 183. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 184. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 185. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 186. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 187. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 188. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 189. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 190. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 191. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 192. Mr. UDALL, of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 193. Mr. UDALL, of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 194. Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 195. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 196. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 197. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 198. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 199. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 200. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 201. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 202. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 203. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 204. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 205. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 206. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 207. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 208. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 209. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 136. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ______. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PROHIBITION ON FUNDING OF THE MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting use of funds for defense programs not authorized by law, which may include the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS), without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 137. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 31, line 19, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 31, line 20, increase the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 31, line 24, increase the amount by $784,000,000.

On page 32, line 2, increase the amount by $238,000,000.

On page 32, line 7, increase the amount by $42,000,000.

On page 32, line 11, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,400,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $322,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $784,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $238,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $42,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.

SA 138. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A BIENNIAL BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a biennial budget and appropriations process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 139. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO UPHOLD SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND PREVENT THE UNITED STATES FROM ENTERING INTO THE UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that relate to upholding Second Amendment rights, which shall include preventing the United States from entering into the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 140. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MODIFY THE METHODOLOGY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION'S COMPLIANCE, SAFETY, ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that would modify the methodology of the Department of Transportation's Compliance, Safety, Accountability Program to ensure that motor carriers' Safety Measurement System scores in each of the measurement categories bear a strong statistical relationship to future crash risk, based on peer reviewed research, and only consider crashes that the motor carrier caused or reasonably could have prevented, without raising revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose if such legislation would not increase the deficit during—

(1) the 5-year period ending on September 30, 2018; or

(2) the 10-year period ending on September 30, 2023.

SA 141. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 405. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION IMPOSING A USER FEE WITH RESPECT TO GENERAL AVIATION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would impose a user fee with respect to general aviation in any year covered by this resolution.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 142. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, line 19, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 20, line 20, increase the amount by $3,250,000.

On page 20, line 23, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 20, line 24, increase the amount by $4,250,000.

On page 21, line 2, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 21, line 3, increase the amount by $4,750,000.

On page 21, line 6, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 21, line 7, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 21, line 10, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 21, line 11, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 21, line 14, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 21, line 15, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 21, line 18, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 21, line 19, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 21, line 22, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 21, line 23, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 22, line 2, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 22, line 3, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 22, line 6, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 22, line 7, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,250,000.

On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $4,250,000.

On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $4,750,000.

On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

SA 143. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIALS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to the health care options of senior executive branch officials, including but not limited to the President, vice-president, and cabinet level officials, which may require them to purchase health care coverage through health insurance exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act in the same manner as Senators, provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 144. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to employer penalties in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which may include restoring a sensible definition of ''full-time employee'', provided that such legislation does not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 145. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR SENSIBLE REGULATORY REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide for sensible regulatory reform for Executive departments and independent regulatory agencies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 146. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, line 9, increase the amount by $201,587,000.

On page 13, line 10, increase the amount by $181,428,000.

On page 13, line 14, increase the amount by $18,143,000.

On page 46, line 7, decrease the amount by $201,587,000.

On page 46, line 8, decrease the amount by $181,428,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $18,143,000.

SA 147. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE IN ACCESSING FOREIGN MARKETS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance to small businesses in accessing foreign markets, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 148. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MCCAIN, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, line 23, decrease the amount by $19,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, decrease the amount by $19,000,000.

On page 23, line 2, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 23, line 3, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 23, line 6, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 23, line 7, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 23, line 10, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 23, line 11, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 23, line 14, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 23, line 18, decrease the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 23, line 19, decrease the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 23, line 22, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

On page 23, line 23, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

On page 24, line 2, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

SA 149. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE THE CAPACITY OF AGENCIES TO ENSURE EFFECTIVE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AND CONTRACT OVERSIGHT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would increase the capacity of Federal agencies to ensure effective contract management and contract oversight, including efforts such as additional personnel and training for Inspectors General at each agency, new reporting requirements for agencies to track their responses to and actions taken in response to Inspector General recommendations, urging the President to appoint permanent Inspectors General at agencies where there is currently a vacancy, and any other effort to ensure accountability from contractors and increase the capacity of Inspectors General to rout out waste, fraud, and abuse in all government contracting efforts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 150. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 58, strike line 9 and insert the following:

(8) wildland fire preparedness, mitigation, suppression, or recovery, including watershed management or flooding associated with wildfires, and air tanker recapitalization; or

SA 151. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years

2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE ENERGY CONSERVATION AND CLEAN ENERGY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of 1 or more committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to energy conservation and clean energy, which may include competitive grants to States for energy conservation and clean energy measures at the State level, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 152. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. MEDICAL MALPRACTICE REFORM.

(a) MODIFICATION OF FUNCTIONAL LEVELS.—

(1) FUNCTION 920.—The levels for function 920 in this resolution are amended by—

(A) reducing the budget authority for each fiscal year by—

(i) $100,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;

(ii) $880,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;

(iii) $3,070,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;

(iv) $5,240,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;

(v) $6,510,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;

(vi) $6,980,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;

(vii) $7,450,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;

(viii) $8,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;

(ix) $8,570,000,000 in fiscal year 2022; and

(x) $9,160,000,000 in fiscal year 2023; and

(B) reducing the outlays for each fiscal year by—

(i) $100,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;

(ii) $880,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;

(iii) $3,070,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;

(iv) $5,240,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;

(v) $6,510,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;

(vi) $6,980,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;

(vii) $7,450,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;

(viii) $8,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;

(ix) $8,570,000,000 in fiscal year 2022;

(x) $9,160,000,000 in fiscal year 2023.

(2) FEDERAL REVENUES.—The levels for Federal revenues in this resolution are amended by increasing the level for each fiscal year by—

(A) $10,000,000 in fiscal year 2014;

(B) $90,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;

(C) $350,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;

(D) $640,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;

(E) $730,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;

(F) $1,010,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;

(G) $1,160,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;

(H) $1,230,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;

(I) $1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 2022; and

(J) $1,380,000,000 in fiscal year 2023.

(b) RECONCILIATION.—Not later than October 1, 2013, the Committee on Judiciary shall report changes in laws, bills, or resolutions within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by $110,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 and $63,860,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SA 153. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXPORT PROMOTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide assistance to small businesses in accessing foreign markets, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 154. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.

(a) REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES.—In the case of any legislative provision to which this section applies, the Congressional Budget Office, with the assistance of the Joint Committee on Taxation, shall prepare, to the extent practicable, as a supplement to the cost estimate for legislation affecting revenues, an estimate of the revenue changes in connection with such provision that incorporates the macroeconomic effects of the policy being analyzed. Any macroeconomic impact statement under the preceding sentence shall be accompanied by a written statement fully disclosing the economic, technical, and behavioral assumptions that were made in producing—

(1) such estimate; and

(2) the conventional estimate in connection with such provision.

(b) LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS TO WHICH THIS SECTION APPLIES.—This section shall apply to any legislative provision—

(1) which proposes a change or changes to law that the Congressional Budget Office determines, pursuant to a conventional fiscal estimate, has a revenue impact in excess of $5,000,000,000 in any fiscal year; or

(2) with respect to which the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget of either the Senate or the House of Representatives has requested an estimate described in subsection (a).

SA 155. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 3, and insert the following:

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CORPORATE TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would cut the corporate tax rates while reducing lower-priority business tax preferences, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $159,630,000,000.

SA 156. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 49, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 50, line 3 and insert the following:

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE-NEUTRAL PRO-GROWTH TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure a revenue structure that is more efficient for individuals and businesses, leads to a more competitive business environment for United States enterprises, and may result in additional rate reductions without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

On page 4, line 6, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $159,630,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, reduce the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, reduce the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, reduce the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, reduce the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, reduce the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, reduce the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, reduce the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, reduce the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, reduce the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, reduce the amount by $159,630,000,000.

SA 157. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REQUIRE THE PRESIDENT, VICE-PRESIDENT, POLITICAL APPOINTEES IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP STAFF, AND CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE STAFF TO PARTICIPATE IN THE HEALTH INSURANCE EXCHANGES ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that may be related to the health care coverage of members of Congress and the executive branch which may include requiring the President, Vice-President, political appointees in the executive branch, Congressional leadership staff, and Congressional committee staff to participate in the health insurance exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 158. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF A BUDGET RESOLUTION THAT INCLUDES REVENUE INCREASES WHILE THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IS ABOVE 5.5 PERCENT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any amendment, amendment between Houses, motion, or conference report thereon that includes a revenue increase while the unemployment rate is above 5.5 percent.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) DETERMINATION OF REVENUE INCREASE.—For purposes of this section, a revenue increase is an increase in Federal Revenues in any fiscal year above total revenues in the same fiscal year of the most recent Congressional Budget Office baseline.

(d) DETERMINATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT RATE.—For purposes of this section, the unemployment rate is the Current Population Survey seasonally adjusted national unemployment rate for the most recent month, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

SA 159. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ______. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONSIDERATION OF ANY LEGISLATION AFTER APRIL 15TH UNTIL A BUDGET RESOLUTION IS AGREED TO IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between Houses or conference report after April 15th until the Senate passes a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SA 160. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE TRANSPARENCY IN THE VALUE-ADDED PRODUCER GRANT PROGRAM TO PREVENT SPENDING TAXPAYER DOLLARS ON WASTEFUL GOVERNMENT GIVEAWAYS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may increase transparency and accountability in the value-added agricultural product market development grant program of the Department of Agriculture by allowing for a systemic review of the program through the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture without raising revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 161. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ______. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ACHIEVING FULL AUDITABILITY OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BY 2017.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving full auditability of the financial statements Department of Defense by 2017, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 162. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXPAND AND ENHANCE THE NO CONTRACTING WITH THE ENEMY PROVISIONS TO PREVENT UNITED STATES TAXPAYER DOLLARS FROM GOING TO THE ENEMIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to preventing contracting dollars from going to the enemies of the United States, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 163. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. CORKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MODERNIZE THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS COMPLEX AND STRATEGIC DELIVERY SYSTEMS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to modernizing the nuclear weapons complex and strategic delivery systems of the United States, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 164. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO DELAY IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT UNTIL THE NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE FALLS BELOW 5.5 PERCENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that may be related to a delay of the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act for economic or employment concerns without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 165. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FROM IMPLEMENTING A PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THE DEFINITION OF "FIDUCIARY" UNDER THE EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974 TO INCLUDE APPRAISALS OF EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may prohibit the Department of Labor from expanding the definition of ''fiduciary'' under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) to include appraisals of employee stock ownership plans without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 166. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 58, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

(10) the reining in of onerous regulations on our Nation's fishing industry;

SA 167. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 51, line 9, insert ''without raising new revenue,'' after ''growth,''.

SA 168. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 51, line 19, insert ''without raising new revenue,'' after ''businesses,''.

SA 169. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, line 5, insert ''without raising new revenue,'' after ''program,''.

SA 170. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 52, line 19, insert ''without raising new revenue,'' after ''sistance,''.

SA 171. Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 58, line 12, insert ''without raising new revenue,'' before ''by the amounts''.

SA 172. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 302(a), strike the period and insert the following: '', except that, in the case of a measure that relates to the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.), the Chairman may only make such a revision if the measure includes a provision to implement program integrity controls to prevent cost overruns by the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor.''.

SA 173. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT LOW-INCOME FAMILIES FROM ELECTRICITY COST INCREASES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of 1 or more committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would reform the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) to prevent any new or amended regulation that increases the cost of electricity on low-income families from becoming effective until approved by the Governor of each State, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 174. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT VULNERABLE FAMILIES FROM JOB KILLING REGULATIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would ensure Federal agencies consider the full cost of regulations, including indirect job losses and the negative health impacts of indirect job losses, prior to enacting or amending any regulation or rule, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 175. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS TO ENFORCE OIL REFINERY REGULATIONS AGAINST FAMILY FARMS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would allows funds to be used to enforce any oil refinery rule or regulation against family farms.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 176. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 26 proposed by Ms. MIKULSI (for herself and Mr. SHELBY) to the bill H.R. 933, making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013; as follows.

Amend the title to read: ''An Act making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes.''

SA 177. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. ___. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the reduction of wasteful spending, which may include but is not limited to the establishment of a new committee of the Senate with the purpose of examining and proposing annually legislation to reduce wasteful, inefficient, and duplicative spending.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendment, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to the reduction of wasteful spending, which may include but is not limited to the establishment of a new committee of the Senate with the purpose of examining and proposing annually legislation to reduce wasteful, inefficient, and duplicative spending, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2023.

SA 178. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REMOVE CONTRADICTORY DATA COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that would remove contradictory data collection requirements imposed on financial institutions by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 179. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, line 25, increase the amount by $547,000,000.

On page 30, line 4, increase the amount by $628,000,000.

On page 30, line 8, increase the amount by $158,000,000.

On page 30, line 12, increase the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 30, line 16, increase the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 30, line 20, increase the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 30, line 24, increase the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 31, line 7, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 31, line 11, increase the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $7,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $78,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $577,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $722,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $737,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $753,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $769,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $785,000,000.
On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $801,000,000.
On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $817,000,000.

SA 180. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $559,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,339,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,329,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,299,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,269,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,239,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,239,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,249,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,269,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $559,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,339,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $1,329,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,299,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,269,000,000.
On page 6, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,239,000,000.
On page 6, line 4, decrease the amount by $1,239,000,000.
On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $1,249,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,269,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $559,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,339,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,329,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,299,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,269,000,000.
On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,239,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,239,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,249,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,269,000,000.
On page 35, line 11, decrease the amount by $559,000,000.
On page 35, line 12, decrease the amount by $559,000,000.
On page 35, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,339,000,000.
On page 35, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,339,000,000.
On page 35, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,329,000,000.
On page 35, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,329,000,000.
On page 35, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,299,000,000.
On page 35, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,299,000,000.
On page 36, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,269,000,000.
On page 36, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,269,000,000.
On page 36, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,239,000,000.
On page 36, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,239,000,000.
On page 36, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,239,000,000.
On page 36, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,239,000,000.
On page 36, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,249,000,000.
On page 36, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,249,000,000.
On page 36, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 36, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 36, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,269,000,000.
On page 36, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,269,000,000.

SA 181. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8; setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013; and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $356,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $428,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $433,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $437,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $442,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $446,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $452,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $456,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $464,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $356,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $428,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $433,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $437,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $442,000,000.
On page 6, line 3, decrease the amount by $446,000,000.
On page 6, line 4, decrease the amount by $452,000,000.
On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $456,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $464,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $356,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $428,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $433,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $437,000,000.
On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $442,000,000.
On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $446,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $452,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $456,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $464,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.
On page 35, line 11, decrease the amount by $356,000,000.
On page 35, line 12, decrease the amount by $356,000,000.
On page 35, line 15, decrease the amount by $428,000,000.
On page 35, line 16, decrease the amount by $428,000,000.
On page 35, line 19, decrease the amount by $433,000,000.
On page 35, line 20, decrease the amount by $433,000,000.
On page 35, line 23, decrease the amount by $437,000,000.
On page 35, line 24, decrease the amount by $437,000,000.
On page 36, line 2, decrease the amount by $442,000,000.
On page 36, line 3, decrease the amount by $442,000,000.
On page 36, line 6, decrease the amount by $446,000,000.
On page 36, line 7, decrease the amount by $446,000,000.
On page 36, line 10, decrease the amount by $452,000,000.
On page 36, line 11, decrease the amount by $452,000,000.
On page 36, line 14, decrease the amount by $456,000,000.
On page 36, line 15, decrease the amount by $456,000,000.
On page 36, line 18, decrease the amount by $464,000,000.
On page 36, line 19, decrease the amount by $464,000,000.
On page 36, line 22, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.
On page 36, line 23, decrease the amount by $470,000,000.

SA 182. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8; setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013; and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $1,909,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $3,735,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $3,735,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,713,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $3,668,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $3,628,000,000.
On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $3,950,000,000.
On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $3,950,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $3,971,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $4,014,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,909,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $3,725,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $3,735,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $3,713,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $3,668,000,000.

On page 6, line 3, decrease the amount by $3,628,000,000.

On page 6, line 4, decrease the amount by $3,950,000,000.

On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $3,950,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $3,971,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $4,014,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,909,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $3,725,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $3,735,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $3,713,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $3,668,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $3,628,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $3,950,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $3,950,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $3,971,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $4,014,000,000.

On page 35, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,909,000,000.

On page 35, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,909,000,000.

On page 35, line 15, decrease the amount by $3,735,000,000.

On page 35, line 16, decrease the amount by $3,725,000,000.

On page 35, line 19, decrease the amount by $3,735,000,000.

On page 35, line 20, decrease the amount by $3,735,000,000.

On page 35, line 23, decrease the amount by $3,713,000,000.

On page 35, line 24, decrease the amount by $3,713,000,000.

On page 36, line 2, decrease the amount by $3,668,000,000.

On page 36, line 3, decrease the amount by $3,668,000,000.

On page 36, line 6, decrease the amount by $3,628,000,000.

On page 36, line 7, decrease the amount by $3,628,000,000.

On page 36, line 10, decrease the amount by $3,950,000,000.

On page 36, line 11, decrease the amount by $3,950,000,000.

On page 36, line 14, decrease the amount by $3,950,000,000.

On page 36, line 15, decrease the amount by $3,950,000,000.

On page 36, line 18, decrease the amount by $3,971,000,000.

On page 36, line 19, decrease the amount by $3,971,000,000.

On page 36, line 22, decrease the amount by $4,014,000,000.

On page 36, line 23, decrease the amount by $4,014,000,000.

SA 183. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8; setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013; and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $535,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,305,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,295,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,270,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,240,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,220,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,175,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,165,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $535,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,295,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $1,295,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,270,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,240,000,000.

On page 6, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,220,000,000.

On page 6, line 4, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $1,175,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,165,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $535,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,295,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,295,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,270,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,240,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,220,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,175,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,165,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.

On page 35, line 11, decrease the amount by $535,000,000.

On page 35, line 12, decrease the amount by $535,000,000.

On page 35, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,305,000,000.

On page 35, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,295,000,000.

On page 35, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,295,000,000.

On page 35, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,295,000,000.

On page 35, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,270,000,000.

On page 35, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,270,000,000.

On page 36, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,240,000,000.

On page 36, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,240,000,000.

On page 36, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,220,000,000.

On page 36, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,220,000,000.

On page 36, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 36, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 36, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,175,000,000.

On page 36, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,175,000,000.

On page 36, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,165,000,000.

On page 36, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,165,000,000.

On page 36, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.

On page 36, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.

SA 184. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXPEDITE EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to promoting the export of goods, including manufactured goods, from the United States through reform of environmental laws, which may include the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions produced outside the United States by goods exported from the United States, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 185. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUM REDUCTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from using funds for the implementation or management of health benefit exchanges, including any associated health insurance cost sharing subsidies, until the chief actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services certifies that the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 have resulted in a reduction in the average health insurance premiums for Americans of $2500, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 186. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT HEALTH CARE RATIONING.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that protect all patients by prohibiting the use of data obtained from comparative effectiveness research to deny coverage of items or services under Federal health care programs and to ensure that comparative effectiveness research accounts for advancements in genomics and personalized medicine, the unique needs of health disparity populations, and differences in the treatment response and the treatment preferences of patients, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 187. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT MARKETING MATERIALS RELATING TO THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the budget authority and outlay allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports that prohibit the use of funds for promotional or marketing materials promoting the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or its benefits, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 188. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS WHAT THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES HAS CALLED A "HEALTH SPENDING PROBLEM".

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that delay the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), as amended by the Health Care and Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), until such time as the Office of the Chief Actuary for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services certifies that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as so amended, will not lead to a net increase in National health expenditures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenue over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 189. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS WHAT THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES HAS CALLED A "HEALTH SPENDING PROBLEM".

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that delay the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), as amended by the Health Care and Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), until such time as the Congressional Budget Office certifies that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as so amended, will not lead to an increase in the net Federal budgetary commitment to health care, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenue over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 190. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR UNDERGROUND AND SURFACE COAL MINING SAFETY AND HEALTH RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to underground and surface mining safety and health research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 191. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE THE DEPENDENCE OF THE UNITED STATES ON IMPORTS OF RARE EARTH METALS FROM THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to reducing the dependence of the United States on imports of rare earth metals from the People's Republic of China, which may include research into alternative technologies, promotion of recycling, or encouragement of the production of rare earth metals in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 192. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 60, strike line 7 and insert the following: credentialing requirements; or

(6) supporting additional efforts to increase access to health care for veterans in rural areas through telehealth and other programs that reduce the need for such veterans to travel long distances to a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

SA 193. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AND REFORM THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that strengthen and reform the National Nuclear Security Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 194. Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPEAL THE 3.8 PERCENT TAX ON INVESTMENT INCOME IMPOSED BY THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that may repeal the 3.8 percent tax on investment income imposed by section 1411 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 195. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. 5___. TO REQUIRE FULLER REPORTING ON POSSIBLE COSTS TO TAXPAYERS OF ANY BUDGET SUBMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT.

When the Congressional Budget Office submits its report to Congress relating to a budget submitted by the President for a fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, such report shall contain—

(1) an estimate of the pro rata cost for taxpayers who will file individual income tax returns for taxable years ending during such fiscal year of any deficit that would result from the budget; and

(2) an analysis of the budgetary effects described in paragraph (1).

SA 196. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION INCREASING NET DIRECT SPENDING WHEN THE NATIONAL DEBT EXCEEDS THE SIZE OF THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, motion, or conference report that increases the net level of direct spending, excluding net interest, relative to the most recent Congressional Budget Office baseline during any period in which the gross Federal debt exceeds 100 percent of United States Gross Domestic Product in the prior year.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) DETERMINATION OF GROSS FEDERAL DEBT AS A PERCENT OF GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT.—For purposes of this section, the percent of total gross Federal debt as a percent of Gross Domestic Product shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate on the basis of the most recently published Congressional Budget Office estimate of nominal Gross Domestic Product in the prior calendar year.

SA 197. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE-NEUTRAL AND PRO-GROWTH TAX REFORM.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to boost economic growth, lower tax rates, and broaden the tax base without confiscating higher levels of revenue from taxpayers as a whole, by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 198. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DISABLED VETERANS AND THEIR SURVIVORS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to protecting the benefits of disabled veterans and their survivors, which may not include a chained CPI, by the amounts provided in that legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 199. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ________. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO LIMIT FEDERAL LAND HOLDINGS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports related to programs that discourage the Federal Government from owning or controlling more than a majority of the total land mass in any of the States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 200. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PREVENTING DOMESTIC DRONE KILLINGS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the prevention of drone killings of citizens of the United States in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit or revenues over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 201. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CHOICE-BASED EARLY EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIPS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports related to school choice, which may include providing a portion of Department of Education funding to the States to allow for scholarships for low-income students in kindergarten through grade 12 to use at either a public or private school, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 202. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPEAL THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND THE HEALTH CARE AND EDUCATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the repeal of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 203. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, decrease the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, decrease the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, decrease the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, decrease the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, decrease the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $159,630,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $20,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $40,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $55,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $70,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $82,110,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, decrease the amount by $95,881,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $115,534,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $135,203,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by $149,801,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $159,630,000,000.

On page 46, line 7, decrease the amount by $183,323,000,000.

On page 46, line 8, decrease the amount by $45,663,000,000.

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $186,590,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $186,590,000,000.

On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $224,131,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $224,131,000,000.

On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $254,932,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $254,932,000,000.

On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $298,289,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $298,289,000,000.

On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $348,950,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $348,950,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $421,311,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $421,311,000,000.

On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $470,358,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $470,358,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $519,061,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $519,061,000,000.

On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $548,033,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $548,033,000,000.

On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $584,973,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $584,973,000,000.

SA 204. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, line 14, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 48, line 15, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 48, line 18, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 48, line 19, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 48, line 22, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 48, line 23, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 49, line 2, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 49, line 3, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 49, line 6, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 49, line 7, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 49, line 10, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 49, line 11, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 49, line 14, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 49, line 15, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 49, line 18, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 49, line 19, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

SA 205. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS PAID IN CIVIL LITIGATION THAT SEEKS TO COMPEL FEDERAL REGULATORY ACTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports for legislation relating to the reform of the use of Federal funds to pay legal costs arising from civil actions, which may include actions against the Environmental Protection Agency or the Department of the Interior seeking to compel regulatory action by those agencies, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 206. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 46, line 11, decrease the amount by $16,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 12, decrease the amount by $16,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 15, decrease the amount by $30,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $30,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 19, decrease the amount by $44,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $44,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 23, decrease the amount by $59,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $59,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 2, decrease the amount by $73,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $73,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, decrease the amount by $87,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $87,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 10, decrease the amount by $101,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $101,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, decrease the amount by $116,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, decrease the amount by $116,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 18, decrease the amount by $130,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, decrease the amount by $130,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 22, decrease the amount by $144,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, decrease the amount by $144,000,000,000.

SA 207. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO END PAYMENT OF FEDERAL FUNDS USED IN PROMOTING NUTRITION PROGRAMS THROUGH ANY PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN FEDERAL AGENCIES AND FOREIGN EMBASSIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would end payment of Federal funds used in promoting nutrition programs through any partnerships between Federal agencies and foreign embassies, by the amounts provided in the legislation for those purposes, provided that the legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.

SA 208. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND TO ACHIEVE SAVINGS BY PROHIBITING ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS OR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS GRANTED LEGAL STATUS FROM QUALIFYING FOR FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED HEALTH CARE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings in health care that may be related to prohibiting illegal immigrants or aliens who were unlawfully present in the United States prior to receiving a grant of legal immigration status from qualifying for Federally subsidized health care without raising revenues, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 5 and 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

SA 209. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND TO ACHIEVE SAVINGS BY PROHIBITING ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS OR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS GRANTED LEGAL STATUS FROM QUALIFYING FOR A REFUNDABLE TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieve savings that may be related to the prohibition of illegal immigrants or aliens who were unlawfully present in the United States prior to receiving a grant of legal immigration status from qualifying for refundable tax credits, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 5 and 10 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''Aviation Safety: FAA's Progress on Key Safety Initiatives.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Reforming the Delivery System: The Center on Medicare and Medicaid Innovation.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2013, at 2:15 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled, ''Counterterrorism Policies and Priorities: Addressing the Evolving Threat.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2013, at 11:30 a.m. in President's Room of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Hurricane Sandy: Getting the Recovery Right and the Value of Mitigation''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2013, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Future of Drones in America: Law Enforcement and Privacy Considerations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2013, at 2 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Building an Immigration System Worthy of American Values.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SR–418 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''VA Mental Health Care: Ensuring Timely Access to High-Quality Care.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND SPACE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Science and Space of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''Assessing the Risks, Impacts, and Solutions for Space Threats.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Emily Sharp and Michael Branson, detailees to the Budget Committee, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the consideration of the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ronald Dabrowski, a detailee with the Finance Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 2013 calendar year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the following members of my Budget Committee staff be granted full floor access for the duration of the consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, John Righter and Mike Jones.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOLD STAR WIVES DAY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 67) designating April 5, 2013, as ''Gold Star Wives Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 5, 2013, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

192ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 84, submitted earlier today by Senator MENENDEZ and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 84) recognizing the 192nd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL CONGENITAL DIAPHRAGMATIC HERNIA AWARENESS MONTH

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 85, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 85) designating April 2013 as ''National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 85) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2013

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9 a.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, the Budget Resolution; further, that there be 34 hours remaining on the concurrent resolution divided between the chair and the ranking member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 10:45 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 21, 2013 at 9 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MEMORIAL TO DONALD HECKARD

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today with a heavy heart; yet, also with personal pride to pay tribute to a great American, Hoosier, mentor, and friend to many: Donald H. Heckard. Don was born on June 19, 1924, in Cass County, Indiana, and he passed away March 1, 2013.

Countless Hoosier friends marked the passing of an iconic figure who cast a significant influence over Indiana politics and vocational education for nearly a half century. For many of the current generation, Don Heckard was the archetypal Hoosier Republican. Conservative in matters of personal and public finance, Don's key to success was his ability to assess an issue, make good decisions, and apply hard work and dedication to the task at hand. Don spent his entire life as a steward of the land in Noble Township, Cass County and was proud to be called a farmer. He was also the owner operator of Logan City Ice Company for thirty three years. To all those who bought ice bags in central Indiana on a hot summer day, Don was known as "Logan Ice."

With strong beliefs in his community and love of family, Don actively served his church in Logansport, Indiana, as a deacon, trustee, elder and Sunday school teacher. Don was appointed by then Governor Otis Bowen as a State Director and Chairman of the Board of the Ivy Tech Community College. Don presided over a period of dramatic growth and development of the regional campus program.

Gerald Gerry Lamkin, President of Ivy Tech Community College, 1983–2007, in his book, "Building Indiana's Community College: My 40-Year Journey," paid tribute to Don Heckard as follows:

> I've written much about Don Heckard of Logansport. Of many exceptional members of the State Board of Trustees, none was better than Heckard. I'm not sure what made him so effective? Perhaps it was that he was a farmer, businessman and politician and good at all of them. (As a district party chair, he sat on the Republican state committee. Political people from across Indiana and the nation sought his advice and still do.) A thoughtful man, he's loyal to friends and associates. He sizes up situations well, consistently makes good decisions, possesses excellent judgment and is unflappable. He doesn't argue for perfection, but does expect effort and effectiveness. These qualities made him an extraordinary trustee.

Don had a deep love for his country and expressed his patriotism by his active involvement in politics. He served as a County Councilman for eleven years, and beginning in the 1970s, as Cass County Republican Chairman, Second and Fifth Congressional District Chairman during the governorships of Otis Bowen and Robert Orr, contributing significantly to their election and to Republican control of the legislature during the period. Don served as a committed Ford delegate to the GOP National Convention that nominated Gerald Ford for the presidency in 1976, and subsequently served as State Chairman of Farmers for Ford. As a Congressional District chairman, Don served on the Republican State Committee and was a delegate to thirteen Indiana Republican State Conventions. Don was also a mentor and personal advisor to Congressman Steve Buyer for 18 years.

Indiana has a special way to recognize one of the state's favorite sons and daughters by awarding the Sagamore of the Wabash as Indiana's highest citizen award. Don was twice an honoree named Sagamore of the Wabash, once by Governor Otis Bowen and the other by Governor Robert Orr.

Don was a noble businessman, civic and political leader, and devoted family man from what American history has crowned the greatest generation. His principles, work ethic, virtues, and values have left positive impressions to the betterment of others in a manner in which the name of Donald H. Heckard will be forever etched in our National Book of Remembrance.

HONORING THE 192ND ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

HON. MICHAEL G. GRIMM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, today I stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in honoring a joyous day for our proud constituents of Greek and Cypriot descent. As an enthusiastic member of the Congressional Hellenic Caucus, I am truly honored to commemorate the 192nd Anniversary of Greek Independence and celebrate the ties that connect our two great democracies in strength and fellowship.

In reflecting on Greece and America's longstanding tradition as friends and allies, we also honor the accomplishments of countless Greek and Cypriot Americans, many of which first immigrated to our country and grew their livelihoods in New York City, a longstanding bastion America's magnificent diversity. I represent the 11th Congressional District of New York and am proud to serve a large and thriving Greek and Cypriot American community. The remarkable cultural festivals thrown by the Holy Cross Orthodox Church in Bay Ridge, or the Holy Trinity/St. Nicholas Greek Orthodox Churches on the West Shore of Staten Island are beloved neighborhood celebrations that are looked forward to by residents of all backgrounds every year. The countless businesses, services, and entrepreneurial endeavors provided by Greek and Cypriot Americans in Staten Island and Brooklyn attest to the strength of, and support for, this thriving community.

Greek Independence Day is an ideal moment for all Americans to contemplate the roots of our own democratic tradition. It is important to remember that when the Founding Fathers set out to structure our young republic on firm footing, many of the laws and principles were based on the ancient political philosophy of the Greeks. Appreciating the very architecture of the United States Capitol, our Temple of Freedom, or reading through the Constitution reveals the profound impact the culture and history of Greece has had on our modern customs and institutions.

It is with great pride that I rise today to honor the independence of a nation that, for centuries, has championed the very rights it has had the distinct honor and privilege of nurturing into existence: those of liberty and participation in the democratic process. I have come to know first-hand the vibrant cultural heritage Greek and Cypriot Americans offer to local communities in Staten Island and Brooklyn, and I have every confidence that the common bonds between the United States, Cyprus, and Greece shall live on for generations to come.

CHRISTINE COOPER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Christine Cooper for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Christine Cooper is an 8th grader at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Christine Cooper is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Christine Cooper for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 75, final passage of the SKILLS Act on March 15, 2013, it was my intention to vote in support of final passage. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING VU QUANG NINH

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I heard of the passing of my late friend, Mr. Vu Quang Ninh, founder of Little Saigon Radio and a media trailblazer in the Vietnamese American community. Mr. Ninh passed away peacefully in Orange County at age 82.

Mr. Ninh lived a very prosperous and productive life, dedicated to public service. His career spanned more than half a century in both Vietnam and the United States. Mr. Ninh grew up in turbulent times during the Vietnam War. He was called on by Prime Minister Ngo Dinh Diem of Vietnam to take charge of Armed Forces Radio right after his graduation from the Army Academy. Mr. Ninh later served as the head of the youth department in Central Vietnam and produced many radio programs, collaborating by the United States and the Republic of South Vietnam government.

After the fall of Vietnam, Mr. Ninh resettled in California but the dream of becoming a radioman never left him. In 1980, he established Radio Tieng Vong Que Huong (Echo of the Motherland), which lasted for 3 years. Mr. Ninh paved the way for the Vietnamese-Americans in the world of radio broadcast when he established Little Saigon Radio. He turned the station into a strong and constructive voice for the community. Today, my thoughts are with his family, friends and the Little Saigon Radio family. His loss will be remembered and felt by all those who were inspired by his legacy.

DARLENE TAPIA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Darlene Tapia for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Darlene Tapia is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Darlene Tapia is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Darlene Tapia for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RED CROSS MONTH

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, since 1943, every President has declared March as "Red Cross Month." This year is no exception. As the Chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I recently was able to visit the National Red Cross, along with the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee—Mr. PAYNE, Jr. from New Jersey, to learn about their operations and show our support. During the visit, we learned that each year the Red Cross responds to about 70,000 natural and man-made disasters, ranging from small incidents, like house fires, to large-scale disasters like Hurricane Sandy and the 2010 earthquake in Haiti. Additionally, the Red Cross, through numerous blood drives, provides approximately 40 percent of the Nation's blood supply.

The visit also provided us with the opportunity to tour the Digital Operations Center. The Digital Operations Center is the first social media-monitoring platform dedicated to humanitarian relief. The Digital Operations Center equips the Red Cross to better share safety and preparedness tips during natural disasters and aims to empower communities suffering during disasters to use social tools to seek help. After visiting the Digital Operations Center, I was very impressed with how the Red Cross has begun to leverage social media and uses smartphone apps to keep citizens informed before, during, and after disasters.

I am personally thankful for the Greater Indianapolis Red Cross chapter and its volunteers. This chapter has truly embraced the Red Cross ethos of turning "compassion into action." Just last year, volunteer Disaster Action Teams responded to more than 500 house fires and assisted over 700 families in recovering from emergencies and disasters. Additionally, more than 30 volunteers from East and Central Indiana were an integral part of the Red Cross' relief operations after deadly tornadoes struck Southern Indiana in March of last year. These examples highlight just a few of the capabilities a typical local Red Cross chapter can offer.

In the upcoming weeks, when you are back in your Congressional District, please take a moment to thank your local Red Cross for all the work they do. The Red Cross is vital to our Nation's ability to prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters, regardless of the size, and they deserve our appreciation.

SHIPYARD LAYS KEEL OF THE JOHN WARNER SUBMARINE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that former Virginia Senator and Secretary of the Navy John Warner was honored last Saturday at a keel laying ceremony at Newport News Shipbuilding, a subsidiary of Huntington Ingalls Industries. This is a special occasion for the Navy and the Commonwealth of Virginia as the *John Warner* SSN 785, a 377-foot nuclear-powered submarine, is the first *Virginia*-class fast attack submarine to be named after a person. The submarine's apt namesake shows John Warner's dedication to the service of our country. Construction of the 12th *Virginia*-class submarine began in 2009 and it is scheduled to be delivered to the Navy in 2015. I am pleased to have served with John Warner in Congress and submit a Daily Press accounting of the ceremony.

[From the Daily Press, Mar. 17, 2013]

SHIPYARD LAYS KEEL OF THE JOHN WARNER SUBMARINE

(By Michael Welles Shapiro)

On Saturday the former lawmaker whose fingerprints are all over Newport News Shipbuilding's involvement in the construction of Virginia-class nuclear submarines watched as his initials were welded onto a piece of the shipyard's latest boat.

In a rarity in military shipbuilding, the shipyard laid the keel of a fast-attack submarine with its namesake, former senator and Secretary of the Navy John Warner, in attendance.

The boat is the 12th in the Virginia-class program and it is scheduled for delivery to the Navy in 2015. The shipyard, a unit of Huntington Ingalls Industries, builds the boats in partnership with General Dynamics Electric Boat in Groton, Conn., a unique arrangement that Warner is credited with helping to start.

Shipyard president Matt Mulherin said naming the latest submarine for Warner is fitting because "he led the efforts to create this teaming agreement between Newport News Shipbuilding and Electric Boat to cooperatively build these submarines."

Navy leaders also spoke glowingly of the joint construction program. Adm. John Richardson, the director of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program, said, "the on-time, on-cost, on-quality implementation of this program is well-known."

Warner also received accolades from lawmakers in attendance.

Sen. Mark Warner, who is no relation, said he admired the former senator for being a politician who was willing to set aside politics when push came to shove.

Mark Warner, a Democrat, said that when he was governor, John Warner, a Republican, spoke out in support of a Mark Warner budget bill that had stalled during a partisan tug of war.

"We could use a lot more John Warners in the United States Congress at this point," he said.

John Warner's wife, Jeanne, is the submarine's sponsor.

To close the ceremony the couple chalked their initials on a steel plate before shipyard worker Matthew Shilling welded the letters onto the metal.

Shilling, 27, said after the ceremony that he'd been practicing welding block letters during the week leading up to the keel laying.

But Warner threw the shipbuilder a curve when he wrote his "J" in cursive with a flourish. "I was nervous," Shilling said, saying he's more accustomed to working in a loud construction environment.

Warner also improvised a bit as the ceremony wrapped up.

The Navy and Marine Corps veteran made an unexpected gesture to show that the submarine represents not just him but an entire generation that served in World War II.

He asked the sub's prospective commanding officer, Cmdr. Dan Caldwell, to have a small pin that he and others who served received at the end of the war kept onboard the submarine near the steel plate.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

From 1903 to the late 1960s, attack submarines like the Warner were given the names of fish and creatures of the deep—the Seawolf, the Sturgeon and the Whale, for instance.

In his speech, Warner attributed a change in that convention to former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird.

Warner said he and Adm. Hyman Rickover—the famed admiral who pushed Congress to buy nuclear-powered ships—were called in to meet with Laird and the secretary brought up the topic of ship names.

Laird told the two men, ''fish don't appropriate, and fish don't vote, so stop calling them fish,'' according to Warner.

Since 1973 the country's two large classes of attack submarines have been named for cities and states. The two exceptions to those traditions are a boat that was named for Rickover and built in the 1980s and the Warner.

Military ships of any sort are seldom named for living people.

Starting in the 1970s about three ships a decade have been named for people who are living at the time of the announcement, according to a July 2012 Navy report to Congress on naming conventions.

The list includes four presidents, former Arizona Rep. Gabby Giffords, astronaut and former senator John Glenn and comedian Bob Hope, who was famous for his numerous United Service Organizations shows to entertain military personnel.

''(W)hile naming ships after living persons remains a relatively rare occurrence . . . it is now an accepted but sparingly used practice for pragmatic (Navy) secretaries of both parties,'' the report says.

''(O)ccasionally honoring an especially deserving member of Congress, U.S. naval leader or famous American with a ship name so that they might end their days on earth knowing that their life's work is both recognized and honored by America's Navy-Marine Corps Team, and that their spirit will accompany and inspire the team in battle, is sometimes exactly the right thing to do.''

Asked how he felt about having a submarine named for him, Warner said, ''I'm not too much of a philosopher,'' but ''I'm humbled.''

DEVON FOX

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Devon Fox for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Devon Fox is an 11th grader at IB Program at Lakewood High and received this award because him determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Devon Fox is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Devon Fox for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of him future accomplishments.

HONORING EAST CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of my constituents at East Central High School in Dearborn County, Indiana.

The Business Professionals of America chapter at East Central High School recently competed in the 2013 State Leadership Conference held in Indianapolis. Students participated and placed in the Broadcast Production, Global Marketing, Financial Math and Analysis, Entrepreneurship, Fundamentals of Word Processing, and Advanced Accounting competitions.

Business Professionals of America competitions are a great way for students to develop leadership and technology skills that are most needed for today's competitive workforce and economy.

I want to congratulate the team and those students who participated in the state contest: Brittany Begley, Lucas Gramman, Jake Griffin, Jesse Hamilton, Danielle McClure, Hannah Patton, Tyler Seiwert, Payton Stonefield, and A.J. Waltz. I also want to recognize the faculty sponsors, Kelly Pettit and Tina Waechter, for their leadership in these students' lives. In addition, Jake and Danielle qualified for the National Competition and will be representing the state in May.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating the East Central High School Business Professionals of America team for their hard work and in wishing them continued success in competition.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES ACT

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my friend and colleague from California, Congresswoman ROYBAL-ALLARD, to introduce the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2013. This legislation would reauthorize critical federal programs that assist states in improving and expanding their newborn screening programs, supporting parent and provider newborn screening education, and ensuring laboratory quality and surveillance.

Over 4 million babies will be born across the United States this year, and each and every one will be touched by newborn screening. Most screenings are done using a simple ''heel stick'' blood sample collected before the newborn leaves the hospital. These screenings test for serious genetic, metabolic or hearing disorders that may not be apparent at birth.

Approximately 1 in every 300 newborns in the United States has a condition that can be detected through screening. If left untreated, these conditions can cause serious illness, lifetime disabilities and even death. Without early interventions, these infants and their families suffer enormous emotional and economic burdens. Imagine the burden of knowing that your child died or is suffering from a disease that could have been prevented if identified through newborn screening. No baby should suffer or die if a screening test can prevent it.

Newborn screening not only saves lives but, it also saves money. As a former dentist, I know well the importance of diagnosing and treating a condition early in a child's life. According to a 2012 study on severe combined immunodeficiency (SCID)—one of the 31 core, treatable conditions recommended for state newborn screening programs—the Medicaid cost of treating a baby with SCID in the first two years of life can cost more than $2 million dollars. Yet, an infant diagnosed early can be cured through a simple bone marrow transplant—costing just $100,000 if performed in the first three months of life.

In 2008, Congresswoman ROYBAL-ALLARD and I introduced the original Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act (P.L. 110–204), which encouraged states to uniformly test for a recommended set of disorders and provided resources for states to expand and improve their newborn screening programs. Prior to passage, the number and quality of newborn screening tests varied greatly from state to state. In 2007, only 10 states and the District of Columbia required infants to be screened for all of the ''core conditions'' recommended by the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children. Today, 44 states and the District of Columbia require screening for at least 29 of the 31 treatable core conditions.

The Newborn Screenings Saves Lives Reauthorization Act builds upon the foundation laid by the original legislation and will ensure that infants continue to receive comprehensive and effective screenings. The legislation reauthorizes programs at the Health Resources and Services Administration to assist states' efforts to improve their screening programs, educate parents and health care providers, and improve follow-up care for infants with conditions detected through newborn screening. The legislation also renews the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children, which maintains and updates the Recommended Uniform Screening Panel that states use to adopt and implement new conditions. Improvement of data quality is also needed to track the clinical outcomes of children more effectively and to refine protocols for short-term and long-term follow-up of children with conditions identified through newborn screening. That is why the Reauthorization Act establishes a grant program within the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to assist states in developing follow-up and tracking programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join with me in supporting this critical legislation—because no baby should die or suffer the devastating health consequences of a condition that could have been treated or prevented if identified through newborn screening.

DOMONICK GUIGON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Domonick Guigon for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Domonick Guigon is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Domonick Guigon is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Domonick Guigon for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING MS. LANA FELTON-GHEE

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Lana Felton-Ghee, a constituent of Pennsylvania's 1st District, for her upcoming 66th birthday on April 8th.

Born, raised and educated in Philadelphia, Lana is well known for her successes in business and politics. Graduating from Temple University, Ms. Felton-Ghee led a longtime, high profile career in marketing and public relations. She established her own business in 1995, Lana Felton-Ghee Associates, Inc., and took on challenging projects in our area and throughout the country. Her expertise was recognized nationally, and she became a key consultant on campaigns for figures such as Mayor Ed Rendell and President Bill Clinton.

Throughout her busy and successful career, Ms. Felton-Ghee also made time for a fulfilling family life and is a proud mother of four and grandmother of ten.

I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues help me in honoring Ms. Felton-Ghee and her birthday. Ms. Felton-Ghee is the epitome of a life-long Philadelphian and a model citizen. We can all learn something from her fortitude and her commitment to her career, her city and her family. She has been known to say that "there is no place like Philadelphia," but Philadelphia would not be nearly as bright a place without her vibrant and dedicated personality.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 76—Approving the Journal, 77—H. Con. Res. 18, and 78—H. Con. Res. 19.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I was absent because of a flight problem.

EDNA SOLIS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Edna Solis for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Edna Solis is an 11th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Edna Solis is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Edna Solis for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING THE OHIO CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Ohio Christian University men's basketball team on their first-ever National Christian College Athletic Association (NCCAA) National Championship win.

Ending a perfect season, the OCU Trailblazers triumphed over the Arlington Baptist University Patriots with a score of 73–62. It was a very close game, and the Patriots had a one point lead by the end of the first half. However, the Trailblazers came back in the second half, limiting the Patriots to 24 points. The OCU defense shut down ABU in the final two minutes, leading the team to the championship title.

Again, I extend my congratulations to the Ohio Christian University men's basketball team on their perfect season and NCCAA title. I am proud of all the hard work and dedication that has led to the team's accomplishments. These hardworking young men have brought pride to the people of Ohio's 15th Congressional District, and I commend them for this outstanding achievement.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ELMIRA COLLEGE WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY TEAM

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Elmira College women's ice hockey team, winner of the 2013 NCAA Division III National Championship. Led by the strong play of goaltender Taylor Steadman, who posted her 11th shutout of the year, the Soaring Eagles skated to a 1–0 victory over Middlebury College on March 16.

Under the leadership of head coach Dean Jackson, the Soaring Eagles finished the season with a remarkable 24–5–1 record. This marks the third time that Elmira College has captured the National Championship since its women's ice hockey program was established in 2002.

The unrivaled success of the Elmira College women's ice hockey team is a testament to the hard work and dedication of the players and coaches. The months of practice and training culminated in the highest level of success that an athletic team can achieve, being crowned as the national champions. This team is a source of pride in Elmira and across my entire district, and I am honored to recognize their great athletic accomplishment.

DAMON BOLTON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Damon Bolton for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Damon Bolton is a 12th grader at Lakewood High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Damon Bolton is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Damon Bolton for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST RELATING TO THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE TWENTY EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the majority that this election contest should be dismissed and that it stands before us without merit. The Contestant notified the House that he should be the winner of the election not based on the finding of any solid evidence but based on rumors, conjecture and hearsay.

Contestant also raises accusations of misconduct by law enforcement and election officials without proof. The Contestant does not support any of his arguments with specific creditable evidence. Based on this, I am voting to grant the Contestee relief by disposing of this contest.

My only regret is that the House was not able to dismiss this frivolous contest earlier in the 113th Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LEAD HAZARD TITLE X AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2013

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Lead Hazard Title X Amendments Act.

Although the prevalence of lead poisoning in children has dropped dramatically since the 1970s, the number of children suffering from lead poisoning remains unacceptably high. Over half a million children under the age of 6 in the Unites States, disproportionately from African-American or low-income communities, are suffering from elevated blood lead levels. There is no safe level of lead exposure for children, yet an estimated 37.1 million homes still have lead-based paint somewhere in the building.

Lead poisoning, which can occur at very low levels of exposure, causes brain damage in infants and toddlers, resulting in poor educational outcomes and widening the achievement gap. Lead poisoning robs children of IQ points, causes cognitive and behavioral issues, and a results in a lifetime of adverse health effects. Each year, lead poisoning costs the United States more than $50 billion in lost productivity. Educating children suffering from lead poisoning costs public school system special education programs an extra $38,000 per child every three years. When it costs less than that to eliminate lead from a home, it hardly makes sense that we permit any of our nation's children to be the victims of lead poisoning.

The bill I am introducing today, the Lead Hazard Title X Amendments Act, modernizes the Department for Housing and Urban Development's Lead Hazard Control Program. By making much needed updates to the program, we can better protect our children and allow for more efficient lead eradication from homes.

This Act will allow families living in all housing, including efficiency apartments, to be eligible for Lead Hazard Control grants. It will broaden the categories of eligible grant recipients, it will allow non-profit agencies and tribal governments to apply for lead abatement funds, and it will simplify the grant application process by allowing Lead Hazard Control grantees to use eligibility information from other government programs to qualify for funds. Finally, this Act will enable grantees already receiving Lead Hazard Control funding to easily and efficiently tap other resources for additional Healthy Housing repairs, including addressing asthma, carbon monoxide, and other safety concerns.

We cannot afford for any of our children not to reach their full potential. I urge my colleagues to stand with me to protect all our nation's children from lead poisoning.

DAVID ROLAND

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud David Roland for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. David Roland is an 11th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because him determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by David Roland is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to David Roland for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of him future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING JAMES D. RUTH

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the accomplishments of Mr. James D. Ruth upon his retirement from the Orange County Sanitation District and from over 50 years of public service. Jim was appointed Interim General Manager of the Orange County Sanitation District, OCSD, in December 2005 for what was supposed to be a six-month role. But instead of serving a short term, his steady management and skill in delivering public services resulted in his six-month assignment turning into a seven-year term of service.

Mr. Ruth stayed to steer OCSD through difficult times, accumulated a number of significant accomplishments, and gained national and international acclaim for the management of the third largest wastewater treatment plant west of the Mississippi River. During his tenure, Jim Ruth streamlined the agency by eliminating waste and duplication and trimming costs without sacrificing service to the 2.5 million Orange County residents that rely on OCSD every day. He negotiated a two-tier pension system and was a leader in implementing reduced employee costs across the board.

Of special interest to me, Jim Ruth oversaw OCSD's participation in the completion of the Groundwater Replenishment System. He also presided over the dedication of OCSD's secondary treatment upgrade. Both of these projects provide for a reliable and safe clean water supply while protecting Orange County's beautiful beaches.

I applaud Jim's service to our community over the years, and most recently, his service to OCSD. While I wish Jim a long and happy retirement, he should know that his accomplishments throughout his career will not soon be forgotten.

HONORING RICHARD D. STEINBERG, CFA

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Richard D. Steinberg, who recently received the Mitzvah Society Award from the Jewish Federation of South Palm Beach County. Rich is a respected financial advisor, dedicated community leader, and generous philanthropist who I am also proud to call my friend.

That Rich has received this prestigious award should be no surprise. Rich is known to his friends and colleagues as a compassionate leader who always puts the well-being of his family, clients, and community above all else. These qualities have contributed to his success as a Chartered Financial Analyst and as President and CIO of Steinberg Global Asset Management. In this role, Rich helps individuals, companies, philanthropists, donors and other clients manage their investments so that they can achieve their goals.

While Rich's professional life alone is worthy of admiration, it is his involvement in the South Florida community that truly sets him apart. A proud Jewish American, Rich's commitment to his community has led him to serve in many leadership roles for the Jewish Federation for South Palm Beach County and the Jacobsen Jewish Community Foundation. Rich serves on the Governance Committee for the Professional Advisory Committee (PAC) of the Jewish Federation for South Palm Beach County, and is Vice Chair and Investment Committee Chair of the Jewish Federation for South Palm Beach County's Foundation Executive Committee. He has also helped secure millions of dollars for local projects in South Florida while balancing these efforts as a devoted husband to a lovely wife and an energetic father who regularly volunteers at his children's schools.

Rich is a model citizen whose dedication to faith, family, friends, and clients has made an immeasurable impact on our community. It is truly an honor to recognize his contributions today.

DOMINIQUE BURKEY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Dominique Burkey for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Dominique Burkey is an 8th grader at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Dominique Burkey is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Dominique Burkey for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be in Washington, DC, on March 18–19, 2013. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote Nos. 77 and 78, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds; "no" on rollcall vote Nos. 79 and 80, ordering the previous question and the rule providing for consideration of the House Budget Resolution; and "no" on rollcall vote No. 82 relating to committee expenses for the 113th Congress.

CONGRATULATING MR. PATRICK LOGAN, RECIPIENT OF THE WALT DISNEY LEGACY AWARD

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to congratulate Mr. Patrick Logan on earning the Walt Disney Legacy Award. The Walt Disney Legacy Award is the most prestigious award given to Cast, Crew and Imagineers who exemplify all three of the Walt Disney Company values of Dream, Create and Inspire.

The Walt Disney Legacy Award is a global program that is generally limited to less than the top 1 percent of eligible Cast Members. To ensure that only the most deserving are awarded this prominent honor, Cast Members only become eligible for this program by a process of peer nomination and vetting through multiple nomination review committees.

To receive this award, Mr. Logan has demonstrated the character qualities of dreaming, creating and inspiring through his actions in support of the Walt Disney Company's business objectives and goals. His unselfish commitment of his time and active focus on improving the Disney experience for millions of guests is to be commended. Mr. Logan constantly goes above and beyond to make certain each guest, many of whom are children, receive an experience from the Walt Disney Company that is a magical celebration and memory.

His accomplishments do not end with the Walt Disney Legacy Award. He has also been the lead point of contact in Walt Disney Company events and community service outreach in the State of Florida and various states around the country.

On behalf of the citizens of Central Florida, I am pleased to recognize and applaud Mr. Patrick Logan for his hard work, dedication and leadership. He is most deserving of the Walt Disney Legacy Award. May his character and passion inspire others to follow in his footsteps.

EDITE MALOKU

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Edite Maloku for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Edite Maloku is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Edite Maloku is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Edite Maloku for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SOUND SCIENCE ACT OF 2013

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my bill, the Sound Science Act of 2013, which directs the Office of Science and Technology Policies (OSTP) to require each agency to develop guidelines to maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of scientific information used by federal agencies.

My legislation requires appropriate peer review, the disclosure of scientific studies used in making decisions, and an opportunity for stakeholder input. It also requires federal agencies to give greatest weight to information based on reproducible data that is developed in accordance with the scientific method. Further, it deems agency actions that do not follow such procedures to be arbitrary and subject to challenge by affected stakeholders.

Mr. Speaker, many of the regulations developed by the federal agencies are well intentioned, yet recently there have been reports that federal agencies, such as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), may be moving well beyond hard-science in the rule making process, which would have significant negative impacts on a wide range of industries. For example, some outside interest groups are pressuring the FDA to take action against antimicrobial soaps, asserting that antimicrobial soaps are no more effective than common soap, even though antimicrobial soap has been mandated in hospitals and doctors' offices for decades. Additionally, chicken and pork farmers are concerned that the FDA's decision to review long-standing industry practices in the area of antibiotics without a sound scientific basis will adversely affect animal welfare and will have a negative impact on food safety.

Simply put, the rules and regulations promulgated by federal agencies affect both businesses and the consumer. Bottom line, the U.S. economy is in a fragile state, any hurdle, fee, or foreign advantage, will cost the U.S. economy valuable jobs. Higher costs to comply with regulations undermine businesses ability to compete globally, while causing consumers to pay more for products.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House (and Senate) to support me in passing the Sound Science Act of 2013 in order to ensure the scientific integrity of federal agencies.

COMMEMORATING THE 192ND ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 192nd anniversary of Greece declaring its independence from the Ottoman Empire. After eight years, Greece was free again for the first time in nearly five centuries. As a former colonial people, we Americans instinctively have a sense of affinity for other peoples seeking to throw off the shackles of foreign rule. In the case of Greece, that feeling is particularly powerful because our very conceptions of democracy, self-government and citizen participation in the life of the nation come directly from ancient Greece.

Today, the people of Greece are struggling with new and serious challenges, especially deep-seated economic problems that have not only rocked the economic foundations of the nation but have put Greek democracy itself at risk. The rise of the "Golden Dawn" movement is a reminder that anti-democratic forces in a society can emerge with frightening speed. I am encouraged that the overwhelming majority of Greeks have rejected the fascist and racist ideology of "Golden Dawn", and America should continue to do all it can to help our Greek ally achieve a full and enduring economic recovery. The bonds of friendship between America and Greece are strong in no small part because of our common commitment to a core value of Western civilization: democracy. On this 192nd anniversary of the rebirth of Greek democracy, I wish the people of Greece and all Greek-Americans a happy independence day.

CONGRATULATING THE INDIANA WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY WILDCATS WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to congratulate the Indiana Wesleyan University Women's Basketball team for winning the NAIA Division II National Women's Basketball Championship. The IWU Wildcats from Marion, Indiana defeated the Davenport University Panthers, winning their second national title in seven years.

The Wildcats played in the spotlight of the NAIA throughout this phenomenal season, which ended with a winning record of 35–3. Since the 1999–2000 season, Coach Steve Brooks has demonstrated outstanding leadership while serving as the head basketball coach. Last year, his leadership both on and off the court was publicly recognized when he was selected as the RUSSELL ATHLETIC/WBCA NAIA National Coach of the Year, and this year he was honored as the NAIA Phyllis Holmes Coach of the Year, an honor he also received in 2007. As the daughter of a high school football coach, I understand the time commitment and personal sacrifices required to lead young athletes to victory, and applaud Coach Brooks' leadership.

In recognition of their achievements, one of the Wildcats was named to the NAIA All-American First Team, while another teammate was chosen as a NAIA All-American Honorable Mention. This outstanding accomplishment is a reflection of the quality and character of IWU's players as well as their exceptional athletic talent. The coaches and players of the IWU team exemplify the highest virtues of the community: teamwork, loyalty, sportsmanship, and dedication.

Once again, congratulations Wildcats, we are very proud of you. We look forward to cheering you on through another great season next year.

EDWIN SAENZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Edwin Saenz for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Edwin Saenz is an 11th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Edwin Saenz is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Edwin Saenz for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 14 and Friday, March 15, 2013, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: "no" on rollcall vote No. 70 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 113); "no" on rollcall vote No. 71 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 113); "yes" on rollcall vote No. 72 (on approving the journal); "yes" on rollcall vote No. 73 (on agreeing to the Tierney substitute amendment to H.R. 803); "yes" on rollcall vote No. 74 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 803 with instructions); and "no" on rollcall vote No. 75 (on passage of H.R. 803).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, the Majority Whip Office asked Representative MICHELE BACHMANN to work on a project during the RSC budget vote. We assured her that we would inform her prior to our closing the vote. We did not, and for that we take responsibility and apologize both to her and her constituents.

Representative BACHMANN would have voted in the affirmative for the Republican Study Committee substitute to H. Con. Res. 25.

CONGRATULATING MEDSTAR ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL IN LEONARDTOWN, MARYLAND, AS A TOP-100 HOSPITAL

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate MedStar St. Mary's Hospital in Leonardtown, Maryland, for being named one of the Nation's 100 Top Hospitals by Truven Health Analytics.

This honor comes as St. Mary's concludes celebrations marking its centennial year, having been established in 1912 to provide quality medical care to families in rural St. Mary's County. Over the years, as the County's communities have grown, so too have its medical needs, and St. Mary's Hospital has become a full-service hospital with ninety-five beds and state-of-the-art facilities.

St. Mary's Hospital provides surrounding communities with inpatient, outpatient, and emergency services with a reputation for compassionate care and excellence in performance. It's no wonder to those of us familiar with St. Mary's Hospital that it has achieved the distinction this year as one of the hundred best hospitals in America.

Last August, St. Mary's Hospital received an $84,335 grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Rural Health Network Development Planning Grant Program. This grant is supporting the development of a Community Health Center Planning Network to meet the needs of underserved areas in rural St. Mary's County. Improving access to affordable care for those living in Maryland's Fifth District remains one of my highest priorities. I was proud to have helped St. Mary's Hospital secure the grant, and I look forward to continuing to work with its administrators and staff to ensure it has the resources it needs to fulfill its mission of providing quality care in our communities.

I join in thanking all the doctors, nurses, administrators, support staff, and emergency responders who have made St. Mary's Hospital the success it is today. After a century of service to Southern Maryland, St. Mary's is surely headed for many more years of excellence.

IN HONOR OF HOWARD CORO

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Howard Coro. Howard joined the North Thompsonville Fire Department on August 30, 1972. Rising through the ranks to Lieutenant and then to Captain in 1994, Howard retired from his post in July of 2012 after forty years of service to the people of Enfield, Connecticut.

Early in his career Howard distinguished himself from his peers and earned the North Thompsonville Firefighter of the Year Award in 1975. He went on to assist in the training of hundreds of new firefighters across the region and was involved with a variety of local committees within the fire department. Howard was instrumental in overseeing the renovation and addition to the current North Thompsonville fire station.

Throughout his decades of service, Howard responded to countless emergency calls. Whether he was responding to a fire, a hazmat incident, or an automobile accident, Howard was someone Enfield residents could count on to help during their most urgent times of need. This compassion and dedication to the people of Enfield truly set him apart.

We owe great deal of gratitude to the first responders who risk their lives every day to protect their communities. I ask my colleagues to join with me in applauding Howard Coro's courage and service.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference.

This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 21, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's record.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 9

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.
SD–G50

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Ernest J. Moniz, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Energy.
SD–366

APRIL 11

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SD–G50

APRIL 16

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the situation in Afghanistan.
SH–216

APRIL 17

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.
SH–216

APRIL 18

10 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the current and future worldwide threats to the national security of the United States; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.
SD–106

APRIL 23

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SD–106

APRIL 25

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC–217 following the open session.
SD–106

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
To hold hearings to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2014 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR–222

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed H.R. 933, Further Continuing Appropriations Act, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1967–S2052

Measures Introduced: Fourteen bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 618–631, and S. Res. 82–85. **Page S2026**

Measures Reported:

S. 622, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs. **Page S2025**

Measures Passed:

Further Continuing Appropriations Act: By 73 yeas to 26 nays (Vote No. 44), Senate passed H.R. 933, making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1967–90**

Adopted:

Coburn/McCain Modified Amendment No. 65 (to Amendment No. 26), to prohibit the use of funds to carry out the functions of the Political Science Program in the Division of Social and Economic Sciences of the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences of the National Science Foundation, except for research projects that the Director of the National Science Foundation certifies as promoting national security or the economic interests of the United States. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the requirement of a 60 affirmative vote threshold, be vitiated.) **Pages S1976, S1984–85**

Coburn/McCain Modified Amendment No. 70 (to Amendment No. 26), to ensure that authorizing committees receive timely information from the Department of Homeland Security. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the requirement of a 60 affirmative vote threshold, be vitiated.) **Pages S1976–81, S1985**

Inhofe/Hagan Modified Amendment No. 72 (to Amendment No. 26), to require the continuation of tuition assistance programs for members of the Armed Forces for the remainder of fiscal year 2013. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the requirement of a 60 affirmative vote threshold, be vitiated.) **Pages S1974–75, S1985**

Mikulski/Shelby Modified Amendment No. 98 (to Amendment No. 26), of a perfecting nature. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the requirement of a 60 affirmative vote threshold, be vitiated.) **Page S1985**

Leahy Modified Amendment No. 129 (to Amendment No. 26), to revise language regarding cluster munitions. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the requirement of a 60 affirmative vote threshold, be vitiated.) **Pages S1985–86**

Pryor Amendment No. 82 (to Amendment No. 26), relative to Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments, Food Safety and Inspection Service, and Domestic Food Programs. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the requirement of a 60 affirmative vote threshold, be vitiated.) **Page S1986**

By 70 yeas to 29 nays (Vote No. 42), Reid (for Mikulski/Shelby) Modified Amendment No. 26, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S1967, S1983–84, S1987**

Murray Amendment No. 176, to amend the title. **Page S2008**

Rejected:

By 48 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 39), Coburn/McCain Amendment No. 69 (to Amendment No. 26), to prohibit Urban Area Security Initiative grant recipients from funding projects that do not improve homeland security. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S1976, S1984**

By 45 yeas to 54 nays (Vote No. 40), Coburn Amendment No. 93 (to Amendment No. 26), to transfer appropriations from the National Heritage Partnership Program to fund the resumption of public tours of the White House and visitor services and maintenance at national parks and monuments. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S1976, S1984**

By 40 yeas to 59 nays (Vote No. 41), Toomey Modified Amendment No. 115 (to Amendment No. 26), to increase by $25,000,000 the amount appropriated for Operation and Maintenance for the Department of Defense for programs, projects, and activities in the continental United States, and to provide an offset. (A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the amendment, having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, the amendment was not agreed to.) **Pages S1967, S1981–83, S1986–87**

Withdrawn:

Durbin Amendment No. 123 (to Amendment No. 115), to change the enactment date. **Page S1967**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 63 yeas to 36 nays (Vote No. 43), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the bill. **Pages S1987–88**

Gold Star Wives Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 67, designating April 5, 2013, as "Gold Star Wives Day", and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S2051**

192nd Anniversary of Independence of Greece: Senate agreed to S. Res. 84, recognizing the 192nd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States. **Page S2051**

National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 85, designating April 2013 as "National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month". **Page S2051**

Measures Considered:

Budget Resolution—Agreement: Senate began consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023. **Pages S1990–S2019**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached provided that staff be permitted to make technical and conforming changes to the resolution, as necessary, consistent with amendments adopted during Senate consideration, including calculating the associated change in the Net Interest function under Section 104 and incorporating the effect of such adopted amendments on the budgetary aggregates under Section 101 for Federal Revenues, the amount by which Federal revenues should be changed, New Budget Authority, Budget Outlays, Deficits, Public Debt, and Debt Held By the Public. **Page S1990**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the period of debate for Economic Goals and Policy under Section 305b of the Congressional Budget Act occur on Thursday, March 21, 2013, at a time to be determined by the two managers. **Page S1990**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the concurrent resolution at approximately 9 a.m., on Thursday, March 21, 2013; and that there be 34 hours remaining on the concurrent resolution, equally divided between the Chair and Ranking Member. **Page S2051**

Executive Communications: **Page S2025**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S2026**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2026–28**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2028–37**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2024–25**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2037–50**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S2050–51**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S2051**

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—44) **Pages S1984, S1987–88, S1989**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 10:45 p.m., until 9 a.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2025.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Frederick Vollrath, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, Eric K. Fanning, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, and 41 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

SPACE THREATS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Science and Space concluded a hearing to examine assessing the risks, impacts, and solutions for space threats, after receiving testimony from James Green, Director, Planetary Science Division, Science Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Edward T. Lu, B612 Foundation, Mountain View, California; Richard DalBello, Intelsat, Bethesda, Maryland; and Joan Johnson-Freese, Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 601, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, with amendments.

CENTER FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID INNOVATION

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reforming the delivery system, focusing on the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation, after receiving testimony from Richard J. Gilfillan, Director, Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

COUNTERTERRORISM POLICIES

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine counterterrorism policies and priorities, focusing on addressing the evolving threat, after receiving testimony from former Representative Jane Harman, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and Kenneth L. Wainstein, Cadwalader, Wickersham and Taft LLP, both of Washington, D.C.; and Michael E. Leiter, former Director, National Counterterrorism Center, and Palantir Technologies, McLean, Virginia.

HURRICANE SANDY

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Hurricane Sandy, focusing on getting the recovery right and the value of mitigation, after receiving testimony from W. Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security; Shaun Donovan, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; and Jo-Ellen Darcy, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original bill entitled, ''Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Reauthorization Act of 2013'', and

S. 330, to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

FUTURE OF DRONES IN AMERICA

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the future of drones in America, focusing on law enforcement and privacy considerations, after receiving testimony from Benjamin Miller, Mesa County Sheriff's Office Unmanned Aircraft Program, Mesa County, Colorado, on behalf of the Airborne Law Enforcement Association; Amie Stepanovich, Electronic Privacy Information Center, Washington, D.C.; Michael Toscano, Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International, Arlington, Virginia; and Ryan Calo, University of Washington School of Law, Seattle.

IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine building an immigration system worthy of American values, after receiving testimony from Ahilan T. Arunlanantham, American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California, Los Angeles; Michael W. Cutler, Senior Special Agent (Ret.), Immigration and Naturalization Service, New York, New York; Jan C. Ting, Temple University Beasley School of Law, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Pamela A. Stampp, The Castro Firm, Inc., Wilmington, Delaware; and Paul Grussendorf, Shepherdstown, West Virginia.

VETERANS AFFAIRS MENTAL HEALTH CARE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Veterans Affairs mental health care, focusing on ensuring timely access to high-quality care, after receiving testimony from Robert A. Petzel, Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Health, Veterans Health Administration; Colonel Rebecca I. Porter, Chief, Behavioral Health Division, Office of the Surgeon General, United States Army, Department of Defense; Lieutenant Colonel Kenny Allred, USA (Ret.), National Alliance on Mental Illness Veterans and Military Council, Rockwood, Tennessee; Jacob Wood, Team Rubicon, Los Angeles, California; Andre Wing, The Vermont Veterans Outreach Program, South Burlington; Kimberly Ruocco, Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors, Newbury, Massachusetts; and Barbara Van Dahlen, Give an Hour, Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 33 public bills, H.R. 1275–1307; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 130 were introduced. **Pages H1717–20**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1720–21**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Hultgren to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1635**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:40 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H1639**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Monsignor RobertA. Kurwicki, Cathedral of St. Joseph, Jefferson City, MO. **Page H1639**

Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Representatives Shimkus, Womack, Israel, and Loretta Sanchez (CA). **Page H1645**

United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Representatives David Scott (GA), Schneider, Frankel, and Connolly. **Page H1645**

Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014: The House resumed consideration of H. Con. Res. 25, to establish the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023. Consideration of the concurrent resolution began yesterday, March 19th. **Pages H1645–H1710**

Rejected:

Mulvaney amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 113–21) that sought to insert the text of the Senate's Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 2014 (by a recorded vote of 154 ayes to 261 noes, Roll No. 83); **Pages H1645–64, H1680**

Scott (VA) amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 113–21) that sought to make significant investments in education, job training, transportation and infrastructure, and advanced research and development programs. The amendment protects the social safety net without cutting Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, or SNAP. The amendment raises new revenue by closing corporate tax loopholes and preferences. The amendment reduces the annual budget deficit to 1.8% of GDP by FY 2023 (by a recorded vote of 105 ayes to 305 noes with 1 answering "present", Roll No. 84); **Pages H1664–71, H1680–81**

Grijalva amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 113–21) that sought to establish the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and set forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2013 and for fiscal years 2015 through 2023. The amendment is referred to as the "Back to Work Budget" (by a recorded vote of 84 ayes to 327 noes with 1 answering "present", Roll No. 85); **Pages H1671–80, H1681–82**

Woodall amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 113–21) that sought to balance in four years, remove the fiscal cliff tax increases, and cut discretionary spending to FY2008 levels (by a recorded vote of 104 ayes to 132 noes with 171 answering "present", Roll No. 86); and **Pages H1682–95**

Van Hollen amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 113–21) that sought to emphasize job creation and growth, replace the harmful sequester with a balanced approach to deficit reduction that includes targeted spending cuts as well as revenues, protect Medicare beneficiaries, and cut tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans while extending tax relief for the middle-class. The amendment meets these national priorities within a fiscally responsible framework that reduces the deficit to a sustainable 2.4 percent of GDP by 2023 (by a recorded vote of 165 ayes to 253 noes, Roll No. 87). **Pages H1695–H1710**

H. Res. 122, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) and the resolution (H. Res. 115), was agreed to yesterday, March 19th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, March 21st. **Page H1710**

Recess: The House met at 6:23 p.m. and reconvened at 8:08 p.m. **Page H1716**

Unanimous Consent Agreement: Agreed by unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 933, with Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without any intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the

House concur in the Senate amendment(s); the Senate amendment(s) and the motion shall be considered as read; the motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question. Page H1716

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1680, H1680–81, H1681–82, H1694–95 and H1709–10. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

Committee Meetings

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a business meeting to consider the following measures: H.R. 634, the "Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2013"; H.R. 677, the "Inter-Affiliate Swap Clarification Act"; H.R. 742, the "Swap Data Repository and Clearinghouse Indemnification Correction Act of 2013"; H.R. 992, the "Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act"; H.R. 1003, to improve consideration by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders; H.R. 1038, the "Public Power Risk Management Act of 2013"; and H.R. 1256 to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to jointly adopt rules setting forth the application to cross-border swaps transactions of certain provisions relating to swaps that were enacted as part of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 634; H.R. 742; H.R. 1003; H.R. 1038; H.R. 1256; and H.R. 992. The following bill was ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 677.

APPROPRIATIONS—CHILDREN'S MENTAL HEALTH OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on Children's Mental Health Oversight. Testimony was heard from Pamela Hyde, Administrator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; and Deb Delisle, Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL GUARD AND U.S. ARMY RESERVE OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve Oversight. Testimony was heard from General Frank J. Grass, Chief, National Guard Bureau; Lieutenant General William E. Ingram, Jr., Director, Army National Guard; Lieutenant General Stanley E. "Sid" Clarke III, Director, Air National Guard; and Lieutenant General Jeffrey W. Talley, Chief, U.S. Army Reserve; National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve Oversight.

APPROPRIATIONS—CYBERSECURITY AND CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Cybersecurity and Critical Infrastructure. Testimony was heard from Rand Beers, Under Secretary, National Protection and Programs Directorate; and Suzanne Spaulding, Deputy Under Secretary, National Protection and Programs Directorate.

APPROPRIATIONS—MAJOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held a hearing on Major Construction Projects of the Department of Energy Oversight. Testimony was heard from Bob Raines, Associate Administrator for Acquisition and Project Management, National Nuclear Security Administration; Jack Surash, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Project Management, Office of Environmental Management, Department of Energy; Paul Bosco, Director, Office of Acquisition and Project Management, Department of Energy; Dave Trimble, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; Mike Ferguson, Chief of Cost Engineering, Huntington District, Army Corps of Engineers; and William A. Eckroade, Principal Deputy Chief, Office of Health, Safety and Security, Department of Energy.

APPROPRIATIONS—JUDICIARY OVERSIGHT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on Judiciary Oversight. Testimony was heard from Julia S. Gibbons, Chair, Committee on the Budget of the Judicial Conference of the United States; and Thomas F. Hogan, Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice and Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing on National Aeronautics and Space Administration Budget. Testimony was heard from Charles F. Bolden, Jr., Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

U.S. NORTHERN COMMAND AND U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing on the Posture of the U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command. Testimony was heard from General Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., USA, Commander, U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command; and General John F. Kelly, USMC, Commander, U.S. Southern Command.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1120, the "Preventing Greater Uncertainly in Labor-Management Relations Act". The bill was ordered reported, as amended.

HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled "Health Information Technologies: How Innovation Benefits Patients". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STATE OF COMMUNITY BANKING IN THE CURRENT REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled "State of Community Banking: Is the Current Regulatory Environment Adversely Affecting Community Financial Institutions?". Testimony was heard from the following Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: Richard Brown, Chief Economist and Associate Director, Division of Insurance and Research; Doreen Eberley, Director, Division of Risk Management Supervision; Bret Edwards, Director, Division of Resolutions and Receiverships; Jon T. Rymer, Inspector General; and Lawrance L. Evans, Jr., Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office.

CRISIS IN SYRIA: THE U.S. RESPONSE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Crisis in Syria: The U.S. Response". Testimony was heard from Robert S. Ford American Ambassador to Syria; Anne C. Richard, Assistant Secretary Bureau for Population, Refugees, and Migration, Department of State; and Nancy E. Lindborg, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance; United States Agency for International Development.

HEZBOLLAH'S STRATEGIC SHIFT: A GLOBAL TERRORIST THREAT

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing on "Hezbollah's Strategic Shift: A Global Terrorist Threat". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MEASURING OUTCOMES TO UNDERSTAND THE STATE OF BORDER SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security held a hearing entitled "Measuring Outcomes to Understand the State of Border Security. Testimony was heard from Michael J. Fisher, Chief, Border Patrol, Department of Homeland Security; Kevin McAleenan, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations; Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; Mark Borkowski, Assistant Commissioner, Office of Technology Innovation and Acquisition, Customs and Border Protection; and Veronica Escobar, Judge, El Paso County, Texas.

CYBER THREATS FROM CHINA, RUSSIA AND IRAN: PROTECTING AMERICAN CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Commmittee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technology held a hearing entitled "Cyber Threats from China, Russia and Iran: Protecting American Critical Infrastructure". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law began a markup on H.R. 367, the "Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013"; and H.R. 982, the "Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency (FACT) Act of 2012". The Committee ordered reported, without amendment H.R. 367. The Committee did not complete action on H.R. 982.

THE REGISTER'S CALL FOR UPDATES TO U.S. COPYRIGHT LAW

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property and the Internet held a hearing entitled "The Register's Call for Updates to U.S. Copyright Law". Testimony was heard from Maria Pallante, Register of Copyright, U.S. Copyright Office.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 527, the "Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act"; H.R. 254, the "Bonneville Unit Clean Hydropower Facilitation Act"; H.R. 291, the "Black Hills Cemetery Act"; H.R. 507, the "Pascua Yaqui Tribe Trust Land Act; H.R. 588, the "Vietnam Veterans Donor Acknowledgment Act of 2013"; H.R. 678, the "Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act"; H.R. 716, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the city of Vancouver, Washington, and for other purposes; H.R. 1033, the "American Battlefield Protection Program Amendments Act of 2013"; and H.R. 1159, the "Cabin Fee Act of 2013". The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 254; H.R. 291; H.R. 507; H.R. 588; H.R. 678; H.R. 716; and H.R. 1033. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 527; and H.R. 1159.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a business meeting to consider the following: H.R. 1232, the "Federal Information Technology Acquisition and Reform Act"; H.R. 1211, the "FOIA Oversight and Implementation Act of 2013"; H.R. 1163, the "Federal Information Security Amendments Act of 2013"; H.R. 1162, the "Government Accountability Office Improvement Act"; H.R. 1233, the "Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments of 2013"; H.R. 1234, the "Electronic Message Preservation Act"; H.R. 328, the "Excess Federal Building and Property Disposal Act of 2013"; H.R. 1133, the "Presidential Library Donation Reform Act"; H.R. 1104, the "Federal Advisory Committee Reform Act"; H.R. 249, the "Federal Employee Tax Accountability Act of 2013"; H.R. 882, the "Contracting and Tax Accountability Act of 2013"; H.R. 313, the "Government Spending Accountability Act of 2013"; and H.R. 1246, the "DC CFO Vacancy Act." The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 249; H.R. 882; H.R. 328; H.R. 1163; H.R. 1232; H.R. 1162; H.R. 1133; H.R. 1104; and H.R. 1246. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 313; H.R. 1211; H.R. 1233; and H.R. 1234.

IMPROVING EPA'S SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PROCESSES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled "Improving EPA's Scientific Advisory Processes." Testimony was heard from Michael Honeycutt, Chief Toxicologist, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality; Roger McClellan, Advisor, Toxicology and Human Health Risk Analysis; and a public witness.

EXAMINING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NIST LABORATORIES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Technology held a hearing entitled "Examining the Effectiveness of NIST Laboratories". Testimony was heard from Willie E. May, Associate Director for Laboratory Programs, National Institute of Standards and Technology; and a public witness.

INEFFICIENCIES AND DUPLICATION ACROSS FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Entrepreneurial Assistance: Examining Inefficiencies and Duplication Across Federal Programs." Testimony was heard from William Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investments, Government Accountability Office; Michael A. Chodos, Associate Administrator for Entrepreneurial Development, Office of Entrepreneurial Development, Small Business Administration; and Doug O'Brien, Deputy Under Secretary for Rural Development, Department of Agriculture.

EMPLOYEE TRAINING AND WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT TO IMPROVE DISABILITY CLAIMS PROCESSING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Focusing on People: A Review of VA's Plans for Employee Training, Accountability, and Workload Management to Improve Disability Claims Processing." Testimony was heard from Allison Hickey, Under Secretary for Benefits, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and Diana Rubens, Deputy Under Secretary for Field Operations, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

CHALLENGES OF ACHIEVING FAIR AND CONSISTENT DISABILITY DECISIONS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing entitled "Challenges of Achieving Fair and Consistent Disability Decisions." Testimony was heard from Patrick P. O'Carroll, Jr., Inspector General, Social Security Administration; and Arthur R. Spencer, Associate Commissioner, Office of Disability Programs, Social Security Administration; and public witnesses.

FINANCIAL PRODUCTS TAX REFORM

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures held a hearing entitled "Financial Products Tax Reform." Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider the nomination of Sarah Jewell, of Washington, to be Secretary of the Interior, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, to hold hearings to examine Asia, focusing on democracy, good governance and human rights, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the Department of Homeland Security at 10 years, focusing on a progress report on management, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Jane Kelly, of Iowa, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, and Kenneth John Gonzales, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, March 21, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice and Science, and Related Agencies, hearing for Members of Congress and outside witnesses, 9:30 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

March 21, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, hearing on Federal Transit Administration Oversight, 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

March 21, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies, hearing on USDA Inspector General Oversight, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, March 21, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on an Update on Military Suicide Prevention, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, March 21, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing on "Our Nation of Builders: The Strength of Steel", 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

March 21, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Health Information Technologies: Administration Perspectives on Innovation and Regulation", 9 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 21, Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, hearing entitled "Cyber Attacks: An Unprecedented Threat to U.S. National Security", 9 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, March 21, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs, hearing on H.R. 910, the "Sikes Act Reauthorization Act of 2013"; and H.R. 1080, to amend the Sikes Act to promote the use of cooperative agreements under such an Act for land management related to Department of Defense readiness activities and to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate inter-agency cooperation in conservation programs to avoid or reduce adverse impacts on military readiness activities, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 21, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on "America's Mineral Resources: Creating Mining and Manufacturing Jobs and Securing America"; H.R. 1063, the "National Strategic and Critical Minerals Policy Act of 2013"; H.R. 687, the "Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013"; H.R. 697, the "Three Kids Mine Remediation and Reclamation Act"; H.R. 761, the "Critical and Strategic Minerals Production Act"; H.R. 767, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project; H.R. 957, the "American Soda Ash Competitiveness Act"; and H.R. 981, the "Resource Assessment of Rare Earths Act of 2013", 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Small Business, March 21, Subcommittee on Health and Technology, hearing entitled, "Protecting Small Businesses Against Emerging and Complex Cyber-Attacks," 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, March 21, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Ongoing Intelligence Activities", 9 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9 a.m., Thursday, March 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 8, Budget Resolution, with 34 hours remaining on the concurrent resolution.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, March 21

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H. Con. Res. 25—Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.